IAR

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS REVIEW

COVER PHOTO
An AH-64 Apache helicopter takes off near soldiers participating in the Allied Spirit VII training exercise in Grafenwoehr, Germany, Nov. 18, 2017.
U.S. Department of Defense Photo by Spc. Dustin D. Biven.
VIRIN: 171118-A-ED017-002C.JPG

The appearance of U.S. Department of Defense visual information does not imply or constitute DOD endorsement.

EDITORS' NOTE

We began work on this issue with the belief that we were about to present more than a collection of research and policy writing, and rather the perspectives and priorities of future leaders in the international affairs arena. The International Affairs Review represents these views and demonstrates the diverse discourse within the passionate graduate community at the Elliott School of International Affairs. We continue to strive to amplify their voices.

As we very well know, many are now fiercely questioning the efficacy of an interdependent, liberal world order. It is in this context that themes of burden sharing, global governance frameworks, and changing U.S. foreign policy dominate the Winter 2019 issue. We hope that readers will enjoy the five articles, the interview, and the book review, and come away with a more nuanced understanding of these complex but vital issues.

We sincerely thank our faculty advisors and the Elliott School of International Affairs for their continued support. Finally, this issue would not have been possible without the excellent work of our contributing writers and the tireless work of our editorial staff, who all displayed great expertise and professionalism throughout the editing process.

Hatim Bukhari, *Editor-In-Chief*
Jack Stuart, *Managing Editor*

CONTENTS

Development And Implications Of
The European Deterrence Initiative

Michael Dyer

Michael Dyer is an active duty U.S. Army Major and student at the Elliot School of International Affairs, where he is pursuing a M.A. in European and Eurasian Studies. Michael spent the last five years serving in Europe as a unit commander and security cooperation planner, coordinating American support in Georgia and Ukraine. An Illinois native, Michael graduated from West Point in 2006 with a B.S. in International Relations and Systems Engineering. He has worked and lived across the United States and has operational experience across Europe, Iraq, and Israel.

ABSTRACT

The recent shift in geopolitics towards renewed great power competition, demonstrated by Russian actions in Ukraine, caused the United States to undertake a new program to assure NATO alliance members and deter further Russian actions. This paper covers the development, implementation, and adaptation of that U.S. effort, dubbed the European Deterrence Initiative. The history of this program paints a story of crisis and response on both sides of the Atlantic. With the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force all contributing plans and resources, the United States military charted a hasty path towards stability on the Eastern flank of NATO. The subsequent budgetary, political, and operational developments of the European Deterrence Initiative provide a valuable case study of contemporary U.S. strategies to meet near-peer competitors. Across both the Obama and Trump administrations, the program has had the effect of reaffirming the longstanding American policy of solidarity and commitment to European security. By continuing the European Deterrence Initiative at current funding levels for the near term, the United States can stabilize and reinvigorate the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance as a cornerstone of its global security strategy.

INTRODUCTION

In early June 2014, President Obama stood in Warsaw with President Komorowski of Poland and announced a major U.S. foreign policy initiative. The United States would embark upon a new effort to bolster the security of NATO allies by pre-positioning additional equipment in Europe and expanding exercises and training with allies to increase readiness.[1] This new program, christened the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI) in late 2014, represented

substantial U.S. investment in the defense of Europe, to an unprecedented level since the end of the Cold War.

The events leading up to that summer 2014 announcement started in the winter of the previous year. The ousting of the government of Victor Yanukovych by pro-European Union segments of the Ukrainian population during the Euromaidan triggered a series of responses in Moscow, Washington, and European capitals. These reverberations were the primary impetus for the new U.S. program. However, the story of ERI, currently known as the European Deterrence Initiative (EDI), is more than a reaction to Russian actions. EDI's development, implementation, and adaptation over the past four years has had a significant impact on U.S. military posture in Europe and encouraged broader stability within the transatlantic relationship.

Careful analysis of EDI yields insights on both current and future U.S. commitment to European security. What factors led to the implementation of the initiative, and why was it needed? How has it changed since its inception, and what drove those changes? What is the current status of the program, and what are its prospects in the near future? By working through these questions, a better understanding is gained about the transatlantic relationship. Although ERI began as an immediate response to Russian aggression in Ukraine, it evolved into something more complex over the past several years: a clear response to doubts over U.S. commitment to NATO and European security.

THE GENESIS OF THE EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE: PERSISTENT PRESENCE & INITIAL ACTIONS

Months prior to President Obama's announcement, a response to the Russian annexation of Crimea and invasion of Eastern Ukraine was already in development. General Phillip Breedlove, filling the dual role as both commander of United States European Command (EUCOM) and Supreme Allied Commander of NATO (SACEUR), coordinated the U.S. military response in the spring of 2014. He directed his subordinate American commands in Europe to plan immediate actions that had one clear initial goal: assure the Baltic States and Poland that the U.S. would defend their sovereignty. Such assurances were especially critical for the Baltic States given the recent history of Russian incursions into other former-Soviet republics of Ukraine and Georgia. Within Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, there were growing fears that Western European members of NATO would hesitate to come to their assistance in the event of conflict with Russia.[2] At that point, the most likely threat to the health of NATO was disunity within the alliance rather than direct Russian action. General Breedlove, leveraging U.S. resources available via EUCOM, was thus able to shore up NATO. Those U.S. efforts, coordinated bilaterally between EUCOM and each of the Baltic States and

Poland, relied upon presence to deliver reassurance to NATO's most exposed members. This core purpose reflected in the name of the operation; "Persistent Presence" began in earnest in April 2014.[3]

The majority of Persistent Presence requirements fell to the United States Army in Europe (USAREUR) and its commander, Lieutenant General Ben Hodges. USAREUR deployed companies of paratroopers from the 173rd Infantry Brigade to the Baltics and Poland for the remainder of 2014, rotating troops every three months. Overall, the number of American ground troops rotating to the region steadied at around a Battalion's strength of 600 personnel at any one time. The United States Air Force in Europe (USAFE) increased F-15 and F-16 Fighter contributions to the NATO Baltic Air Policing mission, more than doubling the American contribution to the ongoing operation. Additionally, over the course of 2014, the U.S. Navy deployed several Arleigh Burke class destroyers to improve naval interoperability, increase readiness, and develop professional relationships with allies.[4] These deployments of American warships represented an increased contribution beyond the existing the Standing NATO Maritime Group.

However, these immediate actions put a tremendous strain on the U.S. forces stationed in Europe physically and fiscally. From the beginning of the initiative, General Breedlove began messaging the difficulty of sustaining Persistent Presence with existing resources to the U.S. political leadership. The downward trend of U.S. forces and funding within Europe since the end of the Cold War had left the military in Europe stretched thin by 2014. "We may need to add additional rotational forces to cover the sustained and persistent presence that we are now envisioning," Breedlove told reporters during a visit to Washington in June 2014. EUCOM as a whole had seen significant cuts, and General Breedlove took many opportunities to publicly remind the Obama Administration and the Pentagon of his concerns:

> *"At the height of the Cold War, the United States had more than 400,000 soldiers assigned to Europe; today, there are fewer than 100,000 soldiers assigned to the continent, and 35,000 of them are on rotational deployments. Indeed, even when combined with the forces of NATO, the United States' military presence on the continent would be hard-pressed to deter a determined Russia."[5]*

In 2014, the imbalance between new threats and existing resources came to a head. General Breedlove was especially concerned with the manning and funding levels within his Army component, USAREUR. Since the end of the Cold War, USAREUR had drawn down from a force of approximately 200,000

to around 33,000, with funding levels proportionally decreasing as well.[6] Of greatest concern, the last Army tank brigade left the continent in late 2013, leaving USAREUR with only one wheeled Stryker brigade and one light infantry airborne brigade. Despite these conditions, the American military in Europe attempted to reassure the eastern members of NATO while maintaining their existing commitments for annual training and maintenance. As the Russian intervention in Ukraine continued to ramp up and the threat towards the Baltics persisted, EUCOM needed a more permanent solution for forces, funding, and direction.

INITIAL EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE GOALS

Driven by public and private concerns from his senior military leaders in Europe, the Obama administration took action. Based on recommendations from EUCOM and the Pentagon, the President made his announcement of ERI in June 2014: "We'll increase the number of American personnel – Army and Air Force units – continuously rotating through allied countries in Central and Eastern Europe. And we will be stepping up our partnerships with friends like Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia as they provide for their own defense. I'm calling on Congress to approve up to $1 billion to support this effort, which will be a powerful demonstration of America's unshakeable commitment to our NATO allies."[7] The fiscal year 2015 budget request from the President to Congress included $1 billion for ERI in the overseas contingency operations fund.[8]

Within that proposal, the Obama administration sought funding along five lines of effort. $440 million was allotted to increase forces rotating to Europe. This included ground forces for the rotations in the Baltics and Poland, Air Force fighters, and an expanded naval presence in the Baltic and Black seas. $250 million was allotted for improved infrastructure projects across Central and Eastern European NATO members, which supported the increased troop presence and training needs. $125 million was allotted for the pre-positioning of equipment in Eastern Europe, including equipment for Marines in Norway. $75 million funded expanded participation in military exercises and training with NATO allies and partners. Finally, the request included $35 million for the Department of Defense and $75 million for the Department of State to "build partner capacity" in NATO member and partner countries via training and gifting of equipment.[9] This billion-dollar infusion did much to address the imbalance between resources and requirements in Europe.

ERI DEVELOPMENTS IN 2014-16

With these funding proposals approved by Congress and signed by President Obama in December 2014, EUCOM then had the capability to both

sustain existing efforts and expand them during 2015. The approval of ERI coincided with the renaming of the American assurance mission in late 2014. The new name, Operation Atlantic Resolve (OAR), reflected the "operational" nature of the mission and espoused the Atlanticism inherent in assurance. OAR's mandate expanded from Persistent Presence in several key areas. It funded the rotation of an armored Brigade Combat Team and a brigade of Army helicopters to support rotations in the Baltics and Poland, representing a significant improvement in the credibility and capability of the American forces.[10] Additionally, the new funding supported rotating division level headquarters to Europe, allowing better command and control of the increased activity from the continent itself. These expansions didn't change the core purpose of the mission to "…reassure NATO allies and partners of America's dedication to enduring peace and stability in the region in light of the Russian intervention in Ukraine."[11]

These U.S. actions set the stage for a heightened summer exercise calendar across Europe. This resulted in over thirty major training events, some of which were new and some which had been expanded upon from previous iterations.[12] Additionally, the fiscal year 2015 ERI funding supported the enlargement of the ongoing assurance mission. Initially covering the Baltic NATO members of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Poland, OAR expanded into the Central European NATO members of Romania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. The 2015 expansion created two distinct geographic regions, labelled "Atlantic Resolve-North" (OAR-N) for the Baltics and Poland, and "Atlantic Resolve-South" (OAR-S) covering Central Europe.

OAR's air component consisted of increased rotations of the USAFE tactical squadrons to Europe, forward deployed in the Baltics and Poland. Initially, a six-month rotation of F-15C/D fighters began in April 2015 in Estonia, Bulgaria, and Hungary. Following rotations incorporated A-10C Warthog, F-16C Fighters, and various transport aircraft, which participated in numerous exercises with their allied NATO air forces. Additionally, these aircraft more than doubled American participation in the enduring NATO Baltic air policing mission and provided support to expanded exercises across Europe. In an unprecedented show of force, the USAFE deployed the advanced F-22 Raptor to Europe for the first time with ERI funding.[13]

By mid-2015, the fiscal year 2016 budgeting cycle began again, and the ERI and OAR continued to receive consistent support from the Obama administration and Congress. Although ERI was originally intended to be a one-year effort, the President's budget for fiscal year 2016 requested $789 million for ERI within the overseas contingency operation budget. This decrease in funding, while not insignificant, had little impact on the ongoing mission. ERI continued the expansions begun in 2015 and enjoyed strong bipartisan support in Congress.[14]

Throughout 2014 and 2015, ERI focused on assuring allies of American commitment to their security. However, 2016 signaled a transition in emphasis away from internal assurance towards external deterrence of Russia. In a March 2016 statement in Latvia, General Breedlove laid out the future for ERI: "Our current funding request for the European Reassurance Initiative would significantly expand on our ERI efforts to date. If approved, our ERI request would expand our focus from assurance to deterrence, including measures that vastly improve our overall readiness."[15] That expansion and refocusing was only possible due to a significant increase in ERI funding by the Obama administration.

The President's fiscal year 2017 budget quadrupled funding for ERI to $3.4 billion. That massive increase was an acknowledgement by the Obama administration of the growing Russian threat to long-term U.S. security interests in Europe. The new funding allowed for the rotational armored brigade, aviation brigade, support units, and division headquarters to have a constant presence in Europe. Under the previous years' planning and budgeting, those expensive forces rotated to the U.S. periodically, leaving short gaps in presence.

Further, the increase in funding allowed the U.S. Army to deepen the stock of prepositioned equipment in Western Europe. An entire heavy brigade's worth of equipment would come to Europe for contingency use, with broad implications for the military, as assessed by a Center for Strategic and International Studies report on ERI: "That action indicated that the [Department of Defense] chose to sacrifice some of its strategic flexibility—or ability to deploy globally by keeping the equipment at home—in favor of heightened readiness to respond to a crisis in the European theater. All of this indicates that the Defense Department is more serious about the defense of Europe and settling in for what they see as an enduring new reality vis-à-vis Russia." The message to allies, partners, and competitors was clear: the U.S. was renewing its physical and financial commitment to the security of Europe.[16]

If the shift from assurance to deterrence was the message of 2016, then Exercise Anakonda 2016 was its exclamation point. Under the initiative of USAREUR's commander, Lieutenant General Ben Hodges, a majority of the personnel in USAREUR participated in a massive series of exercises that summer. These exercises were interconnected under the overall banner of Anakonda 2016, co-hosted by Poland and the U.S. Army. Comprising over 31,000 soldiers from 24 NATO members and partners, the exercise represented the largest such endeavor by the U.S. since the end of the Cold War.[17] ERI was the primary method for funding this unprecedented series of exercises, which would have otherwise been impossible.

ERI IN 2017-18 UNDER THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

The fiscal year 2017 funding request for ERI was the last iteration overseen by the Obama administration. The election of Donald Trump in November of 2016 cast doubt over continued American spending on European security. Political and military leaders on both sides of the Atlantic heard the anti-NATO campaign rhetoric from Trump – typified by comments on burden sharing – dimming their expectations for funding for ERI in fiscal year 2018.[18] As 2017 unfolded, however, the bottom failed to drop out of ERI funding. On the contrary, the administration's actions not only continued support for ERI but actually increased funding for the program. Along with this increase, the Department of Defense under President Trump officially renamed the initiative to the European Deterrence Initiative (EDI). Driven by USAREUR and EUCOM's shift in focus the year prior, the name now accurately reflected the program's intent.

President Trump requested $4.7 billion for EDI from contingency funding in his budget proposal for fiscal year 2018. Specifically, the increase in the budget request allowed for construction of infrastructure and support facilities to handle increased rotations of American ground forces (an increase of $120 million from 2017), as well as paying for those forces themselves (an increase of $700 million). Additionally, it allowed for an expansion of the efforts to pre-position fuel, ammunition, and equipment across Europe, an increase of $320 million.[19] Conclusively, the new administration supported Department of Defense and EUCOM proposals to accelerate the growth of the American military presence in Europe.

EDI funding, when compared to similar funding requests for other U.S. military operations, provides some perspective on the priority of the NATO Alliance to the U.S. EDI represented 13.5% of the Trump administration's overseas contingency operations budget request of $64.6 billion in comparison to the 20% ($13 billion) for operations in Iraq and Syria against ISIS (Operation Inherent Resolve) and 71% ($45.9 billion) for operations in Afghanistan (Operation Freedom's Sentinel).[20] However, EDI signified a mission of deterrence, not an active combat operation like the other two major operations funded within the overseas contingency operations budget. That a deterrence mission should be given such a large portion of funding relative to ongoing combat operations demonstrates its strategic importance to the U.S.

In an acknowledgement of this apparent mislabeling, the U.S. Congress sought to shift funding for EDI in fiscal year 2018 from overseas contingency operations to the base-operating budget of the Department of Defense. This move by Congress affirmed the importance of the NATO Alliance. The Senate Armed Services Committee articulated this perspective within their commentary on the 2018 Defense budget, calling EDI an

"…enduring function that belongs in the base [Defense] budget." Moving EDI from overseas contingency operations was "…part of a broader effort to use [overseas contingency operations funding] for its intended purpose in funding temporary war-fighting expenditures rather than for functions traditionally and properly supported through the base budget."[21]

The budgeting move also signaled a re-prioritization of EDI by Congress; funding the program through the base budget removed much of the unpredictability associated with the overseas contingency operations budget.[22] EDI ranked as an equal to other similar line items within the base budget for fiscal year 2018. Comparable efforts to train, equip, and build partner military capacity received equal or lesser funding than EDI. Of note in the 2018 budget, the Senate authorized $1.8 billion in funding for counter-ISIS efforts via the "train and equip" programs in Iraq and Syria, $4.9 billion for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, and $705 million for Israeli cooperative missile defense programs.[23]

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN EDI

From the beginning of ERI through its development into EDI, EUCOM and the Department of Defense have repeatedly called for a growth in the permanent size of USAREUR by adding another brigade of ground forces and a brigade of army aviation. EDI funding in 2018 would allow EUCOM to meet those force requirements. The high cost and long lead times for rotating large units to Europe had been a constriction on the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the deterrence mission. In 2016, the National Commission on the Future of the Army reported to Congress and the President that increased permanent forces assigned to Europe were imperative. They concluded that the existing practice of rotating aviation and armored brigade combat teams was less effective than permanent basing.[24] This opinion was echoed in a 2016 CSIS report:

> "an armored brigade and aviation brigade should be permanently
> assigned to Europe, given the need and high-costs associated with
> continuously rotating these forces from the United States."[25]

Although EDI had set the conditions for additional forces to permanently re-join USAREUR, General Breedlove believed the Department of Defense could do more, "As for what form this ramped-up presence should take, the U.S. should preposition the equipment for two or three additional armored brigades in Eastern Europe, along with the supplies to sustain those forces through at least two months of intense conflict."[26] Such a buildup would allow the U.S. Army to stage equipment forward without housing the accompanying

soldiers in costly European living arrangements. In the event of conflict or increased tension, the soldiers of those units would travel from their home bases in the U.S. and fall in upon their vehicles and weapons in Europe.

General Breedlove's successor as Commander of EUCOM, General Curtis Scaparrotti, shared this position during his 2016 congressional confirmation hearings saying he understood the challenges given resource limitations but believed "a permanently stationed armored brigade in Europe would be best… [because it] establishes relationships with the supporting elements of all forces from the United States as well as a more permanent and lasting relationship with all of our allies. That can be done over time better than a rotational force can potentially do it."[27] Regardless of the size of the increase or its timeline for execution, there is a strong possibility that some or all of that effort could be funded through EDI.

Another increasingly important aspect of EDI is the U.S. support to NATO deterrence efforts. The renaming from European Reassurance Initiative to EDI reflected an American desire to reinvigorate the alliance towards collective deterrence in lieu of continued bilateral assurance measures used up to that point. Coinciding with this shift in assuring allies to deterring external threats, NATO held the Warsaw Summit in September 2016. At that summit, the North Atlantic Council decided to move forward with a NATO operation similar to the American efforts under OAR.

The Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP), announced following the Warsaw summit, represented a new NATO effort to collectively deter Russian actions. Beginning in June 2017, NATO began its forward presence in the eastern part of the Alliance, with four multinational battlegroups in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland, on a rotational basis. These battlegroups, led by the United Kingdom, Canada, Germany and the United States respectively, were composed of combat formations capable of high-intensity warfare using armor, artillery, and engineers.[28] EFP represented an improvement in size and capability from previous efforts under OAR. Earlier U.S. initiatives to develop infrastructure for housing of personnel, improvements in training areas, and increased equipment, ammunition, and fuel storage to support OAR ended up facilitating later Enhanced Forward Presence deployments. Additionally, the U.S. battlegroup participating in EFP was partially paid for by ERI funds.[29] As EFP continues for the foreseeable future, the program will continue to reap the benefits of this funding; the 2019 budget proposal from the Department of Defense allocated $225 million to the NATO mission.[30] Thus, the continuation of EDI and the success of NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence are inexorably linked.

AN INDICATOR OF TRANSATLANTIC HEALTH

Stemming from statements made by then-candidate and later President Donald Trump in 2016 and early 2017, many assumed that this renewed American investment in European security under EDI would taper off. In an ominous tweet from April 2016, President Trump labeled the NATO alliance "obsolete," and similarly antagonistic rhetoric littered the campaign trail.[31] This hostility and skepticism directed towards the alliance culminated in the May 2017 trip to Brussels for the NATO summit, where the President declined to directly mention the United States' Article V commitments.[32] Article V is the "mutual defense" clause under the North Atlantic Treaty, and requires the U.S. to treat an attack on a NATO ally as an attack on the U.S. itself. Over the past year of his administration, however, President Trump has tempered his tone on NATO. His administration chose to fund EDI through consecutive budgeting cycles, indicating an American commitment to European security.

Indeed, the United States' underlying commitment to Europe was evident to at least one leading European politician. NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg, ahead of the conference in Brussels, stated:

> *"I welcome yesterday's budget proposal to significantly increase the [American] presence in Europe with more troops, infrastructure, and exercises."*

Despite President Trump's deliberate omission of the U.S. commitments under Article V, the Secretary General of NATO made a deeper observation on the U.S. position:

> *"Yesterday, the Trump administration presented a budget where they increase funding for [American] military presence in Europe by forty percent, which is a significant increase which comes on top of the increase we saw last year. So after many years of a decline in [American] military presence in Europe we now see for the first time in many years an increase […] so this is a commitment to our collective defense from the United States not only in words but also in deeds."[33]*

The Secretary General saw past the political rhetoric of a populist politician appealing to his base; he followed the money to reveal the United States' long-term position.

Domestically, both houses of the U.S. Congress continued to openly support ERI and now EDI in 2018. Congress's recent actions have moved

towards securing EDI funding in future defense budgets. As the conflicts in Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan continue, competition for funding and forces will remain. However, recent legislative and executive actions have proven that, even during major competing threats and issues around the globe, Europe remains at the heart of the U.S. interests. During these last four years, we have seen ERI develop from an immediate response to allies' uncertainty and Russian actions into EDI: an unequivocal answer on American solidarity with Europe.

THE FUTURE OF EDI

The current policy of the U.S. has gone a long way to assure allies within NATO, while simultaneously deterring further Russian adventurism in Europe. Despite competing budget requirements and military threats, the Trump administration should continue the current policy and funding for EDI for the next several years. The U.S. is entering a critical phase of investment into its military posture in Europe, and some allies still have reservations about American commitment to NATO. Steady funding and political support over the near-term will solidify our Allies' confidence and complete our European force posture improvements.

For fiscal year 2019, the Department of Defense proposed a 36 percent increase in funding for EDI.[34] This increase can support two new developments: increasing permanently stationed American units in Europe and expansion of support for NATO-led deterrence activities. Both actions herald a long-term U.S. commitment. The significance of permanent stationing of units in Europe and allocation of funds towards long-term infrastructure projects will not be lost on our allies, partners, and competitors in Europe.

The importance of a stable and secure Europe to the U.S. is clear. The two are inextricably linked, both economically and politically. The European Union is United States' largest trading partner, and together the two represent a majority of the world's gross domestic product. The $5.5 trillion in annual trade requires stability, confidence, and security to sustain growth. Regardless of competing economic and security concerns in the Pacific, the U.S. exports four times the amount of goods to Europe than it does to China. Europe represents the United States' most lucrative relationship; the security provided by NATO is the underlying foundation for that prosperity.

Despite the past four years of EDI funding, some European allies continue to doubt the U.S. commitment to European security. Due in no small part to trade negotiations and friction between the U.S. and the European Union, France and Germany have reinvigorated the call for independent European military capability outside the framework of NATO. The Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) initiative within the European Union could potentially

compliment and augment NATO capabilities, but would surely overlap with existing NATO efforts. Such initiatives ultimately waste limited European defense budgets on redundant command hierarchies, military capabilities, and acquisitions programs. Political support for PESCO within the European Union stems from the doubt of American support for European security. These reservations can be significantly reduced through steady American actions in the face of hyperbolic political rhetoric. The U.S. can silence these initiatives for independent European military forces through continuation of the funding for EDI.

Steady funding for EDI over the next several years will secure the effect the U.S. seeks: assuring our allies of NATO's stability and deterring our Russian competitors from aggressive actions in Europe. The modest cost of EDI, relative to other major operations and programs around the globe, will help to secure America's most valuable economic and political relationship and calm our allies' insecurities. The transatlantic bond, dating back to the foundations of our nation, should be a major priority for the Trump Administration and our military during this time of renewed global competition. Our security and prosperity depend on it.

ENDNOTES

1   "Remarks by President Obama and President Komorowski of Poland in a Joint Press Conference." June 03, 2014. https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/06/03/remarks-president-obama-and-president-komorowski-poland-joint-press-conf

2   Stefani Weiss, "Germany's Security Policy: From Territorial Defense to Defending the Liberal World Order?" Bertelsmann Foundation, October 1, 2016, http://www.bfna.org/research/germanys-security-policy-from-territorial-defense-to-defending-the-liberal-world-order/

3   U.S. Army STAND-TO!, "USAREUR's Persistent Presence," May 7, 2014, https://www.army.mil/standto/archive_2014-05-07

4   Office of the White House Press Secretary, "Fact Sheet: European Reassurance Initiative and Other U.S. Efforts in Support of NATO Allies and Partners." June 3, 2014, https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/06/03/fact-sheet-european-reassurance-initiative-and-other-us-efforts-support-

5   Andrew Tilghman, "EUCOM Chief: Time to Stop the Drawdown in Europe." Atlantic Council, July 7, 2014, https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/natosource/eucom-chief-time-to-stop-the-drawdown-in-europe

6   Homeland Security Digital Library, "National Commission on the Future of the Army: Report to the President and Congress, Published 28 January, 2016," January 28, 2016, https://www.hsdl.org/?abstract&did=789780

7   The White of, President Barack Obama, "Remarks by President Obama and President Komorowski of Poland in a Joint Press Conference," June 03, 2014, https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/06/03/remarks-president-obama-and-president-komorowski-poland-joint-press-conf

8   Department of Defense, "Statement by Pentagon on Fiscal Year 2015 Overseas Contingency Operations Request." June 26, 2014, http://archive.defense.gov/Releases/Release.aspx?ReleaseID=16801

9   Federation of American Scientists, "Congressional Research Service report on the FY2015 ERI Request." September 14, 2018?, https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/index.html

10   EUCOM, "2015 OAR factsheet, EUCOM", July 17, 2015. www.eucom.mil/doc/35545/oar-fact-sheet

11   Ibid.

12   Ibid.

13   U.S. Air Forces in Europe and Air Forces Africa Public Affairs, "F-22 inaugural deployment to Europe," August 28, 2015, http://www.usafe.af.mil/News/Article-Display/Article/748135/f-22-inaugural-deployment-to-europe/

14   Mark Cancian, "The European Reassurance Initiative," Center for Strategic & International Studies, February 9, 2016, https://www.csis.org/analysis/european-reassurance-initiative-0

15   EUCOM, "Transcript of General Breedlove's speech at the Northern European Chiefs of Defense Conference" March 31, 2016, http://www.eucom.mil/media-library/article/35187/remarks-from-the-northern-europe-chiefs-of-defense-conference-in-riga-latvia

16   Ibid.

17   U.S. Army Europe, "Anakonda 2016 Press Release," USAREUR, http://www.eur.army.mil/anakonda/

18   Jorge Benitez, "How to navigate Trump's tectonic change in transatlantic relations," February 16, 2017. http://www.cnn.com/2017/02/16/opinions/multinational-deterrence-initiative-benitez-opinion/index.html

19   United States European Command, "EUCOM 2018 ERI Factsheet," October 16, 2017.

20   Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, "Fiscal Year 2018 Defense Spending Request Briefing Book," November 14, 2017, https://armscontrolcenter.org/fy-2018-defense-budget-request-briefing-book/

21   Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Executive Summary of NDAA FY18," https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/FY18%20NDAA%20summary2.pdf

22   Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), "ERI Report from DoD Budget FY18 to the House Armed Services Committee," May 2017, comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/defbudget/.../FY2017_ERI_J-Book.pdf

23   Ibid.

24   National Commission on the Future of the Army, "Report to the President and Congress," January 28, 2016, 52.

25   Kathleen Hicks, "Evaluating Future US Army Force Posture in Europe," Center for Strategic & International Studies, June 2016, https://www.csis.org/analysis/evaluating-future-us-army-force-posture-europe-phase-ii-report

26   Philip Breedlove, "NATO's Next Act: How to Handle Russia and Other Threats" *Foreign Affairs,* June 2016, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/europe/2016-06-13/natos-next-act

27   Association of the United States Army, "Scaparrotti Confirmation Hearings before the SASC," April 22, 2016, https://www.ausa.org/news/scaparrotti-favors-permanent-abct-europe

28   NATO, "NATO EFP Fact Sheet," May 2017, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_136388.
     htm?selectedLocale=en

29   EUCOM, "EUCOM 2018 EDI Fact Sheet," October 2, 2017, www.eucom.mil/media-library/.../2018-
     european-deterrence-initiative-edi-fact-sheet

30   Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), "Fiscal Year 2019 European Deterrence
     Initiative Budget Request," February 2018, 4, http://comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/
     defbudget/fy2019/fy2019_EDI_JBook.pdf

31   Shayna Freisleben, "A Guide to Trump's past comments about NATO," *Cbsnews.com*, April 12, 2017,
     https://www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-nato-past-comments/

32   Rosie Gray, "Trump Declines to Affirm NATO's Article 5," *Atlantic*, May 2017, https://www.
     theatlantic.com/international/archive/2017/05/trump-declines-to-affirm-natos-article-5/528129/

33   David Herszenhorn, "NATO cheers Trump's military budget," *Politico*, May 2017, https://www.
     politico.eu/.../nato-donald-trump-military-spending-cheers-military-budg...

34   "Fiscal Year 2019 European Deterrence Initiative Budget Request," 56.

Role of U.N. Peacekeepers In
Donbas Conflict Resolution

John Sims

John Sims is a second-year graduate student at the Elliott School of International Affairs. He is pursuing a M.A. in Security Policy Studies with concentrations in transnational security and conflict resolution. John received a B.A. in Russian Language and Literature and International Studies from Indiana University. He has a particular interest in understanding why conflicts occur and how they may be brought to an end. A former student of Russian studies, John's regional interests lie in Russia, the former Soviet space, and Europe.

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that third-party peacekeeping can play a vital role in mitigating and resolving the Ukraine-Russian conflict in the Donbas region. Understanding the current situation in the region as well as the intricacies and implications of a U.N. peacekeeping mission is important in assessing a solution to the ongoing conflict. This paper will provide an overview of the Minsk Agreements, signed as a result of prior attempts to halt the conflict, and will discuss which actors and stakeholders could play a prominent role in implementing a peacekeeping mission. It will then go over the details of such a peacekeeping force, including necessary U.N. mandate requirements, troop consistency, and the challenges of deployment on the ground; and highlight the objectives for reducing hostilities. The paper will conclude by addressing which goals are thought to be attainable within the short, medium, and long-term.

INTRODUCTION

The Ukrainian Donbas region has been in conflict since the Euromaidan protests and the ousting of President Yanukovych in 2014. Russia viewed the protests and subsequent ousting as a coup against a democratically elected leader. On the pretext of protecting Russian minorities in Ukraine, Russia then annexed Crimea and provided financial and military assistance to pro-Russian separatist regions in the Donbas: the Donetsk People's Republic (DPR) and Luhansk People's Republic (LPR). The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), Russia, France, and Germany attempted to mitigate the conflict through the two Minsk Agreements, signed in 2014

and 2015 respectively. However, these efforts ultimately failed to uphold a ceasefire and critical portions of the Minsk II Agreement remain neglected. A resolution is critically needed as the Donbas conflict continues to exacerbate the tenuous relationship between Russia and the transatlantic alliance. Russia's aggressive actions may bolster its position as an influential state, but these actions increase the risk of conflict with the United States and the European Union. While great power politics dominate the relationship between Russia and the West, Ukrainian citizens, as well as its national sovereignty and institutional legitimacy, continue to suffer from this ongoing conflict.

This paper argues that third-party peacekeeping can serve as a solution to ending the conflict between Ukraine, Russia, and the pro-Russian republics in the Donbas region. In order to illustrate this argument, it is first necessary to highlight the viability of a U.N. peacekeeping mission and address the Minsk Agreements that have attempted to halt the conflict.

THE MINSK AGREEMENTS

The Minsk I and II currently serve as the governing peace documents for the Donbas conflict. Minsk I was negotiated between the OSCE's Trilateral Contact Group, which consisted of representatives from Ukraine, Russia, and the OSCE. The agreement established twelve protocols designed to implement a peace agreement to end the conflict, including a ceasefire.[1] However, Ukraine and the pro-Russian republics frequently violated the terms of ceasefire and the conflict continued to escalate through 2014. As a result of the continuous heavy fighting, the negotiations for Minsk II began. In February 2015 – following a round of negotiations that included the presidents of France, Germany, and Russia – Ukraine and the separatist republics accepted a new ceasefire agreement and established thirteen implementation protocols.[2]

Minsk II's thirteen protocols sought to build a roadmap for resolving the conflict. These included agreement between the conflicting parties on "an immediate and comprehensive ceasefire, the withdrawal of heavy weaponry from the line of contact, elections held based on the Law of Ukraine, the withdrawal of foreign armed formations, and the reestablishment of Ukrainian control of the Ukraine-Russia border."[3] The agreement stipulates that the OSCE will remain the governing body in charge of enforcement and monitoring to ensure the protocols are followed.[4]

While Minsk II is an imperfect document, it does provide a roadmap for ending the Donbas conflict. Ceasefire violations continue and the conflicting parties of Russia, Ukraine, DPR, and LPR have failed to implement the specific protocols needed to achieve an effective resolution. Russia accuses Ukraine of

not pursuing the political reforms outlined in Minsk II, while Ukraine accuses Russia of failing to remove its troops or surrender control of Ukraine-Russia border.[5] Russia continues to provide financial and military aid to the separatist republics, and neither the Ukrainian government nor the republics have moved their heavy weaponry from the ceasefire line. Moreover, Ukraine has failed to implement amnesty for combatants and does not have the "necessary leverage" to compel Russian cooperation.[6] These continued hostilities have prevented establishment of mutual trust between all parties.

Additionally, the OSCE is not an effective neutral actor and cannot enforce the agreement. OSCE monitors do not have full access to the separatist regions and the ongoing clashes preclude comprehensive oversight of the participants.[7] The OSCE has the necessary toolkit to implement the Minsk protocols, but has failed to compel the conflicting parties towards those objectives. Without adequate protection or capabilities to address the political differences, the OSCE cannot implement the peace agreement or maintain the ceasefire.[8]

Despite its flaws, Minsk II remains critical to addressing the conflict. The thirteen principles established should not be eliminated by an intervening third-party, but instead be incorporated into the broader mandates of peacebuilding in the region. A better agreement is unlikely to occur, as Russia will not remove troops until a political compromise is reached and Ukraine will not push a political compromise until military forces are removed.[9] Due to the rigidity of the conflict parties, an intervening third-party force is required to mitigate conflict and uphold the terms of the peace agreement.

CRITICAL ACTORS

A peacekeeping mission offers the best solution in this situation, but the approval for such a mission requires the support of some specific actors. First, Ukraine must request a peacekeeping deployment, and then, United Nations Security Council (UNSC) members, especially Russia and the United States, must approve the mission. Moreover, DPR and LPR's consent is critical for any deployment.

UKRAINE

Following 2015 Ukrainian losses near the ceasefire line, President Poroshenko called for the deployment of international peacekeeping forces. Ukraine proposed a robust mission to guarantee that peacekeeping forces would aid in the removal of foreign troops and heavy weaponry as well as help the Ukrainian government regain control over the Ukraine-Russian border.[10] Ukraine does not support a proposal that does not guarantee government control over the separatist regions. Russia opposed Poroshenko's proposal and

the initiative stalled in the UNSC.[11] Nevertheless, new Russian statements on peacekeeping highlight the potential for a future mission that would be mutually acceptable.

To many in Ukraine, Minsk II was accepted under duress after pro-Russia groups violated Minsk I to secure critical contested territory.[12] Members of Ukraine's government have consequently hesitated to initiate the reforms required by Minsk II. The Ukrainian resistance to Minsk II, complicates the implementation of the agreement and of any future peacekeeping mission, and necessitates considerable consensus-building efforts in Ukraine.[13]

RUSSIA

Russia has recently supported the possibility of a peacekeeping force in the region. In September 2017, President Putin proposed a limited lightly-armed peacekeeping force that would control the Minsk II ceasefire line and aid the OSCE in monitoring efforts.[14] However, Ukraine and Western governments rejected this proposal on the grounds that it would be inadequate to create the conditions needed to support the Minsk process, and would legitimize the separatist border as a permanent split in Ukraine.[15] President Poroshenko denounced the Russian plan and continued to advocate for the 2015 Ukrainian peacekeeping proposal, stating, "The U.N. peacekeeping operation should restore justice rather than freeze the conflict and cement the [Russian] occupation."[16] Ukrainian and Russian interests therefore continue to remain divided.

Although Russia annexed Crimea with minimal resistance, the Donbas conflict is taking a greater toll on Russian international interests. Therefore, Russia can be incentivized towards international peacekeeping cooperation despite its past obstinacy. First, Russian peacemaking efforts would engender Western appreciation and assist in normalizing relations. Second, Russian funding of the separatist republics add up to about $1 billion a year, a financial burden which is compounded by the economic sanctions imposed by the West.[17] Third, while seizing Crimea offered the strategic port of Sevastopol and valuable infrastructure connecting Russia to its military bases on the peninsula, the Donbas is comparatively less valuable, both geographically and economically.

Although the Donbas conflict offers few benefits for Russia, Russian support for a peacekeeping operation is conditional on being offered certain advantageous incentives. Russia will not support any peacekeeping mission that does not lift international sanctions. The Russian economy has contracted under the sanctions and credible promises of sanctions relief are vital to ensuring Russian cooperation with any peacekeeping negotiations. With its UNSC veto power, Russia will play a key role in negotiating the terms

of the peacekeeping mandate as well as the structure of the deployment.[18] Russia will not permit a stabilizing peace mandate and will resist a force structure that consists of NATO-country forces.[19] Additionally, any peacekeeping operation must be solely focused on the Donbas; inclusion of Crimea in any peacekeeping mandate would be lead to a veto in the UNSC.

DPR AND LPR

Although their consent is not required for a peacekeeping deployment, the DPR and LPR maintain significant regional control and their cooperation is valuable for ensuring the safety and success of a peacekeeping mission. Obtaining DPR and LPR consent remains a challenge, however. DPR and LPR consent to a peacekeeping force would include agreeing to abide by Ukrainian government control, which is unacceptable to some regional leaders. Former DPR leader Zakharchenko rejected any peacekeeping beyond protecting OSCE monitoring efforts.[20] So long as these groups see peacekeepers as a tool to enforce Ukrainian control in the region, they will remain unwilling to participate.

Despite their hesitation to cooperate with a peacekeeping mission, the DPR and LPR are dependent upon Russian support and will likely comply with Russian directions on the matter. While Russia is unlikely to limit support until a peacekeeping agreement is accepted, the threat of reduced support would compel the republics to comply with peacekeeper requests.[21]

UNITED STATES

The United States' complicated relationship with Russia and its permanent seat on the UNSC give it a significant role in any peacekeeping discussions. The U.S. has expressed a willingness to discuss a possible U.N. peacekeeping mission and force structure, but would like Russia to make a good-faith commitment to the process first.[22] President Trump has demonstrated a willingness to participate in resolving global conflicts and display his administration's mastery of foreign policy, both in North Korea and in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. By deploying peacekeepers to mitigate the Donbas conflict, the Trump administration would enjoy a foreign policy success and a possible boost in domestic approval.

The United States has long advocated for peaceful resolution to the conflict; however, certain preconditions exist. One such precondition is that the peacekeeping mandate cannot be limited to traditional ceasefire line enforcement. In the context of the Donbas conflict, such a limited mandate would essentially concede the Donbas region to Russia without granting Ukraine control over the Ukraine-Russia border. Another precondition is that

any Russian demand for sanctions relief must only address Donbas-related sanctions. The United States seeks a credible withdrawal of all Russian forces from the Donbas and a denouncement of the insurgent groups. Without these conditions, U.S. support for a peacekeeping mission would be limited and a successful UNSC resolution would be unlikely.

THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

The UNSC is the principal guarantor of any peacekeeping mission. A peacekeeping mission could be authorized if nine of the fifteen council members approve it, but anything less than an unanimous approval would weaken the mission.[23] Additionally, any veto by a permanent member of the UNSC – China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States – would jeopardize any resolution.

The Security Council's membership is an important factor in the approval of peacekeeping forces. China, France, and the United Kingdom maintain significant influence in the area of peacekeeping operations. Due to their close relationship with the U.S., France and the United Kingdom would most likely follow the United States' lead; any U.S. sanctions relief for Russian participation in the peace process will require France and the United Kingdom's cooperation. China, however, has made contradictory statements regarding its support of peacekeeping operations and its support cannot be assured. In the last several years, China has committed 8,000 troops to the U.N. peacekeeping standby force, one-fifth of the 40,000 total troops committed by fifty nations.[24] China has also increased economic ties with Ukraine and proposed that it become a UNSC member. Nevertheless, China and Russia have also acted aggressively to hedge against U.S. hegemonic control, suggesting that if Russia remains resistant to peacekeeping, China will likely follow suit.

While the permanent members of the UNSC have the greatest control in enabling a peacekeeping operation, other member states also play critical roles. At least nine UNSC members will have to agree with the mandate and its associated scale and deployment in order for it to be authorized. These nations can be grouped into differently aligned factions: pro-Russian countries such as Bolivia and Kazakhstan are likely to side with Russian proposals while U.S.-aligned nations such as Sweden and the Netherlands are likely to agree to Western proposals. A peacekeeping proposal must steer through the political gamesmanship that U.N. negotiations entail.

A U.N. PEACEKEEPING MISSION TO UKRAINE

A U.N. peacekeeping mission is the only way to mitigate Ukrainian-Russian differences and ensure peace in the Donbas region. If ceasefire violations

continue, the chances of any peaceful resolution will fade. Russia's support for the DPR and LPR continues to damage Ukraine's relationship with Russia, a vital economic partner. A peacekeeping mission with a targeted mandate, careful troop selection, acceptable leadership, and wide operational objectives will ensure that all parties adhere to the Minsk II terms.

The proposed peacekeeping mission, United Nations Peacekeeping Force in the Donbas (UNFID) will meet resistance in the UNSC and its success depends on the drafting of an acceptable mandate that addresses conditions on the ground. UNFID's goals should closely match Minsk II objectives. Additionally, it should use the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES) as a template for success. UNTAES' principal tasks included re-establishing functioning public services, assisting and training police forces, ensuring the possibility of refugee and displaced people's return, and organizing elections in due time.[25]
UNFID must be mandated under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter to ensure the stability and security of the region, assist in managing elections in accordance with Minsk II, and supervise public services and civilian reintegration.[26] Missions mandated under Chapter VII provide the force permission to maintain international security – specifically through peace enforcement – and demonstrate a greater commitment on the part of the U.N. to end the conflict.[27] Enforcement of these conditions must extend to the entirety of the Donbas region.

UNFID's mandate on troop commitments will be difficult to pass. A traditional peacekeeping mission is too limited to achieve UNFID's goals, while a stabilizing mission, in which force is utilized to neutralize spoilers, is too aggressive. Instead, a robust peace operation is necessary to resolve the conflict while remaining acceptable to all stakeholders.[28] Russia would be unwilling to support a mission that advocates aggressive actions against proxy groups, and the DPR and LPR would view a stabilizing mission as direct Western intervention. To pass UNFID, the United States and European Union members must agree to Russian sanctions relief. Ukraine will also need to commit to future economic cooperation with Russia and permit Russian culture and language study in the Donbas. These incentives do not guarantee that Russia will accept a robust peacekeeping resolution; however, coercion has failed to alter Russian conduct in the region and these inducements offer the greatest chance of creating a successful peacekeeping mission.

Force size, composition, and command are also essential elements in the creation of a permissible mandate. Although the Russian peacekeeping proposal requested that troop size remain minimal, it is estimated that, to meet the challenges of a robust peacekeeping mission, between 20,000 and 50,000 personnel are recommended. Most analysts agree that a member force of at least 20,000, along with a police force of 4,000, is required to fulfilment

the mandate of a robust peacekeeping mission.[29] A mission of this size would be comparable to U.N. peacekeeping missions in Darfur, South Sudan, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.[30] A majority of these troops would be used to secure the Ukraine-Russia border. A mission that illustrates the numbers needed for border patrol is the U.N. Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Golan Heights: 1,000 personnel were needed to patrol sixty kilometers of border.[31] A similar border "trip-wire" in the Donbas would therefore require between 5,000 to 6,000 personnel to patrol 400 kilometers.[32] The rest of the peacekeeping force would be dispersed throughout the Donbas. A peacekeeping force of roughly 20,000 personnel would cost approximately $1 billion USD.[33]

UNFID's leadership should be carefully selected to maintain impartiality in the peacekeeping mission. Russia and the United States will defeat any resolution that places command under aligned nations, such as Kazakhstan, Belarus, or NATO member states. The United States has advocated for Sweden, a current UNSC member with a neutral position on the conflict, as a suitable leader for the mission.[34] Alternatively, Scandinavian countries such as Finland could serve as effective leaders of a U.N. mission as these nations are not NATO members and are influential regional players.[35]

Although Europe is required to provide a contingent of the troops for the UNFID mission, additional forces must also be found elsewhere. Chinese participation would ensure involvement of a permanent UNSC member in the conflict, while countries like Kazakhstan and Belarus should contribute additional forces to ensure that Central Asian and Russian-aligned nations have a voice in the peacekeeping mission.[36] Countries such as Pakistan, Nepal, and Egypt already provide significant troop contributions to the United Nations, and these forces can be utilized in support of UNFID.[37] Other countries such as Poland, Portugal, and Romania have experience with U.N. policing operations[38] and further support could be drawn from Rwanda, Senegal and Jordan–the three largest contributors to U.N. police forces.[39] Overall, a large contingent of troops and police is required for the UNFID mission, and these forces must be drawn from pro-U.S., pro-Russian, and non-aligned nations to establish the international composition needed for the mission's success.

Finally, troop deployment to and dispersal in the region are factors that must be considered. A gradual extension into the Donbas territory or an immediate insertion into the entire region are both viable options. With a robust mandate, full integration into the region is required. A phased approach carries risk to Ukraine, as Russia can slow peacekeeping efforts by continuing to finance separatist factions.[40] However, an immediate deployment and dispersal into the entire Donbas will elicit resentment in the

local population and likely increase the risk of violence. Although it grants leniency to Russia's agenda, a phased deployment is best. UNFID's first phase can secure the Minsk II ceasefire line, its second phase will extend the operation towards deployment in Luhansk and Donetsk, and its third phase will secure the border regions between Ukraine and Russia, with full deployment throughout the Donbas. Once security and a ceasefire are established, additional mandated objectives can be pursued.

UNFID OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES & MANAGING SPOILER BEHAVIOR

OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES

A peaceful solution in the Donbas is contingent on completion of the U.N. peacekeeping mandates. UNFID's ability to maintain the ceasefire, pursue conflict de-escalation, provide for local elections and the establishment of viable political representation, mediate cultural conflicts, and implement Minsk II will be critical. Each aspect of the mandate must be addressed to move the conflict towards long-term peace.

UNFID's immediate objective will be to separate the combatant parties and uphold the ceasefire, as no further objectives or reconciliation efforts can occur until a ceasefire is achieved. UNFID would work with the OSCE's regional presence to promote de-escalation and monitoring. UNFID forces will be expected to carry out civilian protection tasks, including but not limited to: providing humanitarian assistance; disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) techniques; supporting police presence; and coercive disarmament.[41] Peacekeepers can facilitate the removal of heavy weapons, the exchange of detained persons, and the withdrawal of armed forces. Peacebuilding efforts can occur alongside OSCE's operations once UNFID's presence is established.

UNFID and the OSCE must ensure that the Donbas pursues fair and credible elections. Minsk II promised local elections and a decentralization of government powers; however, the Donbas region declared independence because it believed the new central government was illegitimate and the Ukrainian government would not recognize the Donbas' Russian ties. Thus the long-term success of UNFID is contingent on tackling long-term apathy in the Donbas region towards Ukraine's political process, and ensuring that the region feels invested in the political process.

Efforts must also be made to improve the discourse regarding the Donbas' Russian cultural ties. Ukraine and the Donbas must reach a consensus on Russian cultural and language programs in the region. Additionally, Ukraine must be willing to allow Donbas minority populations to teach and use the

Russian language in governance and education. Donbas minorities will continue to view the central government as illegitimate and oppressive if it fails to recognize their historic cultural ties to Russia. A compromise that allows for both Russian and Ukrainian programs in the Donbas may offer a possible solution. Cultural and ethnic understanding will serve as a tool to prevent further violent clashes.

Critical to the UNFID's operational objectives is restoring public services and promoting social order. In addition to improving the cultural climate, UNFID can seek to bolster government operations weakened by the conflict. UNFID's police force can work towards educating and training local police personnel. Militia rule would not be permissible as the region is returned to Ukrainian control.

UNFID will also need to ensure justice is pursued, as a reduction in conflict will mean combatants return to society. Amnesty for combatants must be offered to separatist fighters, as established in Minsk II requirements. However, a blanket amnesty will be unacceptable to some UNSC members[42] and will permit potential future spoilers to return to the conflict. Instead, amnesty should be offered to any combatants who have not committed war crimes or crimes against humanity. Amnesty will encourage a return to normalcy by allowing the combatant parties to negotiate.

SPOILERS

Spoilers can arise in every peace process. While Ukraine's cooperation is required to deploy a peacekeeping mission, as an inside party, it could act as a 'limited' or 'greedy' spoiler. Limited spoilers have critical red lines that must be managed in the peace agreement, while a greedy spoiler's behavior changes depending on the advantages the spoiler can garner.[43] If the Donbas republics are slow to reintegrate with Ukraine, for example, Ukraine may be unwilling to demobilize paramilitaries.[44] Alternatively, Ukrainian leaders may spoil the peacekeeping process if regional elections lead to government losses and the installation of pro-Russian politicians.

Ukraine's spoiler behavior can be addressed by offering positive measures to address grievances, decreasing violent conflict, and through socialization–a process in which new norms are established that create a framework for negotiation.[45] Western governments can encourage the Ukrainian government to comply with UNFID and Minsk II using trade agreements. Through socialization, UNFID and stakeholders can demonstrate to Ukraine that normative standards include commitment to democratic participation and socialize the government's behavior to comply with smooth transitions of political power.

In any discussion of Ukraine's future, the risk of Russia will spoil the peace

process is substantial. As outlined above, Russia can prevent the implementation of any peacekeeping mission if its demands and conditions are not met. Many in the Russian government are total spoilers who are unwilling to broker any compromise and who support aggressive action in Ukraine. However, President Putin is likely a greedy spoiler. Putin's objectives change based on a costs benefits analysis. Putin is willing to negotiate with the West when it benefits him, but he can also serve as a roadblock. As part of peace negotiations, Putin will demand Ukrainian inducements in the short- and long-term. These inducements with Russia would not guarantee safer relations given Russia's long history of interfering in Ukraine. Russians continue to abide by zero-sum strategies and can be resistant to compromise settlements.

The Donbas republics are a critical component of any peace agreement and are likely to show spoiler behavior. The DPR and LPR are likely to be limited spoilers. Both republics have specific conditions for the future direction of the Donbas; common ground must be found in order to promote peace. Russia serves as the greatest ally in ensuring the cooperation of the DPR and LPR because the republics rely on Russian support. Russian direction can force the republics' compliance with any peace agreement or peacekeeping mission.[46] Additionally, UNFID and the UNSC must consider possible regional total spoilers: Donbas groups marginally aligned with the DPR and LPR. These groups see total power as the only viable path and will work to endanger the peacekeeping mission. They must be met with force.

UNFID GOALS

A peacekeeping mission offers an opportunity to move the Donbas conflict towards peace and reconciliation. UNFID should be able secure its short-term goals within six months to a year, and medium-term goals within three to five years. However, its long-term objectives can only be achieved through the successful application of peacekeeping forces as well as commitments from all parties to work towards a long-term positive peace.

A phased schedule should secure a fully integrated force deployment within six months to a year. After approving the UNSC resolution, Russia must withdraw any troops in the conflict areas and be completely withdrawn by the end of UNFID's second phase. Ceasefire maintenance and border security is paramount. Once all Russian troops are withdrawn and the border is secure, the United States and allied nations should immediately lift the relevant sanctions against Russia. Hesitation will doom the mission as Russia will continue its elicit activity and Russian troops will threaten all peacekeeping efforts. Within six months of full deployment, UNFID should control and monitor the entirety of the contested Ukraine-Russia border in the Donbas. Once the border is secure, UNFID can start demilitarization efforts and work towards fulfilling

the mission's public service objectives. The OSCE will be a vital partner in the process by engaging in dialogue to defuse tensions and restore stability to the region.[47]

Within three to five years, UNFID, Ukraine, and Russia should work to address the political, economic, and social reintegration of the Donbas. Alongside the OSCE, the conflicting parties should work within the framework of Minsk II to hold elections according to Ukrainian and international law. Ukraine must start decentralization reforms, as outlined in Minsk II, to delegate decision making to the regional level instead of Kiev. These reforms must include discussion about and efforts to address Russia's historic connections to the region as well as formally allow for Russian cultural and language study. With a ceasefire secured, Ukraine can bolster economic ties and assist the region in revitalizing its industrial base via the EU and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS).

The primary objectives of UNFID's short-term and medium-term goals are to transition the Donbas from its conflict-ridden state to a sustainable peace; however, achieving goals requires overcoming immediate challenges, including moving the region towards peaceful representative elections and stable governance. Caution must be exercised while doing this and reforms must be carried out with a clear roadmap and through a slow and deliberate process. The Ukrainian government must be willing to integrate Donbas political representation into its central government. This move is necessary as ensuring those in the Donbas region feel their views are represented in Ukraine's government is critical to preventing future re-escalation of the conflict. As such, if the Ukrainian population determines that Russia offers them the greatest avenue towards success, Kiev must be open to this view.

Another component of achieving UNFID's goals involves addressing Ukraine's future international and economic ties, including the question of Ukraine's relations to NATO and the EU. NATO's attitude toward Russia and the possible addition of Ukraine to the alliance play an important factor in Russia's aggressive regional maneuvers. A commitment by NATO to exclude Ukraine from the organization would mitigate this destabilizing factor in Ukrainian-Russian relations.

The Ukrainian people have made it clear that they wish to pursue stronger EU ties. This relationship must be allowed to continue; however, decisions must be made regarding further economic integration with the CIS. Ukraine need not be a member of either institution but can profit from being at the epicenter of both trade blocs. Dialogue must continue and be encouraged between Ukraine, Russia, and the West in order to reconcile the socio-economic challenges that created the conditions for the Euromaidan protests.

CONCLUSION

The proposed peacekeeping mission would move mediation and negotiation forward and facilitate an end to the conflict in the Donbas. Minsk II is the only viable avenue for peacebuilding and each stakeholder places great importance on the agreement. UNFID offers the best chance to secure a lasting ceasefire and begin the process of implementing the terms of Minsk II. The UNSC mandate must focus on building transparent institutions and compromises between Ukrainian and Russian interests as part of the peace process. Ultimately, UNFID seeks to establish short-term peace that will allow the Donbas to work towards long-term reintegration and peacebuilding with Ukraine.

ENDNOTES

1   *Declaration of Minsk in Support of the "Package of Measures for the Implementation of the Minsk Agreements"*, (Feb 12, 2015), 1. https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/UA_150212_MinskAgreement_en.pdf

2   Robert Golanski, "One Year After Minsk II: Consequences and Progress," *European View* 15, no. 1 (June 2016): 68-70, Doi: 10.1007/s12290-016-0398-2, http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1007/s12290-016-039-2

3   United Nations Peacemaker, "Package of measures for the implementation of the Minsk Agreements," February 12, 2015, 1, https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/UA_150212_MinskAgreement_en.pdf

4   Ibid.

5   International Crisis Group, "Can Peacekeepers Break the Deadlock in Ukraine," Europe Report N 246, December 2017, 2, https://d2071andvip0wj.cloudfront.net/246-can-peacekeepers-break-the-deadlock-in-ukraine.pdf

6   Golanski, 69-71.

7   Ibid., 70-71.

8   Richard Gowen, "Can the United Nations Unite Ukraine?" Hudson Institute, 2018, 11, https://s3.amazonaws.com/media.hudson.org/files/publications/UkraineJan29.pdf

9   Hiski Haukkala, "A Perfect Storm; Or What Went Wrong and What Went Right for the EU in Ukraine," *Europe-Asia Studies* 68, no. 4 (Apr 20, 2016): 661-662, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09668136.2013.1156055

10 Rasmussen Global, "Potential UN Mission in the Donbas," September 2017, 1, https://rasmussenglobal.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/UN-Mission-in-the-Donbas.pdf

11 Ibid.

12 International Crisis Group, "Can Peacekeepers Break the Deadlock in Ukraine," 12.

13 Ibid., 14.

14   Rasmussen Global, "Potential UN Mission in the Donbas," 1.

15   Ibid, 1.

16   Henry Meyer, "Putin Pushes Ukraine Peacekeeper Plan in Face of Opposition," *Bloomberg.com*, September 20, 2017, https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-09-20/putin-s-plan-for-ukraine-peacekeepers-gets-cool-reception

17   International Crisis Group, "Can Peacekeepers Break the Deadlock in Ukraine," 5.

18   Gowen, "Can the United Nations United Ukraine?" 17-20.

19   Ibid., 25.

20   International Crisis Group, "Can Peacekeepers Break the Deadlock in Ukraine," 19.

21   Stephen John Stedman, "Spoiler Problems in Peace Processes," *International Security,* 22 no. 2, (1997): 12-13.

22   Richard Gowan, "Analysis: Could U.N. Peacekeepers Help End the War in Ukraine?" *Washington Post*, March 1, 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/03/01/would-a-u-n-peacekeeping-force-in-eastern-ukraine-make-sense/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.bd51fd0b6554

23   United Nations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, Department of Field Support, *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines* (New York: United Nations University Press, 2008), 50, https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/capstone_eng_0.pdf

24   Courtney J. Fung, "China's Troop Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping," United States Institute of Peace, 2016, https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/PB212-China-s-Troop-Contributions-to-UN-Peacekeeping.pdf

25   Derek Boothby, "The Political Challenges of Administering Eastern Slavonia," *Global Governance* 10, no. 1 (January 1, 2004): 38, https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/27800508.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Ae2b785ec88b4a05b338f5c4678fb9c2d

26   Gowan, "Can the United Nations Unite Ukraine?" 19.

27   United Nations Peacekeeping, "Mandates and the Legal Basis for Peacekeeping," accessed November 11, 2018, https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/mandates-and-legal-basis-peacekeeping

28   Gowan, "Can the United Nations Unite Ukraine?" 18.

29   See Hiski Haukkala, A Perfect Storm; Robert Golanski, One Year After Minsk II; and International Crisis Group, Can Peacekeepers Break the Deadlock in Ukraine.

30   Rasmussen Global, "Potential UN Mission in the Donbas," 4.

31   Gowan, "Can the United Nations Unite Ukraine?" 24.

32   Ibid.

33   United Nations Peacekeeping, "Monusco Fact Sheet," https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/mission/monusco. The size of this peacekeeping force, roughly 20,000 personnel, will cost $1 billion USD, similar in size to the peacekeeping mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

34   International Crisis Group, "Can Peacekeepers Break the Deadlock in Ukraine", 22

35   Gowan, "Can the United Nations Unite Ukraine?" 25.

36 Alexander Vershbow, "How to Bring Peace to the Donbas (Yes, It's Possible)," The Atlantic Council, January 5, 2018, http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/ukrainealert/how-to-bring-peace-to-the-donbas-yes-it-s-possible

37 United Nations Peacekeeping, "Contributors to UN Peacekeeping Operations by Country and Post," February 28, 2018, https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/1_summary_of_contributions.pdf

38 Gowan, "Can the United Nations Unite Ukraine?" 28.

39 United Nations Peacekeeping, "Contributors to UN Peacekeeping Operations by Country and Post. Police, UN Military Experts on Missions, Staff Officers and Troop 31/3/2018," March 31, 2018, https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/1_summary_of_contributions_1.pdf

40 Gowan, "Can the United Nations Unite Ukraine?" 20.

41 Alex J. Bellamy and Paul D. Williams, *Understanding Peacekeeping* (Cambridge, England: Polity/Wiley, 2010), 350.

42 International Crisis Group, "Can Peacekeepers Break the Deadlock in Ukraine," 16.

43 Stedman, 9-11.

44 International Crisis Group, "Can Peacekeepers Break the Deadlock in Ukraine," 18-19.

45 Stedman, 12-17.

46 International Crisis Group, "Can Peacekeepers Break the Deadlock in Ukraine," 20.

47 Stefan Lehne, "Reviving the OSCE: European Security and the Ukraine Crisis," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, September 2015, 6, https://carnegieendowment.org/files/CP_249_Lehne_OSCE.pdf

Effectiveness of U.N. Peacekeeping Operations in

Combating Organized Crime

Alison Epstein

Alison Epstein received her M.A in International Affairs from the Elliott School of International Affairs in May of 2018, with concentrations in conflict resolution and U.S. foreign policy. Her research interests include ethnic conflict and U.S. responses to mass atrocities. Alison holds degrees in History and Politics from New York University and currently works for the U.S. Department of Justice. The views expressed in the article are those of the author and do not reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Justice or of the U.S. government.

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the approaches that peace operations have taken to address organized crime and explores strategies to improve their effectiveness. In the last twenty years, the U.N. has produced relevant threat assessments and conventions, enhanced its use of technology in peacekeeping missions, and increased the authority and number of police deployed. However, significant gaps still remain in the effectiveness of assessments and U.N. doctrine, its police and technical capabilities, intelligence gathering, and coordination with regional organizations. Using relevant case studies, this article demonstrates how improvements in exploitation of available technologies and in preparedness for interactions with criminalized power structures can ensure better outcomes for peacekeeping operations.

INTRODUCTION

As United Nations peacekeeping missions have been deployed to host countries engaged in intrastate war and ethnic conflict, the U.N. forces have increasingly encountered organized crime networks on the ground. In the last twenty years, the U.N. has produced threat assessments and conventions, enhanced its use of technology in peacekeeping missions, and increased the authority and number of police deployed. However, significant gaps still remain in the effectiveness of the U.N. doctrine, the use of Organized Crime Threat Assessments (OCTAs),

the role of UN police (UNPOL), the utilization of up-to-date technology, and the understanding of criminalized power structures (CPS). In order to improve its ability to combat organized crime during peace operations, the U.N. should bridge the gap in available technology and improve its understanding of CPS and their long-term effects on peacekeeping missions.

ORGANIZED CRIME AND 21ST CENTURY PEACE OPERATIONS

One of the many complexities peacekeepers face in the "new wars" of the 21st century is organized crime. As opposed to traditional interstate wars, state failures have produced intrastate (internal) wars, which often involve ethnic conflict and obfuscate the separation between public and private combatants.[1] As such, it is much more common today for peacekeepers and organized criminal networks to occupy the same space due to the shifting nature of war.

Academics highlight new difficulties in designing holistic responses during peace operations, resulting from the confluence of organized crime, failing states, and violent conflict. James Cockayne, the Director of the Center for Policy Research, and Daniel Pfister, a U.N. Humanitarian Affairs Officer, defined three types of organized criminal networks in the new war context: predatory, parasitic, and symbiotic groups. Predatory groups are direct adversaries of the authority structure, usually the standing government, and directly compete with it for resources. Parasitic groups are less opposed to the authority structure, and are therefore considered more "sustainable." These parasitic networks and the authority structure can inhabit the same space, while symbiotic groups work in conjunction with the authority structure to obtain resources.[2] Symbiotic networks and criminalized power structures pose similar obstacles to peace operations since both depend on revenues from organized crime for political survival. Cockayne and Pfister's typology suggests that there tends to be a correlation between conflict dynamics and organized crime, and that organized criminal groups might respond to peace processes and political settlements involving the authority structure in different ways.

Although the typology is helpful in academic terms, in practice, the U.N. does not train its peacekeepers or police to identify organized criminal groups, assess their perceived political goals, or respond appropriately. In fact, in the last twenty years, peacekeepers have directly and indirectly participated in and facilitated organized crime. This demonstrates their lack of awareness and preparedness when it comes to dealing with organized criminal networks.[3] Although U.N. peacekeepers are trained with a "do no harm" principle in mind, their lack of training to combat organized crime endangers the implementation of that principle.

REFORMING U.N. DOCTRINE TO ADDRESS ORGANIZED CRIME

The U.N. frames organized crime within a transnational context and based on the capacities of member states to prosecute relative crimes. This framework creates unrealistic expectations for weak governments and failed states hosting peace operations, as well as U.N. peacekeepers. The United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC) defines an "organized criminal group" as a group intending to reap material or financial gains by committing "serious crimes." Unfortunately, definitions of "serious crime" differ depending on domestic legislation. UNTOC simply defines it as any crime for which the potential punishment is greater than four years.[4] This broad definition assumes that the host government or member state has an operational penal code and a stable government that can enforce the rule of law. In reality, UNTOC's definition of organized criminal activity is incongruent with the "new war" reality that peacekeepers face in the field. As a result, peacekeepers are increasingly unable to properly respond to situations they encounter in conflict zones.

In order to remedy the lack of U.N. guidance concerning organized crime and peace operations, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) should work in consultation with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the United Nations Department of Political Affairs (UNDPA), and regional experts to establish a set of guidelines to approach organized crime in a peacekeeping context. Increased coordination and information exchange with UNODC would allow for a deeper understanding of current organized criminal networks. Ideally, the expansion of coordination beyond DPKO and UNODC to UNDPA and regional experts would address the political economy of organized crime during peace operations more effectively and facilitate the analysis of the interactions between organized crime groups and criminalized host governments. Regional experts can shed light on the context-specific grievances that mobilize locals to participate in illicit activity, as well as the role host governments can play in such activity. They also have a better understanding of the conflict dynamics between organized criminal networks and authority structures, as well as of the possible consequences of peacekeepers' involvement. In addition, UNDPA's input would be invaluable to develop a longer-term approach in accordance with the U.N. Security Council's objectives.

DPKO should also establish guidelines for conducting honest evaluations of peacekeepers' roles in organized crime networks to ensure accountability. The "do no harm" principle states that the interactions between U.N. peacekeepers and the host country may not "enabl[e] the criminalization" of the conflict.[5] In practice, such an evaluation would not only damage the

U.N.'s credibility in peacekeeping, but also attract negative media attention to one of the most expensive U.N. functions. Furthermore, the unwillingness, and often inability, of U.N. member states and host countries to impose legal consequences for their personnel's crimes impede U.N. efforts. Regardless, a more integrated and coordinated approach across U.N. entities would likely reduce the negative developments in organized crime caused by individual peacekeepers and peacekeeping operations more broadly. Reducing organized crime in peace operations requires both increased cooperation and coordination within the U.N. system, as well as reforms to the U.N. doctrine. This would require significant time and resources from U.N. member states and the Secretariat.

SIGNIFICANCE OF ORGANIZED CRIME THREAT ASSESSMENTS

The lack of relevant Organized Crime Threat Assessments (OCTAs) also undermines the U.N.'s ability to address organized crime in peace operations. The UNODC states that the purpose of the OCTAs is to "enhance the knowledge base available to Member States to develop effective international responses to transnational organized crime threats."[6] Since 2014, UNODC has only published five OCTAs, three of which relate to Afghan drug trafficking.[7] Instead of publishing multiple OCTAs that concern a single organized crime network, the U.N. should broaden the scope of the OCTAs to cover organized crime in multiple regions, and update the assessments regularly throughout the year. Furthermore, UNODC can incorporate OCTAs into Technical Assessment Missions (TAMs) during the planning stage of peace operations and in their report for the Security Council. DPKO and UNODC would also benefit from publishing OCTAs retroactively for ongoing peace operations in order to inform future decision-making.

Integrating the same kind of analysis used in OCTAs and providing personnel with more complete information during pre-deployment training could better prepare peacekeepers for scenarios they might encounter on the ground. On average, the delay in providing necessary resources to carry out devised strategies can amount to almost five years.[8] If DPKO and Department of Field Support (DFS) incorporate OCTAs as a normalized procedure in the planning stage of operations, they could get a better estimate of the expertise and the number of troops required to carry out the mandate. Improving the accuracy of resource estimates from the beginning of a peace operation would likely make operations shorter, cheaper, and consequently more appealing to the Security Council and member states. Additionally, the implementation and enforcement of a mission mandate with an OCTA analysis could potentially lead to more sustainable peace, as it takes a wider range of mobilizing grievances

into account. The U.S. intelligence community has focused on understanding "who the local power brokers" are, and OCTAs would enable DPKO and the Security Council to do the same.[9]

Given the ever-changing nature of organized crime in peace operations, OCTAs are necessary even if illicit activity is not increasing in a particular region. OCTAs should incorporate conflict and systems analysis in order to highlight the push and pull factors for participating in illicit activity and underline areas at risk of succumbing to organized criminal networks. In addition, in OCTAs, DPKO can provide advice on how to disincentivize participation in organized crime networks in areas where these might be proliferating. OCTAs "should become part of standard operating procedures" for DPKO to design well-informed mandates and help peacekeepers to better navigate illicit activities in accordance with the "do no harm" principle.[10]

POLICING ORGANIZED CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

The lack of coordination and training from other relevant U.N. agencies leaves U.N. police (UNPOL) poorly trained and ill-equipped to handle organized crime during peace operations. DPKO often places language related to organized crime in policies concerning the functions of UNPOL, but specific guidance pertaining directly to organized crime is virtually non-existent. For instance, DPKO's 2014 policy paper *United Nations Police in Peacekeeping Operations and Political Missions* mentioned organized crime only once.[11] In 2015, DPKO and the DFS jointly published *Guidelines: Police Operations in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions*, charging UNPOL with "target[ing] active and prolific offenders" and disbanding organized criminal networks.[12] Instead of explaining how exactly UNPOL should achieve these goals, DPKO and DFS failed to provide any concrete or practical guidance. The guidelines do not cover how UNPOL should learn to recognize illicit activity, track such activity, or organize an appropriate response without an executive policing mandate. Simply tasking UNPOL with assisting host governments to establish the rule of law, with the aim of reducing organized crime, is insufficient because it does not account for government participation in illicit activity or unintended impacts of the peace operations on organized crime.

The lack of innovation in UNPOL training and mandates weakens peace operations in areas plagued by organized crime. As of 2013, only four mandates explicitly mentioned the presence of organized crime networks in the mission's region and tasked UNPOL to address them.[13] Illicit activity requires DPKO and DFS to supplement existing guidelines and policies with additional training. UNODC and DPKO should also establish concrete, actionable guidelines for UNPOL to directly address organized criminal networks.

In addition, UNPOL should receive mission-specific guidance before deployment to conflict zones. The lack of an explicit doctrine and executive policing in mission mandates leaves UNPOL ill-prepared and ill-equipped for responding to organized criminal activity.

Despite the aforementioned doctrinal gaps, UNPOL has had some success in reducing organized crime in the short- to medium-term. The U.N. and the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR) attempted to establish a multi-ethnic police force in Kosovo to weaken the violent, separatist organization, Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), and its organized crime network. The United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) created specific units in the Kosovo Police Service (KPS), such as the Central Intelligence Unit, the Trafficking and Prostitution Investigation Unit, the Interim Security Facility (to accommodate victims of human trafficking), and the Directorate for Organized Crime (DOC).[14] UNMIK successfully created units dedicated to addressing ethnic tensions and locals' grievances, whilst effectively implementing its executive policing mandate to crack down on violent organized crime networks.

Although UNMIK and U.S. civilian police forces helped create these moderately successful institutions in Kosovo during the peace operation, they did not foresee the repercussions of integrating a parasitic organized crime group into the peace process. UNMIK integrated the KLA and its representative, Hashim Thaci, into the peace process as they constituted a major party in the conflict. Ultimately, this choice aided Thaci's rise to the position of Prime Minister and, eventually, President. Even though he holds the highest political office in Kosovo, Thaci is still tied to numerous organized crime networks in the Balkans.[15] Had the U.N. trained UNPOL and UNMIK personnel to anticipate the consequences of integrating organized criminal groups into peace processes, they might have been more successful in reducing organized crime, both during the early part of their mission and in the long-term.

In Haiti, the U.N. initially failed to establish police units dedicated to fighting organized criminal activity during the first two years of its stabilization mission (MINUSTAH). However, eventually the U.N. built on the short-term success of the police units formed by UNMIK by deploying a SWAT team and creating a Joint Mission Analysis Centre (JMAC). When the mission was recruiting formed police units (FPUs), DPKO did not consider whether the FPUs were qualified to "lead special operations, gather criminal intelligence, or support complex investigations into sexual violence, corruption, kidnapping, homicide, or counter narcotics."[16] Furthermore, MINUSTAH lacked an executive policing function in their mandate.[17] Because of the poorly trained personnel and restrictive mandate, UNPOL's capabilities during the first few years of the mission were extremely limited.

The mission finally received a total of eight FPUs and an experienced 40-person SWAT team capable of preserving the ongoing peace process in 2006.[18] The FPUs and the SWAT unit were operationally successful. They worked with the Haitian National Police (HNP) to arrest and neutralize gang members and control riots. In addition, the creation of the Joint Mission Analysis Centre (JMAC) enabled the mission to integrate "military, police, security, political affairs, and other units contributing information, personnel, and expertise."[19] The integration of FPU, SWAT unit, and JMAC operations, in partnership with the local police force, enabled the mission to neutralize violent gang activity in Cite Soleil and other hotspots. Like the U.N. Mission in Kosovo, MINUSTAH was successful through the use of force, but it was unable to anticipate and comprehend how political elites would exploit organized criminal networks for their own survival.[20] The country's repeated descent into gang violence after the devastating 2010 earthquake demonstrates the consequences of MINUSTAH's lack of understanding.

The creation of the JMAC, the SWAT unit recruitment, and UNMIK's establishment of well-prepared special police units successfully combated organized crime in the short-term. However, both MINUSTAH and UNMIK failed to rid their respective regions of organized crime in the long-term. U.N. peacekeeping operations lack the knowledge and capabilities to understand why and how such illicit activities are conducted by locals and the different ways in which criminal networks are used for political purposes. In order to sustain a campaign against organized crime, the U.N. must transform its use of UNPOL and provide clearer guidance and objectives with regards to their interactions with organized criminal groups, as these will continue to affect future political arrangements. DPKO and other relevant U.N. agencies can work together to draft specific guidelines for UNPOL that target organized crime, including typologies of organized crime similar to those established by Cockayne and Pfister, and that dictate the responsibilities and qualifications needed from the FPUs.

THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN COMBATING ORGANIZED CRIME

Despite its efforts to incorporate technology into peace operations, the U.N. needs to update its intelligence collection and communication infrastructure in order to more effectively address organized crime. Technologies such as license plate recognition systems, encryption technology, and unmanned aerial vehicles typically target different threats, but imagery technology renders them useful for combating organized criminal activity. Similarly, the gathering and analysis of police-related intelligence, as it pertains to organized crime, remains lacking in peace operations. Yet, its enhancement could drastically improve

peacekeeper responses to illicit activity.

The U.N. has repeatedly made resourceful use of outdated technology to target organized crime during the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), the United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), and the United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). In Cambodia, UNTAC personnel used photocopy machines in the backs of trucks to collect evidence of assassination attempts and planned violations of the peace agreement.[21] Despite the logistical difficulties, UNTAC was able to use technology to design and execute a strategy to collect intelligence and subsequently preempt assassination attempts by spoiler groups. The U.N. also installed fixed cameras in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe's Mission in Kosovo (OMIK) and the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) in Iraq.[22] These cameras were important for OMIK to monitor areas where ethnic violence often took place and for UNMOVIC to track the production of weapons of mass destruction.[23] However, in both missions, captured footage failed to provide timely and actionable intelligence for NATO or coalition forces to prevent further violence or destroy alleged weapons of mass destruction. UNTAC, OMIK, and UNMOVIC exhibited resourcefulness with the tools available to them, but they could have accomplished significantly more had they had access to updated real-time surveillance technology.

License plate recognition (LPR) systems could also be improved to help UNPOL assess whether vehicles approaching checkpoints or "hotspots" pose a threat.[24] LPR systems could also be useful for tracking black market deals, kidnappings, and human trafficking. Furthermore, LPR used in conjunction with encryption technology in vehicles would enable peacekeepers to track illicit activity and communicate freely to coordinate their response. After learning that the Serbian government was able to intercept U.N. communications in the 1990s, the U.N. installed encrypted radios in their vehicles.[25]

The U.N. could also expand its use of aerial reconnaissance. MONUC did in fact incorporate unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) into its mission. It enhanced the U.N.'s use of UAVs to combat election violence, identify illegal arms trafficking and collect imagery.[26] In 2015, Hervé Ladsous, the former Under-Secretary General for Peacekeeping Operations, praised the use of UAVs in DRC, Mali and the Central African Republic as integral to protecting civilians and gathering the intelligence necessary to enforce robust mandates.[27] Today, reconnaissance capabilities should be updated with satellite technology, to allow peacekeeping operations to legally monitor designated conflict zones without permission from the host country.[28] The implementation of satellite reconnaissance would allow U.N. peace operations to avoid dangerous confrontations with organized criminal networks (particularly those connected to the host government), circumvent disputes concerning consent

from the host government, and monitor illicit activity conducted by the host government itself.

MONUC has also started obtaining more timely intelligence by establishing communication infrastructure and mapping systems. The mission constructed a community alert network by giving locals cell phones to report dangerous situations to mission personnel in real-time.[29] This initiative encouraged locals to become stakeholders in MONUC's fight against organized crime, whilst also providing actionable intelligence to peacekeepers. MONUC also utilized the U.N.'s geographic information systems (GIS) technology to map organized crime networks and activity across entire regions.[30]

Despite MONUC's technological advancements, DPKO will have to reexamine how it can effectively use and obtain technology. As technological advancements occur, the U.N. and member states have the opportunity, and arguably the responsibility, to utilize them to promote international peace and security. For example, infrared technology can mitigate the dangers that accompany night patrol. "Breaking the night barrier" enables personnel to monitor organized criminal groups at night, when they are most likely to plan attacks or conduct illicit activities.[31] Access to infrared technology might prevent troop-contributing countries from resorting to caveats and allow their personnel and formed police units (FPUs) to patrol more effectively at night, thus increasing the probability of peacekeepers preventing illicit activities.

Peacekeeping expert Walter Dorn and former Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy have introduced the concepts of the "digital peacekeeper," the "technology contributing country (TechCC)," and "precision peacekeeping" as potential goals for future peacekeeping. Implementing these concepts in U.N. peacekeeping operations might help reduce the risk of bodily harm for those confronting organized crime networks. Dorn and Axworthy describe "precision peacekeeping" as being led by the "digital peacekeeper," who can be "safer and more effective" with collected intelligence and more complete information from their technological equipment.[32] Dorn defines "precision peacekeeping" as a mission's ability to "send the right peacekeepers to the right place to do the right things."[33] Dorn and Axworthy also argue that the U.N. should encourage the participation of technology contributing countries (TechCCs). These countries would provide technology and expertise where others provide troops and police forces.[34] This principle has gained some traction, and the United States even confirmed in a 2015 White House memorandum that it "will seek to become a leading 'technology contributing country' to U.N. peacekeeping operations."[35] The United States and countries in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) often contribute very few troops and FPUs. Therefore, leading up to the yearly Peacekeeping Defence Ministerial Conferences, the U.N. should encourage TechCCs to not only contribute technology, but also proper guidance on how

to use the equipment in order to avoid interoperability issues and confusion amongst different FPUs.

The use of technology in peace operations is improving, but this is only one aspect of tackling organized crime. Although technological advancements would enable missions to send peacekeepers to hotspots with more adequate equipment, they do not inform what constitute the "right things" that Dorn and Axworthy believe peacekeepers should do. For instance, even if UNPOL improved its intelligence collection processes, it would still lack guidelines on how to best utilize the gathered information. Moreover, technological advancements will not suffice to protect peacekeepers from organized crime networks. In terms of fostering "precision peacekeeping," the U.N. must take into account many other socio-political factors to improve its understanding of organized crime and to help peacekeepers "do the right things."

THE POLITICAL CONSTRAINTS ON THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND PEACEKEEPING MANDATES

Security Council-approved mission mandates direct peace operations' goals and authorities. Mission mandates also reflect that the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and Germany (P5+1) prioritize their own national security concerns over most peace operation objectives. As such, the Security Council still constrains the reach of mission mandates and the extent to which measures addressing organized crime are integrated into peace operations. Even though several countries and peace operations have already faced the issue of organized criminal networks, the Security Council did not address organized crime until it was linked to terrorism in the early 2000s.[36] Organized crime received more attention as it pertained more directly to the permanent members' primary security concerns. Yet, few peacekeeping missions directly affect the P5+1's more immediate security concerns. Moreover, the Afghan drug trade has occupied many of the OCTAs in recent years despite the fact that U.N. member states already have separate unilateral and multilateral structures that are monitoring the situation.

The Security Council has the authority to send out Expert Panels, which has enhanced its efforts to address organized crime in peacekeeping missions. Stabilization expert Michael Dziedzic suggests that the Security Council send Expert Panels to "monitor compliance with its targeted sanctions," thus reducing revenue flows to the criminalized power structures (CPS).[37] The Security Council did in fact use an Expert Panel to monitor the implementation of sanctions on the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and to produce "Due Diligence Guidelines." The Council decided that "sanctions could be imposed against any entity...that failed to exercise due diligence in accordance with those Guidelines."[38] As a result, the Security Council now

targets not only governments that benefit from organized criminal activity, but businesses too.

The Security Council's most challenging constraint is the perennial principle of sovereignty that complicates many of the U.N.'s functions. A U.N. peacekeeping mission requires the consent of the host government, and antagonizing a state with a perceived violation of its sovereignty would almost guarantee an ousting of the mission. For this reason, the Security Council must tread lightly when governments receive revenue from organized crime networks. While the conflict in eastern DRC demonstrates progress in the U.N.'s understanding of CPS, there are still flaws in MONUSCO. The Security Council is cognizant of the agreement made between Laurent Kabila of the DRC, Paul Kagame of Rwanda, and Yoweri Museveni of Uganda to aid Kabila with his plan to overthrow DRC President Mobutu Sese Seko and reward Kagame and Museveni with access to the eastern DRC's resources.[39] While the mission's mandate does acknowledge the "illicit exploitation of natural resources as a cause of the conflict," it only allows for MONUSCO to monitor the situation.[40] As violence in eastern DRC persists, the Security Council is still responsible for maintaining peace and security in the region. Even though it can allocate more resources to designing alternative approaches to addressing organized crime, sovereignty will still be an obstacle that the Council cannot circumvent.

Political will within the Security Council also determines how the Council addresses organized crime in specific peace operations. The United Nations Integrated Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNIOGBIS) exemplifies a peace operation that has actually benefited from not being "very high on anyone's policy agenda."[41] Guinea-Bissau did not pose any threat to the P5+1's security interests, thus making it a less controversial region to address. In addition, Guinea-Bissau's weak government and political institutions worked in favor of the Security Council, as it faces "less resistance to tackling criminal activity where sovereignty is weakest."[42] As a result, the Council has made more progress in Guinea-Bissau, since sovereignty did not impede its actions. It should be noted that the Council's treatment of organized crime in Guinea-Bissau is not the norm. The "Security Council is a political body, not a forum for justice" and, as a result, will treat some countries as partners and others as targets of law enforcement.[43] Such an inconsistency allows for the Security Council to choose between peace operations that warrant a strong response to organized crime and those that are too politically sensitive to warrant any Security Council intervention. Since P5+1 members seek to preserve their national security priorities, most peace operations fall in the latter category.

The Security Council also has the ability to deepen the cooperation between the U.N. and regional organizations to reduce organized crime.

ECOWAS has established the West African Coast Initiative (WACI), but this organization is understaffed and incapable of operating in Guinea-Bissau due to fear of retaliation and insufficient funding.[44] Even though WACI personnel are committed to combating organized crime and reducing drug trafficking, they have expressed the futility of their efforts when they lack protection.[45] Nonetheless, WACI is still considered a step in the right direction. Peace operations expert William Durch states that WACI "needs to be replicated in every sub-region in which U.N. missions operate."[46] Providing more direct support to regional offices that enables them to mitigate their own security concerns will help the Security Council build trust with local entities combating organized crime.

CRIMINALIZED POWER STRUCTURES PERPETUATING ORGANIZED CRIME

The frequency of and ways in which peace operations interact with criminalized power structures (CPS) will determine how well the operations can combat organized criminal activity in the long-term. Dziedzic defines CPS as illicit networks that "[enrich] themselves from transactions in gray and black markets, criminaliz[e] state institutions, and perpetuat[e] a culture of impunity."[47] As the state collects dues from organized crime networks, it ensures its own security and survival.[48] All of the aforementioned topics are affected by the rising phenomenon of CPS. Dziedzic concludes that "the most prominent spoilers of peace processes have been criminalized power structures."[49] Peace processes and the impending settlement of a conflict do not benefit host governments that have overlapping interests and membership with the organized crime networks. The incentives and grievances that might have once driven state participation in illicit activities are diminished during peace processes, thus encouraging CPS to extend the conflict and preserve their political survival. Dziedzic measures the successful mitigation of organized crime based on whether the "CPS ceased use of violence, opposition to the peace process, or exploitation of illicit revenue to obtain or maintain power."[50] None of the case studies in this article meets Dziedzic's criteria. As a result, the U.N. needs to reframe its responses to organized crime in peace operations with CPS in mind.

Dziedzic devises his own toolkit for addressing CPS in peacekeeping operations. While conflict resolution experts Walter Kemp, Mark Shaw, and Arthur Boutellis call for "creative and assertive mandates," Dziedzic also suggests the implementation of mandates that adequately identify the spoilers specific to the peace process.[51] U.N. member states often keep the language in mission mandates very vague and broad. Adding executive policing components and other more aggressive authorities would allow missions to

address organized criminal networks directly with more resources. In order to draft more assertive mandates, the Security Council has to directly address CPS, and in turn map out how peace operations will interact with these structures.

NGOs also play a significant role, both in advocating reforms and providing analysis concerning interactions with CPS. As NGOs often build relations and maintain direct contact with locals, they can obtain information regarding illicit activity that otherwise may not be disclosed to U.N. forces.[52] Others have also called for clandestine intelligence to inform peace operations. NGO's open-source intelligence might often be considered inferior to clandestine intelligence, but is nonetheless valuable. Open-source intelligence can also diminish host governments' fears of potential U.N. surveillance. Additionally, the Civil Society Triangle of NGOs, research institutes, and think tanks promotes "accountability, democratization, anti-corruption, and free and fair elections."[53] It follows that DPKO should foster deeper integration of the "third U.N.," which is comprised of NGOs and civil society partners, in the planning stage of peace operations and as a stakeholder in the operation itself.[54] By increasing cooperation with civil society organizations, DPKO insures its endeavors with stakeholders that share the long-term objectives stated in peace operation mandates.

However, Dziedzic's recommendations for halting the flow of revenue between organized crime networks and governments rely not only on changes to peacekeeping operations, but also on other international actors. He cites the enforcement of Section 11 of the USA PATRIOT Act that allows the United States to punish banks that "launder illicit CPS proceeds from the U.S. banking system."[55] This recommendation aligns with the UNTOC in that it relies on domestic legislation to target organized crime. However, American legislation is only one example of law enforcement criminalizing the flow of money from CPS into domestic banking institutions, and as such should not be overestimated. Instead, UNODC and DPKO should use comparative studies of domestic legislations like the USA PATRIOT Act as they plan their own responses and peace operations, and make recommendations to member states.

CONCLUSION

This analysis of gaps in U.N. peacekeeping approaches to combating organized crime in peace operations suggests that the U.N. is very capable of bridging the technological gap. Therefore, it must focus on understanding criminalized power structures to design appropriate responses. Encouraging TechCCs, and especially OECD countries that would rather provide technology than troops or police, is the most achievable goal for the U.N. In the lead-up to the annual Peacekeeping Defence Ministerial Conferences, member states should be encouraged to provide new technology, such as infrared and satellite

technology, or the associated technical training to utilize them. However, simply updating technology will not be sufficient to counter organized crime. Creating networks of information and imagery collected by updated capabilities will be integral to tracking illicit activities and organized crime networks. Future peacekeeping operations should also establish JMACs as a repository for information pertaining to all components of the mission.

Finally, the U.N.'s superficial understanding of criminalized power structures requires immediate and comprehensive review, as it is by far the most significant obstacle to combating organized crime during peace operations. Vague mandates fail to prescribe a concrete and effective method of cooperation with host governments whilst addressing organized crime and criminalized power structures. Since peace operations are not usually a primary security concern for the Security Council, it is unlikely that the Security Council will lead the campaign against organized crime alone. UNDPA should be more involved in mediation efforts with governments with criminalized power structures or susceptible thereto. As the future of peacekeeping operations unfold, DPKO and UNODC will need to coordinate their efforts in order to design a more holistic approach to organized crime. To be successful, this approach will have to include and address the impact of criminalized power structures on promoting international peace and security.

ENDNOTES

1   Alex J. Bellamy, Paul Williams, and Stuart Griffin, *Understanding Peacekeeping* (Malden: Polity Press, 2010), 35.

2   James Cockayne and Daniel Pfister, "Peace Operations and Organised Crime," International Peace Institute and Geneva Center for Security Policy Geneva Paper, No. 2, 2008, 18.

3   S.E. Mendelson, *Barracks and Brothels: Peacekeepers and Human Trafficking in the Balkans* (Washington DC: CSIS, 2005), 75.

4   United Nations, "Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime," UN doc. CTOC/COP/2012/CRP., September 20, 2012, 4.

5   Peter Andreas, *Blue Helmets and Black Markets: The Business of Survival in the Siege of Sarajevo,* (Ithaca, N.Y.:Cornell University Press, 2008), 4.

6   United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, "Transnational organized crime threat assessments," December 10, 2017, https://www.unodc.org/unodc/data-and-analysis/TOC-threat-assessments.html

7   Ibid.

8   Michael Dziedzic, "Introduction to" *Criminalized Power Structures: The Overlooked Enemies of Peace*, ed. Michael Dziedzic (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016), 5.

9   Ibid.

10   Walter Kemp, Mark Shaw, and Arthur Boutellis, *The Elephant in the Room: How can peace operations deal with organized crime?* (New York: IPI, 2013), 2, https://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/elephant_in_the_room.pdf

11   UN DPKO/DFS, "Policy: UN Police in Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions," February 2014, 16.

12   UN DPKO/DFS, "Guidelines: Police Operations in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions," 2015, 13.

13   William Durch, "Police in UN Operations," Challenges Forum Paper, 2014, 12, http://www.challengesforum.org/Global/Forum%20Documents/2014_SGF_Oslo/Backgroundpaper_Oslo_Dr_Durch.pdf.

14   Fabian Kuehner, "The Impact of Organized Crime on Peace Support Operations," in *Law Enforcement within the Framework of Peace Support Operations*, ed. Roberta Arnold (Leiden, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2008), 92.

15   Chuck Sudetic, "The bullies who run Kosovo," *Politico*, July 2015, https://www.politico.eu/article/kosovo-hashim-thaci-un-special-court-tribunal-organ-trafficking-kla-serbia-milosevic-serbia-ramush/

16   David Beer, "Haiti: The Gangs of Cité Soleil," in *Criminalized Power Structures: The Overlooked Enemies of Peace*, ed. Michael Dziedzic (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016), 131.

17   Sofía Sebastián, "The Role of Police in UN Peace Operations," The Stimson Center, 2015, 10, https://www.stimson.org/sites/default/files/file-attachments/CIC-Policy-Brief_3_Sept-2015-Web-REVISED_Jan2016_0.pdf

18   Beer, 132.

19   Ibid., 129.

20   Ibid., 94.

21   A. Walter Dorn, *Keeping Watch: Monitoring, Technology and Innovation in UN Peace Operation* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2011), 34.

22   Dorn, *Keeping Watch*, 41.

23   Ibid., 59.

24   Ibid., 38.

25   Dorn, "Smart Peacekeeping: Toward Tech-Enabled UN Operations," International Peace Institute, Providing For Peacekeeping No. 13, July 2016, 10.

26   Ibid., 34.

27   Africa Renewal, "Unmanned aerial vehicles are effective in protecting civilians – Hervé Ladsous," United Nations Africa Renewal, accessed December 12, 2017, https://www.un.org/africarenewal/web-features/unmanned-aerial-vehicles-are-effective-protecting-civilians%E2%80%94herv%C3%A9-ladsous

28   Dorn, "Smart Peacekeeping," 6.

29   Lloyd Axworthy and A. Walter Dorn, "New Technology for Peace & Protection: Expanding the R2P Toolbox," *Daedalus* 143, no. 4 (Fall 2016): 93.

30   Dorn, *Keeping Watch*, 55.

31   Ibid., 9.

32   Axorthy and Dorn, "New Technology," 91. .

33   Dorn, *Smart Peacekeeping*, 12.

34   Ibid., 2.

35   Barack Obama, remarks at UN Peacekeeping Summit, Trusteeship Council Chamber, UN headquarters, New York, NY, September 28, 2015, available at www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/28/remarks-president-obama-un-peacekeeping-summit ; and White House Office of the Press Secretary, "Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies: United States Support to United Nations Peace Operations," September 28, 2015, available at www.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/2015peaceoperations.pdf.

36   James Cockayne, "The UN Security Council and Organized Criminal Activity: Experiments in International Law Enforcement," United Nations University Working Paper Series, 2014, 4, https://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:3124/wp03_oca.pdf.

37   Michael Dziedzic, "An Overview of the International Toolkit for Combating Criminalized Power Structures," in *Criminalized Power Structures: The Overlooked Enemies of Peace,* ed. Michael Dziedzic (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016), 383.

38   Cockayne, "The UN Security Council," 5.

39   Jana Nyerges, "Democratic Republic of Congo: M23," in *Criminalized Power Structures: The Enemies of Peace*, ed. Michael Dziedzic (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016), 207.

40   Ibid., 210.

41   Kemp, Shaw, and Boutellis, *The Elephant in the Room*, 28.

42   Cockayne, "The UN Security Council," 3.

43   Ibid, 10.

44   Kemp, Shaw, and Boutellis, *The Elephant in the Room*, 28-29.

45   Ibid.

46   Durch, "Police in UN Operations," 19.

47   Dziedzic, "Introduction," 3.

48   Peter Andreas, "Illicit International Political Economy: The Clandestine Side of Globalization," *Review of International Political Economy* 11, no. 3 (2004): 650.

49   Michael Dziedzic, "Conclusions," in *Criminalized Power Structures: The Overlooked Enemies of Peace*, ed. Michael Dziedzic (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016), 321.

50   Ibid.

51   Kemp, Shaw, and Boutellis, *The Elephant in the Room*, 14.

52   Dziedzic, "An Overview," 384.

53   Ibid., 387.

54   Thomas G. Weiss, David P. Forsythe, Roger A, Coate, and Kelly-Kate Pease. *The United Nations and Changing World Politics* (Boulder, Co: Westview Press, 2014), 6.

55   Dziedzic, "An Overview," 383.

Countering Maritime Piracy in Southeast Asia

Marshall Reid

Marshall Reid graduated from Rhodes College in Memphis, Tennessee in 2015 with a degree in History and International Studies. He is currently pursuing his M.A. in International Affairs at the Elliott School of International Affairs with a focus on U.S. foreign policy and Asia. Marshall is currently an intern with the German Marshall Fund of the United States' Asia Program where he conducts research on Taiwan and India.

ABSTRACT

While Southeast Asia has experienced substantial economic and commercial growth in recent years, transnational criminal organizations have sought to prey upon the success. Among these groups, few are more economically draining than maritime pirates. These actors operate outside the bounds of traditional state control, crossing international boundaries, and flouting international and national laws. While individual attacks are typically limited in scope, consisting primarily of minor robberies and assaults, they have had devastating cumulative effects on international trade. If Southeast Asia is to continue its precipitous economic rise, states with interests in the region must take substantial steps to combat maritime piracy. This paper proposes four distinct yet complementary policy recommendations to address the root issues of poor coordination, weak institutions, cultural rivalry, and economic insecurity. By doing so, states with significant interests in Southeast Asia can decrease the risk of maritime piracy and its negative effects on trade and development in the region.

INTRODUCTION

Over the course of past several decades, few regions have experienced greater transformation than Southeast Asia. Previously seen as an international backwater plagued by political turmoil and post-colonial instability, the area has developed rapidly in recent years. Centered on the crucial Straits of Malacca – through which roughly 25 percent of global oil trade and tens of thousands of commercial vessels pass – the region has become an indispensable component

of the world economy.[1] This process has been largely facilitated by prescient economic policies and shifting trade dynamics.

However, the rapid development of Southeast Asia has not been without obstacles. From its outset in the early 1980s, the process has been accompanied by an emergence of significant transnational security concerns. These threats, ranging from an expansive network of illicit drug trade to a substantial increase in international terrorist activity, have worked to undermine regional cooperation, exacerbate existing tensions, and erode crucial relationships.

Among such issues, few are as flagrant and economically-draining as maritime piracy. Though frequently depicted as endemic to lawless stretches of the African coastline, maritime piracy has become a problem of grave concern for Southeast Asian states. This concern is no exaggeration given the region's recent crowning as the top destination for piracy (as a percentage of global occurrences).[2] This paper will shed light on the threat of maritime piracy in Southeast Asia by providing its historical background, surveying existing attempts to combat it, and exploring potential multilateral policy solutions. In doing so, it contends that the piracy which plagues Southeast Asia is a complex, multifaceted problem, requiring a combination of both short- and long-term international, regional, state, and local policy solutions in order to comprehensively address its many drivers.

DEFINING PIRACY

Prior to exploring these policy solutions, however, it is critical to first understand what constitutes piracy – in general as well as in the specific context of Southeast Asia. According to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), piracy consists of "any illegal acts of violence or detention, or any act of depredation, committed for private ends by the crew or the passengers of a private ship," which are typically undertaken on the high seas.[3] Unlike traditional violent warfare, piracy does not include actions taken by state actors against other states; rather, it is perpetrated by private actors acting in their own (typically financial) self-interest. Notably, UNCLOS' definition distinguishes piracy as only occurring in international waters, describing crimes committed in national waters as armed robbery.

While useful to some degree, the UNCLOS definition excludes countless acts which would otherwise be considered piracy on the basis of their private motivation and armed/illicit nature. Additionally, piracy statistics often suffer from the same problem as many other transnational crime statistics: they seek to explain crimes which are undertaken by groups which prize secrecy and discretion and are only sporadically reported.[4] UNCLOS' narrow definition therefore seems to further hamper the measurement of this inherently illusive activity.

Alternatively, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation (SUA), a secondary U.N. convention, defines piracy more broadly. The SUA definition includes smaller, more common acts of maritime violence—including those committed in national waters – rather than limiting its scope to high-profile crimes undertaken in international waters (such as the 2009 hijacking and hostage incident on the *Maersk Alabama*).[5] The crimes covered by the SUA definition may include acts such as unwarranted boarding of ships, theft of cargo, kidnapping, and hostage taking. For the purposes of gaining a more comprehensive perspective on the issue of piracy in Southeast Asia, this paper will use the SUA definition as a framework.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

While the issue of piracy in maritime Southeast Asia has recently gained greater international attention, it is by no means a new phenomenon. Beginning with recorded accounts as early as the fifth century and intensifying as European traders explored in the mid-1500s, the waters which sustain the region's vast trade networks have long harbored an expansive array of criminal actors.[6] From individual corsairs to more organized syndicates, these actors preyed upon commercial enterprises and developing state-led economies, seizing cargo and disrupting financial arrangements.[7]

These groups typically acted outside the bounds of traditional conceptions of sovereignty, operating across national borders and flouting organized attempts to counter them.[8] Launching raids from isolated inlets and sparsely-populated atolls, Southeast Asia's pirates significantly impacted trade efforts of numerous powers, from dynasties of China to colonial empires of the Dutch, the Portuguese, and the British. While their power has fluctuated over time – typically in response to unilateral crack-downs from regional or colonizing powers, or weakly coordinated anti-piracy efforts by concerned parties – it is nevertheless true that maritime pirates played a substantial role in shaping the area's economic development throughout its history.

The modern pirates plying the waters of Southeast Asia are similar to their predecessors in terms of their motivations and strategy. Driven by financial gain, these actors may participate in numerous illicit activities in order to fund other transnational criminal activities, including terrorism and drug trafficking.[9] Rather than operating in the service of a specific national entity, these groups act independently, largely ignoring national boundaries and international law and circumventing already weak institutions.[10] Today's pirates frequently seek to exploit the intense rivalries and long-term territorial disputes which define the region, fleeing across borders and making cooperative policing efforts difficult. This phenomenon was well-illustrated by Indonesia's unwillingness to join a Singapore-based counter-piracy

initiative, arguing that it should have a more central role in the agreement than neighboring Singapore.[11]   Like many others in the region, this pair of countries shares a long history of conflict born out of soured alliances, assassinations, and self-serving internal political narratives.[12] In turn, this historically-rooted disagreement has weakened existing multilateral efforts and complicated future cooperative measures. Much like pirates of the past, modern pirates use Southeast Asia's unique geography to their advantage. A vast area composed of thousands of islands, hidden lagoons, and impenetrable jungles, the region naturally lends itself to illicit activity.[13]

As unique as Southeast Asia's geography is the region's rapid and uneven economic development. As a result of rising labor costs in China, low-skilled Southeast Asian communities are quickly becoming attractive assembly hubs for the world's global production.[14] This shift has played a significant role in increasing the volume of commerce flowing through the region and facilitating the rise of modern piracy by exacerbating inequality. While many have benefited from the increased economic integration and modernization of the area, vast rural populations have become increasingly marginalized. With few alternative prospects, many individuals in these communities—particularly fishermen and farmers residing in isolated, coastal regions—have turned to piracy to survive.[15] Thus, while the pirates of Southeast Asia have deep historical roots, they are increasingly motivated by modern economic anxieties and trade dynamics.

Conceivably more lawless regions like the Horn of Africa have gained international reputations as the global centers of pirate activity; however, piracy in these regions pales in comparison to the levels experienced by maritime Southeast Asia.[16] This has been particularly true in recent years. Greater international focus on the African coast has resulted in a reduction in the number of large-scale attacks, with zero instances of hijacking occurring between 2012 and 2017.[17] Despite similar – albeit more limited – efforts in Southeast Asia, the results have been decidedly less promising. Over the course of the past decade, the region has again peaked as an international hub of maritime piracy[18] and a number of trends have become clear through this increased activity.

MODERN TRENDS

Beginning in the early 1990s, Southeast Asia witnessed a pronounced trend towards lawlessness in its maritime zones. Incidents of piracy in the region escalated steeply during this time, with 237 attacks in 2000—up from just 15 in 1993.[19] The proliferation was the result of a diverse array of regional and international factors. Regional factors included government instability and corruption (particularly in Indonesia), rapid and weakly-regulated industrialization, marketization of local economies that increased trade and

marginalized rural inhabitants, and declining fish stocks that resulted in widespread unemployment.[20] Internationally, the trend was primarily driven by the increasing emphasis on liberalizing East Asian economies, particularly China.[21] Naturally, this shift resulted in massive increases in shipments through Southeast Asia, providing pirates with an unprecedented number of valuable targets to prey on.[22] The 1997 Asian financial crisis in particular proved to be a powerful shock to this rapidly developing region, plunging many back into poverty and further incentivizing black market forms of employment.[23]

Numerous pirate attacks continue to disrupt the supply chains of firms and interdependent economies throughout the region. Cumulatively, these activities cost billions of dollars to the global economy.[24] While piracy exists in every part of the region, it is concentrated in the Indonesian waters surrounding the Straits of Malacca, where an estimated 43 attacks of varying severity occurred in 2017.[25] Many commercial vessels have chosen to avoid the heart of the region entirely by taking longer, more expensive routes between the Indian and Pacific oceans.[26] Additionally, numerous attacks on freighters carrying valuable cargo such as petroleum, palm oil, and weapons have demonstrated the significant threat that piracy in maritime Southeast Asia poses to global trade and regional security.[27] Understanding the policies that have allowed this externality to persist in Southeast Asia is vital to crafting new, more effective policies to address the issue.

EXISTING COUNTER-PIRACY INITIATIVES

Piracy in maritime Southeast Asia is not a new phenomenon; nor, therefore, are policies aimed at its eradication. For centuries, nations with interests in the region have gone to great lengths to counter crimes on the high seas. These initiatives have ranged from relatively limited efforts by local kingdoms to safeguard their own waters to more expansive, coordinated counter-piracy measures undertaken by colonial powers. While these attempts were occasionally successful, they consistently failed to fully address the issue's root causes. Since the initial proliferation of pirate activity in the early 1990s, eradication efforts have generally fallen into two categories: limited, unilateral policing actions by individual nation states and larger, multilateral, regional efforts. Both types of initiatives have seen limited success, but their impact on overall piracy levels in Southeast Asia has been insufficient. This failure is the result of a variety of financial, logistical, and geopolitical factors.

Prior to the recent pivot towards multilateral cooperation in combating transnational security threats, the nations of maritime Southeast Asia relied on small, localized counter-piracy efforts. This norm was a product of limited financial flexibility and intense rivalry between neighboring states, meaning that such initiatives were typically aimed at protecting national waters above

all else.[28] Localized anti-piracy campaigns, such as those pursued by Malaysia and Indonesia during the 1990s, were primarily executed by coast guard vessels and consisted of patrols, limited police operations, and strict enforcement of anti-piracy laws.

Past strategies helped slow the precipitous growth of pirate activity at the time, but they were hampered by a number of daunting obstacles. First, insufficient funding and manpower meant that national forces were frequently incapable of operating effectively. Second, the vast, complex geography of the region (especially in Indonesia) provided refuge for pirates and made comprehensive patrols nearly impossible. Finally, long-standing rivalries and territorial competition between regional powers allowed pirates to exploit national boundaries and evade national police forces. Though limited initiatives have seen greater success in recent years—a product of increased funding and operational capacity—they remain insufficient. Consequently, stakeholders in the region have increasingly focused on multilateral approaches to address the aforementioned root causes and enabling factors of piracy.

Despite the many cultural, political, and religious cleavages which define Southeast Asia, the area has experienced an explosion of multilateral cooperation over the past decade and a half. Motivated by a shared desire for economic gains and guided by expansive regional institutions such as ASEAN and the East Asia Summit, regional players have demonstrated a greater willingness to cooperate on a wide range of issues. With regard to counter-piracy efforts, this joint process has been highly beneficial. Starting slowly with a relatively limited 1992 information sharing agreement between Indonesia and Singapore, multilateral cooperation has demonstrated tangible results.[29] Furthermore, early success has incentivized further coordination and cooperation.

This trend is perhaps best exemplified by the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia (ReCAAP). Founded in 2006, ReCAAP includes most parties with interests in the region, allowing for greater collaboration, intergovernmental dialogue, and joint security operations. In addition, numerous nations have agreed to participate in joint training exercises. Finally, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines have recently agreed to allow "hot pursuits" of pirates across their national borders, thereby eliminating a powerful advantage previously exploited by pirates.[30] While a great many of these collaborative arrangements have been orchestrated by local nations, others have been organized by external powers with significant trade interests in the region. One example of this can be seen in Japan's aggressive counter-piracy initiatives during the early 2000s.[31] Overall, the multilateral anti-piracy approaches have seen significant success. Reported pirate attacks in the region have gradually declined from their peak in the late 1990s.[32] Attacks in Indonesia, one of the region's most affected areas,

have fallen by nearly 60 percent from 2013-2017 alone.[33]

Nevertheless, numerous organizational and logistical flaws, such as measurement issues born from incomplete piracy definitions, have persisted. Many Southeast Asian nations have been driven by a desire to protect national sovereignty and maintain tenuous diplomatic relationships, leaving recent multilateral efforts unable to confront the piracy issue directly. As such, wholesale changes will be required to comprehensively combat piracy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The pirate activity which plagues the waters of Southeast Asia has no simple solution. A complex, multifaceted problem driven by economic marginalization, geography, institutional weakness, global trade, and cultural dynamics, piracy resists traditional preventative efforts. Left unchecked, piracy in the area will continue to present numerous threats. Regionally, such activity places thousands in danger, threatens the livelihoods of countless individuals, and frays the already tenuous ties between Southeast Asian nations.[34] Globally, it represents an unacceptable drain on international trade by regularly placing critical cargo in danger and destabilizing markets.[35] Policy solutions must reflect the nature of the problem in order to be effective. That is, they must be transnational and marshal a wide range of enforcement mechanisms towards a common goal. With this in mind, this paper will provide four counter-piracy policy recommendations, each representing a critical layer of enforcement from the supranational to local policy levels.

First, the United Nations must develop a more comprehensive, well-informed definition of piracy to be enshrined in an amended United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). While piracy's immediate impacts are relatively localized, affecting only those firms and ship workers directly involved in the attack, its long-term ramifications are far reaching, affecting the rest of the supply chain and the global trade system as a whole. As such, a broad, international solution is vital. The U.N. – with its near-universal influence – specializes in broad, global solutions, yet its current efforts with regards to piracy in Southeast Asia have proven inadequate. While this failure is likely the result of an array of factors, from inadequate resources to lack of interest, it is rooted in a simple, definitional issue.

As previously discussed, the U.N.'s legal definition of piracy, codified in the UNCLOS, is fundamentally incomplete. In an effort to avoid infringing on national sovereignty, it defines piracy as a crime endemic to international waters, designating the same activity in national waters as armed robbery.[36] Complicating matters, a second U.N. convention, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation

(SUA), includes acts occurring within national waters in its definition of maritime crime.[37] This inconsistency injects uncertainty into what should be a straightforward enforcement process. The U.N. should streamline its current framework and develop a definition of piracy that includes acts occurring in both international and national waters. Doing so would ensure that piracy statistics accurately represent the magnitude of the threat facing not just Southeast Asia, but other regions as well. Comprehensive U.N. definitions of concepts such as violence against women and human rights have shown how great an impact this largely technical process can have—even garnering it a label: the "Helsinki effect."[38] Refining the definition of piracy and anti-piracy norms to which all U.N. members subscribe sets an example for regional institutions. Finally, this change encourages cross-regional, North-South collaboration by improving reporting accuracy and by bringing awareness to the scale of this issue and its effects on global trade and development.

Second, regional multilateral organizations – particularly those focused exclusively on reducing piracy – must be strengthened and granted legitimate enforcement capabilities. Though it is perhaps the most powerful multilateral organization, the U.N.'s influence in Southeast Asia is dwarfed by that of regional groups such as ASEAN, the East Asia Summit, and APEC. Products of the area's shift towards multilateralism, these organizations have accomplished a great deal—fostering greater economic and political integration, bridging cultural divides, and developing multinational cooperation towards solving common problems. Nevertheless, their efforts have been inadequate in the fight against piracy and its underlying causes. This lack of progress is primarily the result of the structure of many Asian international institutions. Driven by a desire for dialogue and fearful of inflaming historical rivalries, many of these groups have prioritized non-intervention over legitimate enforcement. While this has improved the political climate of the region, it has led to the creation of numerous "toothless" organizations that are incapable of carrying out treaties and agreements. This is perhaps most clearly illustrated by ASEAN, whose broad mandate and utopian values have consistently failed to inspire true multilateral cooperation and enforcement. In order to best combat piracy, the nations of Southeast Asia must make up for years of empty cooperation agreements by granting regional anti-piracy organizations more enforcement power and creating frameworks closer to that of the European Union. This could be accomplished by reforming existing institutions or by creating a new, dedicated anti-piracy organization (with far more power than ReCAAP). Such an organization would allow the region to better contain its rampant piracy while simultaneously maintaining its cherished multilateral character.

Third, regional powers, such as Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines, must divert greater resources to the fight against piracy, strengthen local police

actions, and work to develop more inclusive, equitable economies for their diverse populations. While piracy is fundamentally a transnational issue, flowing across national boundaries, national governments must continue to play a significant role in combating it. Small, unilateral anti-piracy actions, such as those taken during the 1990s, were indisputably inadequate, especially without widespread multilateral cooperation occurring elsewhere. A significant portion of these failings were the product of insufficient resource allocation. Frequently, national police services did not have enough money, manpower, or naval resources to adequately patrol their vast, complex maritime territories. With significantly more funds at their disposal—a result of rapid economic development—regional governments should divert far greater resources to the fight against piracy. In a region defined by its growing reliance on international trade, a reallocation of capital would perhaps best be accomplished by documenting commitments in future regional and international trade agreements. Operationally, this would entail making bilateral and multilateral trade deals contingent on commitments by all participants (both within and outside the region) to devote a larger portion of their respective GDP to counter-piracy efforts. By doing so, national governments could better supplement regional multilateral counter-piracy initiatives, protect their own national interests and the interests of global trade partners, and deny pirates critical sources of asylum.

Fourth, regional governments should work to develop more inclusive, equitable economies for their citizens, tackling one of the most fundamental roots of the piracy issue. Ultimately, this is likely to be the most difficult policy recommendation, requiring widespread coordination and awareness to be implemented properly. Nevertheless, it is perhaps the most critical step towards solving the problem, as recent empirical studies indicate.[39] Though piracy is occasionally driven by nefarious actors – from organized crime organizations to extremist cells – it is predominantly the pursuit of economically desperate men and women. These individuals have been left behind in the region's globalization, abandoning now obsolete traditional occupations and resorting to piracy as a means of survival.[40] Rather than merely seeking out and punishing pirate activity, local governments should work to better understand the links between economic disenfranchisement and criminal behavior and adjust their policies accordingly. Operationally, this should include local-level policies aimed at better integrating marginalized individuals into the modern regional economy, such as job-training initiatives, improvements to primary education and truancy policy, and tax and subsidy incentives for growing small-scale farming and fishing enterprises. Though the financial costs of such policies may be high in the short-term, they will be outweighed by the benefits accrued in the long-term.

The piracy which plagues Southeast Asia is a transnational threat with global implications. While existing efforts to combat it have been admirable, a

great amount of work remains to be done. Critically, past initiatives have been largely one-dimensional. Rather than tackling piracy on several fronts, they have generally focused on a single, limited area of prevention. In combating an issue as complex and variegated as maritime piracy, this approach is fundamentally insufficient. In light of the ongoing inadequacy of counter-piracy measures in Southeast Asia, this paper has sought to provide a path towards a more comprehensive, multifaceted counter-piracy strategy by combining a wide range of supranational, regional, state, and local solutions. By pursuing such recommendations, the nations of Southeast Asia can finally gain an upper hand in their fight against maritime piracy, thereby diminishing a problem which has plagued them for centuries. In doing so, Southeast Asian countries can once again use their critically important seaways without fear and ensure the continuation of their economic ascendancy into the future.

ENDNOTES

1   Candace Dunn and Justine Barden, "More than 30% of Global Maritime Crude Oil Trade moves through the South China Sea," U.S. Energy Information Administration, August 27, 2018, https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=36952.

2   Karsten von Hoesslin, "The Economics of Piracy in Southeast Asia," Global Initiative Against Transnational Organized Crime, May 2016, 24, http://globalinitiative.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/global-initiative-economics-of-se-asia-piracy-may-2016.pdf.

3   UN General Assembly, "Convention on the Law of the Sea," December 10, 1982, 61, http://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf.

4   Ahmad Almaududy Amri, "Southeast Asia's Maritime Piracy: Challenges, Legal Instruments and a Way Forward," *Australian Journal of Maritime & Ocean Affairs* 6, no. 3 (2014): 154-69, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/18366503.2014.915492?journalCode=ramo20.

5   UN General Assembly, "Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation," no. 29003, March 1988, 222, https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%201678/v1678.pdf.

6   Robert J. Antony, "Turbulent Waters: Sea Raiding in Early Modern Southeast Asia," *The International Quarterly Journal of The Society for Nautical Research* 99, no. 1 (February 2013): 23, https://www-tandfonline-com.proxygw.wrlc.org/doi/pdf/10.1080/00253359.2013.766996?needAccess=true.

7   Ibid.

8   Robert C. McCabe, "The Development of Modern Counter-piracy Initiatives in Southeast Asia: Vietnamese Boat Refugees and Alternative Incidents 1979-1997," *International Journal of Naval History* 12, no. 1 (January 2015), http://www.ijnhonline.org/2015/01/15/the-development-of-modern-counter-piracy-initiatives-in-southeast-asia-vietnamese-boat-refugees-and-alternative-incidents-1979-1997/.

9   Ibid.

10   Justin V. Hastings, "The Return of Violent Maritime Organizations to Southeast Asia," Department of Government and International Relations, University of Sydney, June 2017, http://web.isanet.org/Web/Conferences/HKU2017-s/Archive/bf3a2acd-a173-4d3e-8c50-cd96d91773df.pdf.

11   World Politics Review, "Why Southeast Asia Remains a Hotbed for Piracy," February 8, 2018, https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/trend-lines/24158/why-southeast-asia-remains-a-hotbed-for-piracy.

12   Natasha Hamilton-Hart, "Indonesia and Singapore: Structure, Politics and Interests," *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 31, no. 2,   (August 2009): 251, https://search-proquest-com.proxygw.wrlc.org/docview/205223786/abstract/204BFF7B502E4BFEPQ/1?accountid=11243.

13   "Why Southeast Asia Remains a Hotbed for Piracy,"

14   Oliver Tonby, Jonathan Ng, and Matteo Mancini, "Understanding ASEAN:The Manufacturing Opportunity," McKinsey Productivity Sciences Center, October 2014, https://www.mckinsey.com/~/media/mckinsey/our%20people/matteo%20mancini/understanding_asean_the_manufacturing_opportunity.ashx.

15   Ted Biggs and Carolin Liss, *Piracy in Southeast Asia: Trends, Hot Spots and Responses*, (New York, NY: Routledge, 2016).

16   Adam McCauley, "Pirates in Southeast Asia: The World's Most Dangerous Waters," *Time*, August 2014, http://time.com/piracy-southeast-asia-malacca-strait/.

17   Jeffrey Gettleman, "Somali Pirates Attack, Raising Fears That a Menace Is Back," *New York Times* (Nairobi, Kenya), April 4, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/04/world/africa/somalia-pirates.html.

18   Ibid.

19   von Hoesslin, 6.

20   Biggs and Liss, 3-5

21   David Rosenberg, "The Political Economy of Piracy in the South China Sea," *Naval War College Review* 62, no. 3, Article 5 (2009): 44, https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol62/iss3/5.

22   Biggs and Liss, 3-5.

23   Catherine Zara Raymond, "Piracy in Southeast Asia: New Trends, Issues and Responses" S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Working Paper no. 089, October 2005, 13, https://dr.ntu.edu.sg/bitstream/handle/10220/39828/WP89.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.

24   McCauley.

25   ICC International Maritime Bureau, "Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships: Report for the Period 1 January-31 December 2017," 2017, 6, https://www.icc-ccs.org/reports/2017-Annual-IMB-Piracy-Report.pdf.

26   Neil Thompson, "Asia's Deadly Pirates," *The Diplomat*, June 2017, https://thediplomat.com/2017/06/asias-deadly-pirates/.

27   Dunn and Barden.

28   McCabe.

29   Ibid.

30   Thompson.

31   John F. Bradford, "Japanese Anti- Piracy Initiatives in Southeast Asia: Policy Formulation and the Coastal State Responses," *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 26, no. 3 (2004): 480-505, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/27640003_Japanese_Anti-Piracy_Initiatives_in_Southeast_Asia_Policy_Formulation_and_the_Coastal_State_Responses.

32   "Why Southeast Asia Remains a Hotbed for Piracy."

33   Ibid.

34   Hastings, 8-17.

35   Ibid.

36   UN General Assembly, "Convention on the Law of the Sea."

37   UN General Assembly, "Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation."

38   Daniel C. Thomas, *The Helsinki Effect: International Norms, Human Rights, and the Demise of Communism*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 3-4.

39   Xiaowen Fu, Adolf K.Y. Ng, and Yui Yip Lau, "The impacts of maritime piracy on global economic development: the case of Somalia," *Maritime Policy & Management* 37 no. 7 (November 2010): 677-697, https://doi.org/10.1080/03088839.2010.524736.

40   Biggs and Liss, 4-6.

Venezuela and ExxonMobil Oil Discovery in Guyana

Anne Marie Morán and Laura Bluher

Anne Marie Morán has eight years of experience in advisory, social research, and strategic communications roles. Anne Marie is fluent in Spanish and Portuguese, and her current research interests include forced migration and the intersection of technology and development. She holds a B.A. in Foreign Affairs from the University of Virginia. She will complete her M.A. in International Affairs at the Elliott School of International Affairs in May of 2019.

Laura Bluher is a paralegal at Kids in Need of Defense (KIND), where she assists with children's immigration cases. Laura holds a B.F.A. in Photography and a minor in Latin American Studies from New York University. She was awarded a Wolcott Foundation Fellowship to pursue a M.A. Latin American and Hemispheric Studies at the Elliott School of International Affairs.

ABSTRACT

Venezuela's economic crisis has spiraled out of control, creating secondary ripple effects that are impacting the entire Western Hemisphere. This manmade crisis has produced an unprecedented regional outflow of migrants and refugees that shows no sign of slowing down and is likely to surpass the Syrian exodus. With an inflation rate estimated to be above 1,000,000 percent, Venezuela has placed its bets on a cryptocurrency tied to oil reserves it is unable to extract. Meanwhile, in neighboring Guyana, ExxonMobil has made nine discoveries since 2015. The discoveries are estimated to hold around 4 billion barrels of crude oil and expected to deliver over $6 billion in royalties and taxes once production is in full swing. This article examines the Venezuelan economic and humanitarian crisis within this context, considers the possibility of Guyana falling victim to the "resource curse," and proposes recommendations for key actors – Guyana, ExxonMobil, Venezuela, and the United States – to ensure Guyana's burgeoning oil industry is established in a responsible manner.

INTRODUCTION

Venezuela's economic crisis has careened out of control, creating ripple effects with implications for the entire Western Hemisphere. According to the United Nations, 3 million Venezuelans, or 10% of the population, have left Venezuela since 2015.[1] An average of 5,000 Venezuelans are fleeing daily,[2] and a new study by the Brookings Institution forecasts that a total of 8 million Venezuelans of diverse social classes will soon reside outside the country.[3] This mass outflow is likely to surpass the magnitude of the Syrian exodus. It has led to a variety of regional security issues, including increased violence in Brazilian and Colombian border towns[4] and proliferation of organized criminal activity like human and arms trafficking.[5]

On May 20, 2015, ExxonMobil announced that it had discovered crude oil in Guyana,[6] a South American country with a population of 800,000 people and the second weakest economy in the region.[7] Guyana shares its western border with Venezuela, and the two countries have long been engaged in a legal battle stemming from Venezuela's claims to the Essequibo land tract that comprises 40% of Guyana's current territory. This dispute escalated again after ExxonMobil made first of nine significant discoveries in the Stabroek Block.[8] This area off the coast of Guyana is estimated to hold at least 4 billion barrels of crude oil.[9] The output is expected to exceed Saudi Arabia's per capita oil production within a decade[10] and could provide a significant economic opportunity for Guyana.

OIL DISCOVERY AND RESOURCE CURSE IN VENEZUELA AND GUYANA

Developing countries like Guyana and Venezuela that are well endowed with extractable natural resources frequently fall victim to the "resource curse." With little to no dependency on tax income and abundant resource revenues, the government fails to develop strong domestic institutions, properly direct investments, and diversify the economy. Oftentimes, the inflow of resource rents promotes corruption, creates economic instability, and increases conflict rates. Assuming Guyana can avoid this fate, the discovery provides an opportunity to reinvigorate and develop the domestic economy. Simultaneously, this discovery will likely exacerbate Venezuela's economic downfall by diminishing any remaining hope for the revival of its once proliferate oil industry.

With the largest proven oil reserves in the world,[11] Venezuela is a prime example of the dangers of the resource curse. Once considered the crown jewel of Latin America, the country thrived on an oil economy for decades. The socialist leader Hugo Chávez, in his early years in power, capitalized on the high price of oil and extensively invested the revenues to finance a broad

portfolio of social programs including welfare, housing projects, literacy, and healthcare initiatives. From 2003 to 2008, Venezuela experienced positive economic outcomes: the unemployment rate dropped significantly, from 16.75 percent to 6.85 percent,[12] and the poverty rate halved from 54 percent to 27.7 percent.[13] However, the Chávez regime concurrently became increasingly authoritarian and corrupt as he attempted to consolidate his grip on power. Chávez expanded his executive authority, allowing him to pass laws by decree, and subsequently dismantled the democratic checks and balances system.

Chávez also nationalized the oil industry, consolidating it into the state-owned oil company, Petróleos de Venezuela (PdVSA). PdVSA now operates all of Venezuela's crude production.[14] Both Chávez and his successor, current president Nicolás Maduro, failed to invest an adequate amount of revenue into maintaining PdVSA and diversifying other sectors of the Venezuelan economy. Diversification would have safeguarded the economy, to some degree, against the global oil market's inevitable and volatile boom-bust cycles.

In 2014, a crash in oil prices ignited an economic tailspin in Venezuela as government revenues were wiped out, leading to a deep deficit in the state budget. In response to crashing oil prices and their influence on the Venezuelan economy, the Maduro regime began printing more money to cover costs, contributing to the hyperinflation we see today. In its 2018 World Economic Outlook, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) projected that inflation in Venezuela could reach 1,370,000 percent by the end of 2018.[15]

To combat hyperinflation, the Maduro regime recently redenominated and launched its official currency as the "sovereign bolívar," slashing five zeros from the end. Then, in another move that baffled analysts, Venezuela announced the launch of a new cryptocurrency, the petro, supposedly backed by oil reserves. The idea behind petro is that it will raise enough money to allow Venezuela to meet its financial obligations and prevent a full-blown default. The Venezuelan government has approximately $150 billion in outstanding foreign debt with about $2.5 billion in default, according to Caracas Capital.[16] At current prices, 100 million petros could theoretically raise about $6 billion. However, as a result of underinvestment in PdVSA, oil production has tanked since 2016[17] and the output is less than half of that in 1999 when Chávez came into power.[18] According to oil expert Francisco Monaldi, Venezuela would need investments of at least $8 billion to extract the 5 billion barrels in reserves that are supposedly backing the *petro*,[19] while PdVSA is currently $45 billion in debt. In March 2018, the United States government made it illegal for American companies and citizens to deal in the *petro*.[20] Other countries followed the suit, limiting foreign investment in a climate where investors' confidence in Venezuela was already low. Furthermore, the *petro* is not presently found on any major currency exchanges. In a special report, Reuters found no evidence of the *petro* being used in Venezuela, nor of any efforts to tap into the

oil reserves that supposedly back it.[21] Thus, it is unlikely that this gamble will pay off.

Moreover, Venezuela is currently experiencing explosive political unrest and one of the highest murder rates in Latin America.[22] The United States and other countries have joined in sanctioning Venezuela for human rights violations, corruption, and economic mismanagement.[23] In May, the Lima Group, comprised of 14 countries that include Argentina, Brazil, Canada, and Colombia, formally refused to recognize the Maduro government, citing illegitimacy in the electoral process.[24] Today, Venezuela is a risky investment, especially when a more stable political environment and new oil reserves are right next door. As there is no security in the *petro*, and no one knows what it actually sells for, companies will likely prefer to do business with Guyana, which has a tradeable currency interlinked to the global economy.[25]

As a country located between Venezuela and Suriname, Guyana is the only English-speaking country in South America. However, since its independence in 1966, the country has been plagued by political corruption and polarization between two parties oriented around ethnicity. As of 2017, over one-third of the country's population lives below the poverty line,[26] with the unemployment rate at 12.5 percent.[27] This tense political climate and lack of economic opportunities has led to a high degree of "brain drain," a phenomenon that occurs when high-skilled and educated people leave their country to pursue opportunities abroad. Endowed with natural resources, Guyana's economy has been based largely around exports of minerals and timber, with gold comprising 60 percent of the country's exports.[28] With ExxonMobil's recent discovery of oil, the World Bank projects Guyana's annual GDP growth to skyrocket from 3.8 percent in 2019 to 29 percent in 2020.[29]

Construction of the first ExxonMobil development, Liza Phase 1, is already underway. Production is slated to commence in early 2020 and is expected to churn out 120,000 barrels of oil a day.[30] According to the Norwegian consultancy Rystad Energy, Guyana's government is poised to annually accrue over $6 billion in royalties and taxes by the end of the 2020s.[31]

Guyana should take concrete steps to learn from Venezuela's mistakes. The country's growth and development potential hinges on whether the influx of revenues can be accessed by its people and is used to develop domestic institutions and business environment. Guyana must prioritize investment of oil revenue in areas that will lift its population from poverty. This includes the health and education sectors to promote long-term growth, increase productivity, and reverse the country's "brain drain" problem. It must also include social welfare programs to alleviate poverty and bolster human development. However, as evidenced by Venezuela, this is just one step in the process towards sustainable development. Guyana must also safeguard its economy from future bust cycles in global oil prices by maintaining economic diversity and continuing to invest

in other natural resource and industrial sectors apart from oil and gas.

DIVERSIFY THE ECONOMY

When considering actionable economic measures, there are several cases Guyana could seek guidance from. Malaysia is one example of an oil-rich nation that has avoided the resource curse by diversifying its economy and investing in its institutions. Even after the 2014 decline in global oil prices, Malaysia still managed to sustain 5.9 percent growth in 2014[32], and sustained a positive growth rate for 2015. Where other oil-dependent countries took substantial hits to their economies after the 2014 bust, the IMF attributes the relative stability and maintenance of positive growth in Malaysia to the diversification of its economy. Guyana should look to Malaysia as a model for economic diversification and commit to investing in its mineral and timber sectors, as well as other underdeveloped sectors like manufacturing. Diversification will temper the country's reliance on oil, which is prone to boom-bust cycles. On the other hand, creation of new opportunities and incorporation of social programs will incentivize Guyana's top talent to remain there, counteracting the existing brain drain problem.

ENSURE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Guyana is an admitted member of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI),[33] an international oversight initiative that seeks to create openness and accountability in resource-rich countries. While in theory, EITI promotes transparency and accountability, there is no formal mechanism of enforcement to ensure that member states remain faithful to EITI regulations. Guyana must ensure government accountability by contracting an independent oil sector oversight committee to evaluate levels of transparency and corruption, especially as it relates to oil revenue. Guyana should publish an annual report announcing the fiscal year's earnings, the national budget, along with the sectors, offices, organizations, initiatives, and individuals which received funds derived from oil revenue. Transparency in the nation's budget and the allocation of oil money will push the government to consistently sustain investments in sectors and initiatives that promote development and benefit the public.

ALLOW EXXON TO CONTINUE INVESTMENT

ExxonMobil has a vested interest in ensuring that Guyana's oil industry is developed responsibly and sustainably, not only because stability and low corruption foster a more productive business environment, but also because the company is mitigating a host of reputational challenges. ExxonMobil's

new CEO, Darren Woods, is trying to break away from his predecessor's legacy of billions of dollars in write-downs and a stock market performance that lags behind peers like Chevron and Royal Dutch Shell.[34] The company is also coming off the heels of other reputational challenges, including the 2017 climate change controversy, where a study conducted by two Harvard professors suggested that Exxon had actively misled the public for 40 years about the effects of climate change.[35] Thus, Guyana presents ExxonMobil with an opportunity to not only make a massive return on their investment, but also to build its reputational equity through leadership in the sustainable development of Guyana's energy sector. ExxonMobil has already begun to host workshops to educate Guyanese small business owners and the general public on how they can maximize their skills and advertise their businesses to access and profit from the new oil sector. Hopefully similar initiatives will follow, even after oil production is in full swing.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES

The U.S. must pay attention to Guyana's development in the interest of regional security. Guyana is currently a strategic partner in the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative (CBSI), working with the United States to combat narcotics trafficking through the Caribbean.[36] In its 2016 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, the U.S. Department of State cited Guyana as a key transit country for South American cocaine shipments en route to the United States.[37] Since the beginning of the surge of Venezuelan migrants to other Latin American countries, analysts have noticed increasing activity by Venezuelan transnational criminal organizations in receiving countries. Members of the so-called Venezuelan "mega-gangs" have been accused of kidnapping, extortion, murder, and narco-trafficking outside of Venezuela.[38] Neighboring Guyana is especially at risk of infiltration by these criminal organizations. If resource curse persists in the region, Guyana could become more unstable and corrupt, rendering it less capable of cooperation with the United States on matters of transnational security.

ENDNOTES

1   UNHCR, "Number of Refugees and Migrants from Venezuela Reaches 3 Million," November 8, 2018, https://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2018/11/5be4192b4/number-refugees-migrants-venezuela-reaches-3-million.html

2   UNHCR, "Venezuela Situation: Responding to the Needs of People Displaced from Venezuela," January-December 2018, http://reporting.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/unhcr%20venezuela%20situation%202018%20supplementary%20appeal.pdf

3   Dany Bahar, "How Many More Migrants and Refugees Can We Expect Out of Venezuela?" *Brookings*

Institution, December 10, 2018, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2018/12/10/how-many-more-migrants-and-refugees-can-we-expect-out-of-venezuela/

4   Venezuela Investigative Unit, "Restrictions on Venezuela Migrants Boost Criminal Networks," *Insightcrime.org*, September 11, 2018, https://www.insightcrime.org/news/analysis/venezuela-migrant-restrictions-boost-criminal-networks/

5   Anastasia Moloney, "Venezuela's crisis boosts trafficking risk for women, children: experts," *Reuters.com*, August 30, 2018, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-venezuela-migrants-trafficking/venezuelas-crisis-boosts-trafficking-risk-for-women-children-experts-idUSKCN1LF1XG

6   Micah Maidenberg and Manuela Andreoni, "The Country that Wasn't Ready to Win the Lottery," *Foreign Policy*, June 2018, https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/06/19/the-country-that-wasnt-ready-to-win-the-lottery-guyana-oil/

7   World Atlas, "The Poorest Countries in South America," March 26, 2018, https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/the-poorest-countries-in-south-america.html

8   "Exxon Mobil Declares Major Guyana Finding," *Energy Monitor Worldwide* (Amman, Jordan), January 8, 2018, Newsbank.com, https://infoweb-newsbank-com.proxygw.wrlc.org/apps/news/document-view?p=AWNB&docref=news/1694D3EB1D771B28. Accessed October 14, 2018

9   ExxonMobil Media Relations, 2018, "ExxonMobil Increases Estimate for Guyana's Stabroek Block to 4 Billion Barrels," July 23, 2018, https://news.exxonmobil.com/press-release/exxonmobil-increases-estimate-guyanas-stabroek-block-4-billion-barrels

10   Kejal Vyas, "Eureka! giant oil find set to bring guyana startling riches. Maybe," *Dow Jones Institutional News*, June 21, 2018, http://proxygw.wrlc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxygw.wrlc.org/docview/2057735278?accountid=11243

11   Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, "OPEC Share of World Crude Oil Reserves," accessed October 14, 2018, https://www.opec.org/opec_web/en/data_graphs/330.htm

12   The World Bank, "Unemployment, total (% of labor force)(modeled ILO estimate): Venezuela," accessed October 8, 2018, https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.UEM.TOTL.ZS?locations=VE

13   Global Poverty Working Group, The World Bank, "Poverty Headcount Ratio At National Poverty Lines (% of Population): Venezuela," accessed October 14, 2018, https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.NAHC?locations=VE

14   Business Monitor International Research, "Venezuela oil & gas report - Q1 2018," 2018, 94-96, accessed October 14, 2018, http://proxygw.wrlc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxygw.wrlc.org/docview/1961996322?accountid=11243

15   International Monetary Fund, "World Economic Outlook, October 2018," accessed October 15, 2018, https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2018/09/24/world-economic-outlook-october-2018

16   Julie Wernau, "Venezuela is in Default, but Goldman Sachs just got paid," *Wall Street Journal* (New York), April 11, 2018, https://www.wsj.com/articles/venezuela-is-in-default-but-goldman-sachs-just-got-paid-1523379999

17   Anatoly Kurmanaev and Kejal Vyas, "Venezuela's Oil Production is Collapsing," *Wall Street Journal* (New York), January 18, 2018, https://www.wsj.com/articles/venezuelas-oil-industry-takes-a-fall-1516271401

18   Ben Chu, "Venezuela: How the most oil rich nation on earth was brought to the brink of collapse," *Independent.co.uk*, August 18, 2018. https://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/analysis-and-features/venezuela-nicolas-maduro-economy-crisis-oil-prices-explained-history-hugo-chavez-a8494696.html

19   Gideon Long, "Maduro's cryptocurrency scheme met with skepticism," *Financial Times* (London), January 16 , 2018, https://www.ft.com/content/9c0fcc2c-faa9-11e7-9b32-d7d59aace167

20   President Donald J. Trump, "Executive Order on Taking Additional Steps to Address the Situation in Venezuela," The White House, section 1 (a), March 19, 2018, https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-taking-additional-steps-address-situation-venezuela/

21   Brian Ellsworth, "Special Report: In Venezuela, new cryptocurrency is nowhere to be found," *Reuters.com*, August 30, 2018. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-cryptocurrency-venezuela-specialrepor/special-report-in-venezuela-new-cryptocurrency-is-nowhere-to-be-found-idUSKCN1LF15U

22   U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, "Venezuela 2018 Crime & Safety Report," April 2018, https://www.osac.gov/Pages/ContentReportDetails.aspx?cid=23791

23   U.S. Department of State, "Venezuela-Related Sanctions," accessed October 8, 2018, https://www.state.gov/e/eb/tfs/spi/venezuela/

24   Perú Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, "Declaración del Grupo de Lima," May 2018, http://www.rree.gob.pe/SitePages/comunicado_conjunto.aspx?id=CC%20-%20009%20-%2018

25   Ellsworth.

26   International Monetary Fund, "Guyana Staff Report for the 2017 Article IV Consultation," IMF Country Report No. 17/175, June 2017, 26, https://www.imf.org/~/media/Files/Publications/CR/2017/cr17175.ashx

27   The World Bank, "Unemployment, total (% of total labor force) (Modeled ILO estimate): Guyana," September 2018, accessed October 7, 2018, https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.UEM.TOTL.ZS?locations=GY

28   Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, "Guyana Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative," Accessed October 14, 2018, https://eiti.org/guyana

29   The World Bank, "Guayana | Data," accessed October 14, 2018, https://data.worldbank.org/country/Guyana

30   ExxonMobil, "ExxonMobil Advances Liza Phase 1 Development," June 12, 2018, https://news.exxonmobil.com/press-release/exxonmobil-advances-liza-phase-1-development

31   Clifford Krauss, "The $20 Billion Question for Guyana," *New York Times*, July 20, 2018, https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/20/business/energy-environment/the-20-billion-question-for-guyana.html

32   International Monetary Fund, "Malaysia: Staff Report for the 2014 Article IV Consultation," accessed October 14, 2018, https://www.imf.org/~/media/Websites/IMF/imported-full-text-pdf/external/pubs/ft/scr/2015/_cr1558.ashx

33   Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, "Guyana," October 2017, https://eiti.org/guyana

34   Ernest Scheyder, "Exxon CEO Struggles to Reverse Tillerson's Legacy of Failed Bets," *Reuters.com*, March 7, 2018, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-exxon-mobil-wall-street/exxon-ceo-struggles-to-reverse-tillersons-legacy-of-failed-bets-idUSKCN1GJ0IE

35   John Schwartz, "Exxon Misled the Public on the Risks of Climate Change, a Study Says," *The New York Times*, August 23, 3017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/23/climate/exxon-global-warming-science-study.html

36   U.S. Department of State, "Caribbean Basin Security Initiative: Guyana," https://2009-2017.state.gov/p/wha/rls/fs/2013/218472.htm

37   Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, "2016 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report (INCSR): Guyana," https://www.state.gov/j/inl/rls/nrcrpt/2016/vol1/253269.htm

38 Venezuela Investigative Unit, "Capture of Venezuela Mega-Gang in Peru is Ominous Sign for Region," *Insightcrime.org,* August 10, 2018, https://www.insightcrime.org/news/analysis/capture-venezuela-mega-gang-peru-ominous-sign/

An Interview with Adam Isacson

Juan Misle Dona

Adam Isacson leads the Defense Oversight Program for the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA). He analyzes U.S. military assistance to Latin America, drug and security policy in the Americas, and peace processes, with a special focus on U.S. defense cooperation in Colombia and Mexico.

In this conversation, we discussed the emergent security paradigms in the Americas: a wave of violence against social leaders in Colombia as it struggles to implement a controversial peace process with demobilized FARC rebels; hostilities between Colombia and Venezuela and the possibility of inter-state violence; potential for drug and security reforms in Mexico; and U.S. involvement in the region. This interview was held in November 2018.

This year's presidential election marked the largest share of votes in recent history for the left in Colombia. How would you assess the current balance of political forces there?

There is certainly a lot more political space for people on the left and center-left than at any other time in recent memory. Somebody with Gustavo Petro's (the left-wing 2018 presidential candidate) views would have been dodging bullets in the early 1990s. He and his supporters would not have held mass rallies or gained enthusiastic support throughout the country. Even a center-left candidate like Sergio Fajardo and his vice-presidential candidate Claudia López — an anti-corruption crusader — would have been excluded from any meaningful participation.

Nevertheless, Colombia is still a fundamentally conservative country and the mainstream in Colombia is more conservative than it was twenty years ago. This can be partly explained by the presidency of Álvaro Uribe, a far-right leader who improved security within Colombia. That being said, there is not a hegemony of the right anymore, and it is possible to have different viewpoints.

Tell us about the rise in killings of social leaders in Colombia. We saw a similar trend in the 1980s after the Colombian state failed to fully demobilize and protect disarmed FARC guerrillas. What can be done to prevent a repeat of another violent relapse?

According to the Defensoria's figures, from early 2016 until early September this year, there have been 350 killings of people identified as social leaders. As part of the peace process, the Colombian government convinced the FARC to pull out of vast areas of the country. From the time the ceasefire was signed in August 2016 until well after August 2017, when they finished turning in their weapons, vast areas of the country became free — for a moment — of armed groups. I traveled to many of these areas and regions that were previously off-limits were now accessible: Putumayo, Caqueta – towns that had clearly been rebel towns. The big mystery is why the Colombian government did not fill the power vacuum that was created, even in areas with swathes of minerals, oil, and other natural resources.

Throughout Colombia, there is a system of tens of thousands of community action boards — juntas de acción comunal. They resemble advisory bodies and are controlled by a wide variety of agents including school teachers, union leaders, indigenous, and afro-colombian landholding leaders.. During this period, these leaders expressed how "suddenly we were able to make our own decisions for ourselves. We were truly independent." Unfortunately this did not last long. Many people with weapons and who are traditional powers from nearby regions want to control the territories where there is a power vacuum.

Who is behind the killings? In some areas, the National Liberation Army (ELN) guerrillas or dissident members of the FARC are now moving back.. Frequently, narco-traffickers, many of whom are heirs of the old United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC) paramilitaries, are now running these smaller regional paramilitary groups.

There is a close relationship between organized crime, mayors, governors, and people in the mining or large landholding sectors – people who want independent leaders out of the way. People participating in coca substitution projects and those who happen to be forming leftist movements are roadblocks. The goal quite often right now seems to be to threaten everybody and prevent genuine political participation.

Unfortunately, in the short-term, the Colombian government is simply unable to protect every junta de acción comunal leader. We're talking about tens of thousands of potential targets around the country in some of the most remote areas around the country. You can't protect them all.

The justice system must do more. A killing will not be ordered if there is a serious probability that the perpetrator will be investigated, tried, and thrown in jail.. More support for collective protection measures is necessary as well.

A lot of indigenous and afro-colombian communities have put together their own armed guards. There are more efforts to gather entire communities under the umbrella of early-warning systems so that there is more rapid response from the state. Certainly just a cellphone and a bulletproof vest is not enough anymore.

The July Mexican 2018 election propelled nationalist Andrés Manuel López Obrador to the presidency, in contrast to regional trends towards right-wing rule. He has promised a wide set of reformist security policies aimed at re-thinking the drug war, including a controversial proposal to grant amnesty to drug traffickers. How does this approach compare with the Colombian government's strategy of revamping the drug war and rolling back the 2016 peace agreements that created similar provisions for FARC insurgents?

Neither government has tried amnesty for small-scale drug traffickers before. López Obrador's proposal has gotten a lot of pushback from victims. The more senior the drug trafficker that you plan to include in any amnesty, the angrier victims get because they were not getting any justice from the justice system from the beginning. There is no guarantee that those granted amnesty won't revert back to criminality.

In Colombia, the Santos government was in more advanced stages of talks with the Urabeños and Gulf Clan neo-paramilitary groups on reduced sentences. Again victims argued that there was no guarantee that there will not be recidivism again in a couple of years. Many of these people were demobilized as Popular Liberation Army (EPL) in the 1990s and then joined the paramilitaries.

This question also relates to a different approach to counter-narcotics. There are Latin American leaders who have taken tentative steps toward a different drug policy — reducing penalties for possession, reducing the incarceration rate, taking a softer line towards families that cultivate drug crops. However, these leaders are running against the popular opinion in their countries. These countries are very conservative when it comes to social issues. Nobody is talking about legalization, even of marijuana, in just about any Latin American country. Leaders have done it, but they have done so against public opinion. In Uruguay, marijuana legalization is also unpopular in the polls. Their leaders have legalized it contrary to public opinion. In Colombia, Duque has taken steps like re-criminalizing the possessions of small amounts of marijuana, which is still a popular policy.

So I think there are limits to what López Obrador can get accomplished in Mexico, even without considering the pushback such a policy would get from the United States.

What conditions can be set for armed actors to abandon illicit activities and transition to civilian life? Should transitional justice be applied at the regional level in a time of globalized cross-border violence?

I don't know if you can apply transitional justice to those cases. You can certainly apply the equivalent of plea-bargaining in the United States, where you give somebody a lighter sentence in exchange for revealing everything about their network. There are some things that could be amnestied as long as there is a serious program to monitor criminals and give them the training and opportunities they otherwise wouldn't have. I don't see that being done anywhere.

Ultimately, this kind of crime thrives because of its relationship with government. You can't have this level of organized crime without a green light from corrupt officials, particularly at the local level, around the country. Negotiating with them would only work if it involved revealing every corrupt official who had helped the network, and not granting amnesty to those officials. I see no proposals to do that right now.

Colombian authorities have detected the presence of Mexican cartels in their territory, who are working in an alliance with local drug gangs and creating regional cleavages in drug and security policy. How do you foresee U.S. officials responding to the effects of changing Colombian and Mexican drug reforms? Could these differences in strategies affect the coherence of U.S. policy responses?

These groups are primarily concerned with maintaining their supply chain. The paramilitaries demobilized ten years ago, key leaders of the Urabeños were lost, and then of course, the FARC demobilized. It messed up their steady supply. In some areas that I have been to recently, especially on the Pacific coast Mexican buyers may even be maintaining peace between all these small bands and gangs by providing leadership and security to the criminal groups, establishing who gets control of each territory. However, some analysts believe this connection is overblown – that buyers do not have that kind of power. Some also say that the same role is being played by corrupt members of the security forces.

The United States should pay more attention to financial flows – where money was going out, where money was coming in, and how it was going back to Mexico. A kilo of cocaine in Colombia costs about $5,000. You split that up in the United States and it is over $100,000. All that money in-between goes to the Mexican groups who are buying cocaine from Colombia and then transporting it up. Yet we spend so many resources to eradicate campesinos' coca fields and trying to stop drug supply through the rivers in Colombia before it even gets to Mexican hands.

The collapse of neighboring Venezuela threatens efforts for coordinated security responses in the region. At the same time, growing presence of the ELN and alleged FARC leadership in the country may put Venezuela on the brink of interstate violence with Colombia. Is there a way to mitigate an escalation of conflict between the two countries?

That is a big worry of mine. An incident could happen on the border, possibly involving organized crime, in which members of Venezuela's Guardia Nacional kill Colombian military or police personnel. It could easily escalate into the first inter-state war in South America since the 1930s.

Given the lack of de-escalation mechanisms, trusted and impartial mediators are crucial. While the OAS (Organization of American States) is designed to mediate such disputes, Venezuela is pulling out of the institution. There is no international peace enforcement capability. Unfortunately, we don't have an administration in the United States that might be inclined to uphold or take the side of cooler heads.

You've been researching and tracking U.S. military assistance and aid to Latin America for years. What are the United States' current strategic security goals in Latin America? How have changing regional dynamics altered U.S.-Latin American relations?

U.S. grants and security assistance to the region is at a historic low. Plan Colombia and the Mérida Initiative are over, and nothing has replaced them. Security aid to Central America has increased, but it focuses on non-lethal assistance. So the missions that are guiding U.S. assistance to the region and U.S. security concerns in the region are always counter-narcotics.

For this administration, while it is clear that migrant flows are viewed as a security threat, it is not clear to what extent the military agrees with that

prioritization. Transnational organized crime is the primary concern they have right now, but the U.S. government doesn't always view it as we do: as a byproduct of corruption and weak rule of law. They often see it as a list of enemies to take out.

Not all of these have a clear military response. Obviously, if you're going to interdict drugs, you deploy more boats and helicopters and things like that to do so. But a lot of other things are more dependent on intelligence and planning, and require much more diplomacy than we're putting in. We are in a phase of strategic incoherence with regard to Latin America.

How
Democracies Die

by Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt

A Review by *Anne Armstrong*

The election of Donald Trump in 2016 baffled political analysts around the world and cast doubt on the strength of American democracy. The simultaneous rise of strongman politics in other parts of the world led many to reconsider the assumptions of liberal democracy. In *How Democracies Die*, authors Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt use a comparative approach to determine factors that have weakened democracy in America and created deep divides within the United States. The authors delve into the country's inception as a republic and outline defining moments in American political history. This research is supplemented with historical case studies from countries such as Turkey, Sweden, and Venezuela. Levitsky and Ziblatt describe how and why democracies have failed throughout history and the world. The authors then detail the institutions and norms that have sustained American democracy, how these institutions are currently under attack, and what must be done to preserve democracy in the United States.

Levitsky and Ziblatt are academics with extensive expertise in democratization theory and practice. Levitsky's background in Latin American politics and Ziblatt's specialization in European governance blend effortlessly in *How Democracies Die* to produce keen insights and pertinent examples. Their unbiased and comprehensive perspective allows them to draw convincing conclusions about patterns in democratic breakdown. The authors argue their case through a historical narrative, and successfully avoid the temptation to assign blame while remaining extremely critical of the United States' Republican Party. The result is a well-researched and well-argued critique of American democracy, a set of realistic recommendations for its preservation, and adds to the broader critique of liberal democracy in the 21st century.

Early in *How Democracies Die*, Levitsky and Ziblatt use several metrics to measure President Trump against current authoritarian leaders. These behaviors include rejection of rivals, indifference to civil rights, or a refusal to denounce violence; and were found to be prevalent when leaders such as Nicolás Maduro, Vladimir Putin, and Recip Erdoğan came to power. The authors conclude that

Donald Trump is not an autocrat like these infamous leaders but nevertheless has behaved undemocratically. Levitsky and Ziblatt emphasize President Trump's attacks on the judicial system and the media, including public criticism of oppositional judges and independent investigator Robert Mueller. evitsky and Ziblatt note the similarity between Trump's actions and actions taken by Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro against a Venezuelan prosecutor who attempted to investigate him. They also highlight a similarity to Ecuadorian President Rafael Correa's use of media attacks to sideline critics. By showing the behavioral similarities between President Trump and undemocratic leaders of less developed countries, the authors demonstrate how he is challenging democratic norms in the United States.

Two critical "guardrails of democracy" frame the book's argument: *mutual tolerance* and *institutional forbearance* (Levitsky and Ziblatt, 97). According to the authors, these norms are crucial as they reinforce checks and balances in the U.S. Constitution that prevent leaders from abusing power. Mutual tolerance is defined as the acceptance of political rivals as legitimate competitors and leaders, so long as they abide by the law. Institutional forbearance refers to the idea that politicians exercise restraint over their power, resisting the temptation to act in a way that violates the "spirit" of the law, even if their actions are technically legal (106). By accepting and respecting these norms, America's two major political parties can and have operated with civility. The authors use these norms as a framework to show how polarization rooted in racial and religious difference has shifted the country's political landscape, and led to electoral wins for populist figures.

Levitsky and Ziblatt show how these two norms have secured American democracy in the past and demonstrate how the same norms relied on racial exclusion to do so. This claim is significant: it suggests that the presumed collegiate nature of past American politics cannot be achieved in the future without rolling back civil rights. The authors contend that the "guardrail norms" were violated and American society became increasingly polarized as non-white voters gained rights in the United States. They trace the division to the Civil Rights Movement; specifically, President Lyndon Johnson's support for the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1965 Voting Rights Act. These changes, in addition to the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion, triggered a dramatic change in the American electorate. Vast numbers of black voters and white evangelical Christians entered politics for the first time. This shift would define the Democratic Party as "the party of civil rights" and the Republican Party as that of the "racial status quo" (169). The increased enfranchisement of black Americans therefore inevitably decreased ideological overlap between Democrats and Republicans and decreased effectiveness of the "guardrails of democracy." Nevertheless, the remedy to partisan polarization is not racial exclusion, and as the American voter base diversifies,

it seems that race has become increasingly divisive.

There is no question that the book paints an unflattering picture of the Republican Party, yet Levitsky and Ziblatt simultaneously maintain that the GOP is critical to maintaining democracy in the United States. To secure American democracy both parties must recommit themselves to upholding democratic norms, rejecting extremism—even at the expense of their party's power—and healing the polarization and resentment through civic and political alliances. Democrats and Republicans must identify the spaces in which their ideals converge without insisting on a political litmus test (219). Working together, these coalitions can strive for genuine progress.

Levitsky and Ziblatt gracefully guide the reader through the key institutions and challenges that have characterized democracies across time and borders. The authors are effective at using domestic and international historical examples to articulate how and why democracies become vulnerable. The book overlooked, however, key aspects of the contemporary political environment – namely, the effect of increased women's political involvement and the impact of foreign influences on U.S. elections. Levitsky and Ziblatt discuss how racial and ethnic diversification has impacted American politics, but they fail to address other changing demographics. As more women have run for office now than any time in American history,[1] and because female lawmakers are shown to be more efficient on average both financially and in terms of laws passed,[2] the absence seems like a critical oversight. The book also neglects to analyze the effect that foreign powers can and have had on U.S. elections. While perhaps published too close to the 2016 U.S. election to comment, the authors could have discussed misinformation campaigns as a contemporary tactic used by foreign adversaries to undermine democracy around the world. Finally, the authors' argument could be enhanced by applying more of the global examples they cite while developing the two critical norms. These comparative examples would place their argument in an international context and contribute to the larger discussion on the current global retreat from democracy. While these oversights do not detract from the overall value of *How Democracies Die*, they call into question whether the book's interpretation of American democracy is truly comprehensive – and if the observations are globally applicable.

The campaign and election of Donald Trump in 2016 challenged the United States' democratic institutions and highlighted their weaknesses. While still fundamentally a democracy, the country remains vulnerable to populist forces. The experience has jolted the international perception of the United States as the world's most successful democracy; in reality, the country is vulnerable to authoritarian threats like any other. Levitsky and Ziblatt explore the nuances of American democracy in *How Democracies Die* without softening these details. The book is not a validation of liberal political claims, but rather a thoughtful reflection on the trajectory of democracy in the United States and

how it can – and must – be safeguarded. Though the book's scope is focused primarily on the mechanisms of democracy in the United States, the lessons it imparts have implications for democracies around the world. As global democracy faces new challenges, Levitsky and Ziblatt's recommendations may prove useful for practitioners aiming to make democratic institutions more resilient.

Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt, *How Democracies Die* (New York: NY: Crown Publishing Group, 2018), ISBN 978-1-5247-6295-7. $26.00.

ENDNOTES

1   Heather Caygle, "Record-breaking number of women run for office," *Politico*, March 8, 2018, https://www.politico.com/story/2018/03/08/women-rule-midterms-443267

2   Andrew McGill, "Would Electing More Women Fix Congress?" *The Atlantic*, August 23, 2016, https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/08/would-electing-more-women-fix-congress/495989.