

1997

UN Peacekeeping: Japanese and American Perspectives

Peter J. Woolley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Woolley, Peter J. (1997) "UN Peacekeeping: Japanese and American Perspectives," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 50 : No. 1 , Article 15.

Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol50/iss1/15>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

thing; using these principles as the basis for formulating future policy is quite another. In a perfect world these considerations could be applied to every situation and a reasoned approach adopted. But the world is not perfect, and frequently foreign policy decisions are made with less than perfect knowledge. Time lines are compressed, and decisions must be made without input from every key actor. This will lead to mistakes. Further, policy alternatives seem to be much more numerous (each with its attendant "pros" and "cons") than the authors would have one believe and it may be argued that the choice rarely boils down to an "either-or" decision.

Despite these drawbacks, Hartmann and Wendzel provide invaluable advice to those interested in American foreign policy. *American Foreign Policy in a Changing World* should be on the shelf of every serious student of international relations.

JOHN J. LANGER
Captain, U.S. Navy

Harrison, Selig S., and Masashi Nishihara, eds. *UN Peacekeeping: Japanese and American Perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for Peace, 1995. 175pp. (No price given)

While books, monographs, and articles about United Nations peacekeeping proliferate at a rate that suggests faddishness, this book is less about UN peacekeeping than about Japan's possible role in the maintenance of global security. In this collection of brief essays, four American and four Japanese scholars address four distinct topics: what the role of the

UN in peacekeeping is and should be; what the tea leaves say about public opinion in Japan and the United States; what steps in preventive diplomacy the United States and Japan can take for Asia-Pacific security; and in what ways Japan can contribute more to global security. Although the introduction suggests that American and Japanese scholars must necessarily disagree, they in fact do agree on most points, and this is what makes the book both coherent and instructive.

Steven Ratner, who served as a legal advisor at the Paris Conference on Cambodia, begins with a review of crucial, but often confused, distinctions among peace-making, peacekeeping, and peace enforcement. The confusion surrounding such terms is not limited to the marginally attentive public but includes the multitude of public officials who influence UN policy and have a great deal to do with reinforcing both public and official perceptions of the usefulness and neutrality of the United Nations.

Masahiko Asada makes Ratner's points clearer. Asada, who was from 1991 to 1993 a legal advisor at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, points out that the UN intervention in Somalia became an alarming departure from precedent when the UN Secretary-General ordered that Somali warlords be disarmed. Asada suggests that the consequences of UN (and U.S.) policy in Somalia reached far beyond the death of eighteen American soldiers and the ignominious withdrawal of U.S. troops: Japan and other nations learned from the episode that a UN mission they have agreed to support can change in mid-course, thereby also changing the risk involved, making it more difficult for them to support missions in the first place.

This brings the reader to the most central and yet elusive topic: How much and what kind of support for UN operations can be expected from the public in the United States and Japan? John Isaacs, formerly a legislative assistant to Stephen Solarz, Democratic representative from New York, claims there is much broader American public support for UN missions than the congressional critics would have us believe. Citing a series of opinion polls, Isaacs points out that the perception of UN success or failure bears directly upon public and government support for future missions. The definition of success, and therefore the public perception of success, requires determined leadership—something that, Isaacs concludes, the Clinton administration has not provided.

Akihiko Tanaka demonstrates that despite the deep-rooted resistance in Japan to greater military roles abroad, a series of qualified successes have increased public support for the peacekeeping legislation that allows the Self-Defense Forces (SDF) to be sent abroad. The SDF has now completed small, well defined missions in Cambodia, Zaire, Rwanda, and Mozambique—all in the midst of a vast electoral realignment, including the ascendance of a Socialist prime minister whose party had once opposed not only peacekeeping roles but the SDF itself.

Edward Luck and Takako Ueta evaluate the possibilities of preventive diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific region, where so many problems of economic transition, dislocation, and boom-and-bust are brewing just beneath the surface. Yet for all their efforts to suggest new peacebuilding measures, one is left with the impression that the most workable and

tangible kind of preventive diplomacy is the maintenance of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty.

Thus, in two final essays we come neatly around to the question of how to achieve greater security cooperation between the United States and Japan. Both William Durch, a senior associate of the Stimson Center, and Masashi Nishihara, a senior professor at Japan's National Defense Academy, conclude that Japan can and ought to improve its air and sea lift capabilities.

In addition, they recommend increasing complementary activities by U.S. and Japanese armed forces. Both authors also offer some sensible cautions.

Durch warns that selected interventions must take into account a wide range of variables, most of which are beyond the control of any policy or country: the size of the target country, its access from the sea, the acuteness of the event, and "the fit with traditional interests." Nishihara warns that U.S.-Japan cooperation necessarily has limits. The SDF can do no more than perform traditional peacekeeping; it cannot be required to coordinate with U.S. troops if those troops are actively enforcing peace, and Japan will not approve of proposals that allow the United States or the UN to change the nature of the mission, as was done in Somalia and Bosnia.

The authors agree with, and even complement, one another far more than most casual observers of U.S.-Japan relations might expect. Indeed, their complementary opinions reflect the similarity of circumstances between the two countries: both are global economic powers; both have the most modern and well equipped armed forces; both have a deep interest in the maintenance of global order; and both have publics that are simultaneously willing to support the UN but skeptical of

open-ended commitments, runaway costs, and embarrassing entanglements. The arguments in this volume are likely to be dated within a few years. But the questions will not be.

PETER J. WOOLLEY
Becton College
Fairleigh Dickinson University

Magyar, Karl P., and Constantine P. Danopoulos, eds. *Prolonged Wars: A Post-Nuclear Challenge*. Maxwell, Ala.: Air Univ. Press, 1994. 463pp. (No price given)

This book is an excellent historical-political analysis of prolonged wars during the Cold War era, when the superpowers had a measure of influence on nation-state behavior in the developing world. As the subtitle suggests, the post-Cold War challenge is to understand these conflicts in a post-nuclear environment. This book has special value for the international security community, because it gives an excellent analysis of the factors that influence the duration of conflicts. The editors argue that it is "analytically misleading to make no distinction between wars that are planned from the onset around a protracted war strategy and wars in which the warring parties expected a quick victory, but various factors prolonged the conflicts." Thus, prolonged wars and the factors influencing their length are the focus of this study. The editors' stated objective is to "establish the distinction between protracted and prolonged wars, to present a number of case studies of prolonged wars drawn from mostly contemporary examples, and to offer the rudimentary outline of a proto theory of prolonged wars."

Magyar and Danopoulos suggest that factors prolonging wars "may be divided into separate but often interrelated categories: general societal, international/regional, and strategic/military." Using this framework of analysis, one can begin to understand the complex nature of prolonged wars. The contributors offer excellent case studies, each providing valuable insight into the origin of the conflicts and the factors that tend to prolong them. While some of the studies are dated (e.g., Earl H. Tilford's analysis of the Vietnam War and Benjamin Kline's "Northern Ireland Conflict") their value is of a historical nature, suggesting how societal, national, and regional factors may lead to prolonged conflict in the post-containment era.

The international security community should find of special interest the case studies of Ann Mosely Lesch's "Prolonged Conflict in the Sudan," Frederick Belle Torimiro's "Chad: The Apparent Permanence of Ethno-Regional Conflict," Karl Magyar's "Liberia's Conflict: Prolongation through Regional Intervention" and "The War over Angola and Namibia: Factors of Prolongation," Christopher Gregory's "Civil War in a Fragile State: Mozambique," and J. Richard Walsh's "Cambodia: Prolonged War, Prolonged Peace?" Given the nature of current post-Cold War conflicts, these studies are useful examinations of the conflicts dominating the international environment today, and they point to a number of different approaches to limiting conflicts in the future.

The editors make no attempt "to develop a general or comprehensive theory of prolonged war." The value of this text is in its excellent case studies and its reflections on how the international community should deal with the dominant conflicts of the latter part of the twentieth century.