■ Peace Operations and the Promotion of Cosmopolitanism

A N N I K A   B J Ö R K D A H L [1]

A B S T R A C T

The article explores the possibility for peace operations to function as a channel for diffusion of norms and values, and it attempts to identify conditions and circumstances conducive to the diffusion of cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism is here regarded as a political alternative to nationalism, and cosmopolitan values are perceived to stand in opposition to identity politics and other exclusive ideologies. Hence, cosmopolitanism may contribute to create conditions for peaceful conflict resolution and the prevention of conflict, and norms pertaining to conflict prevention are considered to have cosmopolitan characteristics. Hence, the diffusion of norms pertaining to conflict prevention may more specifically contribute to impede conflict. The UN mission UNPREDEP and the EU missions Concordia and Proxima to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) are analyzed to explore their capability to promote cosmopolitanism and diffuse norms such as those pertaining to the prevention of violent conflicts. The analysis suggests that both the UN mission and to a greater extent the EU missions provided opportunities to diffuse a cosmopolitan vision emphasizing conflict prevention to Macedonia. Cosmopolitanism was promoted as a long-term preventive strategy and as an alternative to the identity-based politics that caused inter-ethnic tensions between the majority of ethnic Macedonians and the largest minority consisting of ethnic Albanians.

Introduction

"Cosmopolitanism is back" *again* we might add (Harvey 2000: 529). Cosmopolitanism has surfaced from time to time, and at the end of the 20th century it has re-emerged as a consequence of the globalization, nationalism, identity politics, migration and multiculturalism (Hannerz 1990, 2005a, 2005b, Nussbaum 1996). Within the international community cosmopolitanism has gained renewed interest as an alternative approach to deal with many of the security threats of the contemporary world that cannot be solved within national borders, such as international terrorism, transnational crime, the proliferation of small arms, light weapons and weapons of mass destruction, human rights violations and violent conflicts (Kaldor 1999, 2002). In order to come to terms with these and other problems and challenges of global concern

---

1   Fil dr Annika Björkdahl is active at the Department of Political Science, Lund university.
     E-mail Annika.Bjorkdahl@svet lu.se

states have created cooperative arrangements and alliances that can be regarded as modes of cosmopolitanism superseding the Westphalian nation-state model. In the post-cold war era, international organizations and various other regional arrangements, such as the United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU) and NATO as well as a multitude of International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) and transnational networks – sometimes described as cosmopolitan institutions– have attempted to address these security concerns. One example of this type of "cosmopolitics" is the growing trend towards peacekeeping and peace enforcement to deal with violent conflicts, gross human rights abuses and ethnic cleansing. These developments have at times been referred to as cosmopolitan law enforcement and proactive cosmopolitanism as well as cosmopolitan wars (Kaldor 2003, Taylor 1999, Zolo 1997).

Cosmopolitanism is a term used in different ways by different people. To some it refers to "cosmopolitics" and a vision of world government, global democracy and world citizenship (Cheah *et al* 1998, Falk 1996, 1998, Archibugi and Held 1995). Cosmopolitanism is here understood as a political alternative to nationalism and identity politics. The spread of cosmopolitan values in general may contribute to the prevention of violent conflict by undermining support for extremists, ultra-nationalists, fundamentalists and other exclusive ideologies that may cause political tensions and eventually violent conflicts. In addition, the norm pertaining to conflict prevention is regarded as possessing cosmopolitan characteristics, and the diffusion of such norm may more specifically contribute to the prevention of violent conflict. Efforts at norm diffusion and particularly through the practice of peace operations may however be defied. Cosmopolitan values may be perceived as "Western" rather than universal, and attempts to spread cosmopolitanism may be viewed as projections of Western power and hence resisted and rejected.

The purpose of this article is to analyze whether cosmopolitan values can be diffused through peace operations, and if so under what conditions. It also discusses if the diffusion of these cosmopolitan values may contribute to prevent violent conflicts. The UN mission UNPREDEP and the EU missions Concordia and Proxima deployed to prevent violent conflicts in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia will be the empirical focus of analysis. Although I am sympathetic to many aspects of cosmopolitanism, such as the commitment to humanist principles and norms and the emphasis on a global responsibility to uphold these norms, this article does not attempt to contribute to the normative discussion, but will provide an empirical analysis of the possibility to diffuse cosmopolitan values through peace operations. I have found that some of these cosmopolitan values and norms have become embedded in the international normative structure and are robust enough to guide practice. Furthermore, once norms are translated into practice, practice contributes to strengthen and develop these norms as norms and practice are regarded as mutually constitutive. This has been the case of norms pertaining to conflict prevention and preventive action (Björkdahl 2002).

Cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism is clearly related to the moral dimension of international relations as well as the ethical nature of the relations between states/communities as for example in the context of violence and war (Brown 1992: 3-4). Cosmopolitanism has become more "policy relevant" in the last few years as actors such as states and international organizations have felt a need to justify their actions in moral terms. According to Mary Kaldor cosmopolitanism refers both to a "positive political vision, embracing tolerance, multiculturalism, civility and democracy", and "to a more legalistic respect for certain overriding principles which should guide political communities at various levels, including the global level" (Kaldor 1999: 116). Cosmopolitanism also highlights for example "…the spread of norms that secure human rights, democratic freedoms and social justice" according to Pugh (2001: 347). Cosmopolitanism has however been criticized by for example Barber (1996: 30-31) on the grounds of its "abstract universalism", and by Himmelfarb (1996: 77) for being an "illusion". It has also been argued that cosmopolitanism relies on a simplistic, polarized view of the world reducible to a few dichotomies such as cosmopolitanism vs. the nation state (O'Byrne 2005: 2). In this empirical analysis of efforts to diffuse norms of cosmopolitan character and spread cosmopolitanism both the political vision and overriding principles will be regarded as both may in different way contribute to the long term aim of stable peace.

Cosmopolitan values

Cosmopolitan values are derived from a humanist universalist context. Three values are shared by nearly all approaches of cosmopolitanism according to Thomas Pogge (1992: 48). These three elements will provide the basis for the understanding of cosmopolitanism of this article. The first is *individualism* as the fundamental units of concern are human beings, in contrast to collectives such as tribes, family lines, ethnic, cultural or religious communities, nations or states. The second element is *universality*. This refers to the equal status of all living human beings, not merely to for example men, whites, or Aryans. The third and final element is *generality* and this status has global force, meaning that human beings are the "ultimate unites of concern for everyone".

An international normative context of international law, laws of war and international human rights law is developing based on these elements in which the protection of humans against harm such as gross violation of human rights and violent conflicts is becoming a moral imperative. War and violent conflicts have been the main impetus behind the development of this normative context over the last two centuries as well as one of the principle threats to its survival. "The concept of harm or its equivalent is present in all moral codes" and it is the basis for the normative context that stipulates the need to provide protection of humans (Linklater 2001: 274). Yet, the principle harm conventions in international society were designed to maintain order between states, and there is only limited agreement about how international order should act to prevent harm to individuals. However, a consensus is emerging around

the conceptualization of human security, in which individual rights are the corner stone. It characterizes security in cosmopolitan terms as concerned with human life and dignity.[2] While the term 'human security' is only a recent addition to the lexicon of global politics, the doctrine undergirding the concept has a much more significant history. A doctrine based on the security of humans has been espoused and pursued by organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross for more than a century. In the UN Charter it is echoed in the phrase "We the peoples", which represent a considerable "advance in the normative vocabulary of international relations" and "it has permeated the framing of the human rights regime" (Dunne and Wheeler 2004: 10). Mary Kaldor (1999: 148) argues that "in some sense, a cosmopolitan regime already exists".

The cosmopolitan characteristics of conflict prevention

The notion of conflict prevention can be traced to a longstanding tradition in international relations where Kant's work on the Perpetual Peace can be regarded as a landmark document. Kant's thoughts can be helpful to contribute to bridge the gap between traditional cosmopolitan values and the contemporary notion of conflict prevention. There is a growing international consensus that violent conflicts can and should be prevented and that incidents of severe abuses of human rights, crimes against humanity and genocide demand international intervention. This implies that the international community has a responsibility to protect, but also to prevent.[3] The idea draws on a cosmopolitan or solidarist tradition in which the motivation behind cosmopolitan politics is empathy and that states become other-regarding rather than self-regarding (c.f. Hannerz 2005a). However, one may not exclude the other. The former US Secretary of State Madeline Albright argued that states acting altruistic and according to cosmopolitan norms do not necessarily act contrary to their national self interest "…[T]he promotion of human rights is not just a form of international social work. It is indispensable for our safety and well-being because governments that fail to respect the rights of their own citizens will in all likelihood also not respect the rights of others" (Albright in Beck 2002:64). The promotion and enforcement of these cosmopolitan values through various means is to a great extent (or should be) based on other-regarding interests and the notion of "solidarity with strangers" (Beck 2002: 62-85).

The idea behind conflict prevention builds on the core notion contained within the expression: "proaction is better than reaction and…crises are and conflicts are better addressed as they emerge, rather than when they have already deepened and widened" (Lund 1996: 37). Conflict prevention refers to actions taken in vulnerable places and times to prevent the emergence, escalation and relapse of violent conflict that cause harm to human beings. Inherent in the notion of conflict prevention is a normative ambition to contribute to build a "better" society. This makes it morally per-

---

2   Human security was first articulated in the UNDP 1994 Human Development report.

3   See for example the UN Report 2004. "A More Secure World. Our shared Responsibility", report by the high-level panel on threats, challenges and change.

suasive (Björkdahl 2002). Nonetheless, there are philosophical and political problems attached to distinguishing between the undesirable conflicts to prevent and those that may be constructive for transforming a society. – "It [conflict prevention] seems to"" have the qualities essential in any concept of showing how interests and ideals can be yoked to each other" (Hill 2001: 315). However, the perennial dilemmas of appeasement and ethnocentrism lurk beneath the surface challenging its universal and cosmopolitan claim.

Although non-intervention has been the norm guiding inter-state relations, sovereignty is reinterpreted in the 21st century. The rise of cosmopolitan values has contributed to this reinterpretation as these values challenge the norm of sovereignty through their diffusion and development of international regimes, norms and institutions. Furthermore, sovereignty has come to imply not only rights, but also duties such as protecting humans living within the borders of the state. Kofi Annan (1999) argues that "states are now widely understood to be instruments at the service of their peoples, and not vice versa". Hence, the treatment of a state's citizens can no longer be considered within the realm of the "internal affairs" of the state and abusive power holders can no longer be protected by the principle of sovereignty.

Cosmopolitan institutions

The international community and its institutions take part in the global struggle against human rights violators, and to prevent violent conflict around the world. Sovereignty is increasingly regarded as conditioned by standards pertaining to those of liberal democratic states such as compliance with human rights, good governance, rule of law and peaceful conflict resolution (c.f. Taylor 1999: 538, Kaldor 2003: 19). If states fail to meet these international standards and are reluctant to alter their ways and make concessions the international community would condemn them as well as impose these standards by coercive or non-coercive means. Consequently, the international community can undertake actions against states because "their anti-democratic or non-liberal behavior…" may "undermine the ethic of co-existence that sustain the society of states" (Elliot and Cheeseman 2002: 28). Cosmopolitanism views human rights violations as well as violent conflicts to be, at least potentially, everyone's concern. It is not enough to refrain from violating human rights directly and avoid solving conflicts with violent means. Instead states should act positively to promote the welfare of human beings elsewhere, and soldiers/peacekeepers should be prepared to die for strangers who are victims of genocide and ethnic cleansing (Kaldor 1999). This makes it impossible for the international community and its representatives to see themselves as disconnected from human rights abuses, ethnic cleansing, violent conflicts e t c that takes place around the world. Cosmopolitanism assigns responsibility for human rights and the prevention of violent conflict beyond those directly implicated in human rights violations and conflicts, although they of course have the greatest responsibility.

In order to shoulder this responsibility and share it among its members the international community has created international institutions that may be considered to uphold cosmopolitan values and are founded upon a cosmopolitan vision. The Interna-

tional Criminal Court should be mentioned here as a recent and innovative form of cosmopolitanism, going beyond Kant's conception of "cosmopolitan law". The ICC itself represents an attempt, in international law, to do away with the principle of the absolute subjection of individuals to the state and develop the status of individual human beings under international law. Individuals are becoming bearers of certain rights under international law, and they can be held responsible for crimes under international law in ways that penetrate the shield of state sovereignty.

International institutions if they are reflecting cosmopolitan values will have to fulfill certain criteria. They need to take individual human beings as the "ultimate units of concern" building on the idea of individualism. Furthermore, these institutions must reflect universality and attach the same status "to every human being equally", if they are to be considered cosmopolitan institutions. And, they must regard human beings as the ultimate unit of concern for *everyone,* reflecting the notion of generality (Kuper 2000: 654). In addition to traditional approaches to power, cosmopolitan institutions may exert normative power (c.f. Manners 2002: 240) and create consensus about values, norms and practices (Taylor 1999: 540). Cosmopolitan institutions may also promote cosmopolitan values through their activities, including peace operations.

The UN – a cosmopolitan institution?

The UN is clearly no world government and was never intended to be one. Yet, despite its flaws the UN can in some regards be viewed as a cosmopolitan institution. As an international organization, the UN is based on a treaty signed by member states and the present UN system conceives of states as subject of security rather than individual human beings. Consequently, the UN fails to unambiguously view human beings as "the ultimate unit of concern". State-centrism has constrained actions to prevent individual human beings from the harm of violent conflict in various ways. The norm of sovereignty has long impeded UN efforts to prevent violent intra-state conflicts from emerging when lacking the consents of the state concerned. State-centrism has also rendered it more difficult to recognize the state as a source of insecurity for individuals. Attempts to build on the statement "We the peoples" in the UN Charter to alter the focus of security from states to humans have progressed. The 1948 universal declaration of Human Rights and various other documents that constitute the human rights regime make explicit the relationship between security and human rights. This is clear from article 3 of the universal declaration that proclaims "the right to life, liberty and security of person" to all human beings (Dunne and Wheeler 2004: 16). The development of the human security concept by UNDP among others can be viewed as a yet another shift towards taking humans as the "ultimate unit of concern" seriously. The ad hocery of UN peace operations however may put the universality and the ambition to attach the same status "to every human being equally" in question as some human beings seem more "worthy" of UN protection than others. Hence, it is possible to view the UN as comprising two categories of subjects of security – sovereign states and individuals.

The UN is considered to exert normative power and has contributed to establishing new norms such as human rights as well as maintaining old norms such as sovereignty in global politics. The UN has also been instrumental in promotion of democracy and has assisted processes of democratization around the world. Although, democracy was never made a condition for participation in the United Nations at the level of the sovereign state, alliances between developed liberal democracies acting within the UN have since the end of the 1990's managed to move the UN to promote values with cosmopolitan characteristics such as human rights and democracy through its activities such as peace operations. UN peace operations have been concerned with electoral assistance and their approach associates democracy with at least a constitutional model that operates in an atmosphere of political pluralism (Falk 1998: 312). Paradoxically, the UN system in itself, and the UN Security Council in particular are despite reform efforts not democratic. In the General Assembly states are perceived as equal and the principle of one state – one vote is applied (Bienen *et al* 1998). Though the five permanent members of the Security Council are certainly "more equal" than their fellow states and for that reason the UN has been characterized as "autocratic cosmopolitanism" by Danilo Zolo (1997: 40).

The EU – a cosmopolitan union?

The EU is moving in a cosmopolitan direction, according to Habermas (2003). The EU has evolved into what has been characterized as a "post-modern state" (Cooper 2002) or perhaps more sarcastically, a Kantian "post-historical paradise of peace and relative prosperity" (Kagan 2002). The European states have moved from confrontation to integration, and over the past fifty years the EU has "successfully domesticated security within the Union" and it is therefore highly unlikely that a member state would use military force against another member state according to Sjursen (2004).This is one reason why the EU can be regarded as a cosmopolitan institution. A second reason is that the members of the EU have come to share a number of "core norms" (Manners 2002: 242) that I view have cosmopolitan characteristics. According to the European Union Constitution, '[t]he Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities'. According to these norms not only states, but also individuals are viewed as bearers of rights and duties. These core norms also have a constitutive effect determining the international identity of the EU (Manners 2002: 242). By exporting these norms the EU may contribute to "set the normative standards of the world" (Rosecrance 1998; c.f. Manners 2002, Björkdahl 2005). A third reason to view the EU as an institution of cosmopolitan character is its alternative approach to power politics. It has over the past fifty years turned away from the traditional notion of power and moved in the direction of international laws, rules, transnational cooperation and integration. It exerts "softcivilian" or "normative" power to influence the world (c.f. Duchêne 1972; Nicolaïdis and Howse 2002; Rosecrance 1998; Manners 2002). The Union is in a strong position to promote cosmopolitan values by way of its vast number of approaches and its capability to combine attractive positive incentives with harsh nega-

tive sanctions to an extent few other actors can match. The promotion of these core norms may also be a way for the EU to construct and/or strengthen its own identity, as identity construction is an ongoing process of "becoming" where identities are shaped and reshaped in processes of interaction. In addition, diffusing its norms may increase the legitimacy of these norms within the community and strengthen the cosmopolitan vision of the union (Björkdahl 2005).

Peace operations

There are a number of actors involved in the diffusion of norms in global politics and a variety of channels and processes are used for norm diffusion. Much of the literature on norm diffusion has focused on efforts of transnational networks, NGOs, social movements and on processes of learning, persuasion and coercion. Yet few studies to my knowledge have focused on peace operations and their practices as channels of norm diffusion. Ideally, peace operations are motivated by the perception that humankind belongs to a single moral community with collectively shared and equally valued rights and obligations which transcend cultures, religions, communities, nations and the sovereign state. Such a sense of belonging to humankind will according to Kant also mean that "a right violated anywhere could be felt everywhere" and cosmopolitan rights (can be interpreted as human rights) override the principle of non-intervention (Kant cited in Kaldor 2003: 18). Consequently, the international community represented by for example the UN, the EU, various other regional organizations as well as INGOs has a global responsibility and a global commitment to all human beings. The legitimacy of peace operations – to protect or defend individuals – rests on this claim that human beings belong to a single community of humankind.

This article suggests that there is room for military means in promoting a cosmopolitan vision, but for defensive, protective purposes such as prevention and not as traditional war. Peace operations of this type are detached as much as possible from statist and great power purposes and they need to be conducted under the authority of broadly based international institutions such as the United Nations. Furthermore, it suggests that military forces deployed in a peace operation need to be qualitatively as well as materially different from traditional militaries in their identity and normative structure. Militaries in Western liberal democracies, in the wake of the Cold War, are searching for a new identity and are recasting their roles and purposes (Elliot and Cheeseman 2002: 36). In reconstructing their identities the "peacekeeper identity" is becoming more prevalent, and the responsibility to save strangers more pronounced. This also includes re-adjusting the military organizational and value structure according to more cosmopolitan purposes, and in practice participating in international peace operations under UN auspices. Multinational peace-keeping forces are in a sense cosmopolitan at the same time as they are characterized by an inherent tension between national and transnational belonging.

Peace operations in order to protect individuals against massive human rights abuse, ethnic cleansing and genocide are proactive i.e. inspired by the emerging culture of prevention and guided the embryonic norms pertaining to conflict prevention. Rather than just "ending" conflict (or other forms of violence), proactive peace

operations must also engage in prevention as well as reconstruction to prevent relapse. According to Elliot and Cheeseman (2002: 41) "it is crucial that the use of coercive power must be embedded in a suit of policy responses which focus on conflict prevention as well as conflict resolution". As the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty discusses, the responsibility to react to gross human rights abuses must be understood also in the context of a responsibility to prevent the occurrence of such abuses in the first place. Hence, proactive peace operations are not intended for warfighting or enforcement, but rather to prevent violent conflicts where gross infringements of human rights take place. A long term goal of proactive peace operations is promoting a new form of political legitimacy, one which offers an alternative to exclusive identity politics, fundamentalism and particularism which may bring about violence.

The main tasks to be performed by proactive peacekeepers are a combination of traditional ambits such as separating belligerents and maintaining ceasefire as well as controlling airspace, and new tasks such as protecting safe zones or relief corridors. In addition, some tasks are close to traditional policing tasks – ensuring freedom of movement, guaranteeing the safety of individuals, including returning refugees or displaced persons, and the capture of war criminals (Kaldor 1999-125). Proactive peace operations are characterized by impartiality but not neutrality, as they may become an actual party to the conflict in siding with the victims as the main objective is to protect civilians (Kaldor 1999:125). Clearly, proactive peace keepers are prepared to use force against actors who threaten civilians, escalate violence or seek to undermine the operation's mandate. However, the use of such force should be demonstrably reasonable, proportionate and appropriate as well as the last resort. Finally, as Richard Falk (1996: 492) argues, the use of force for cosmopolitan purposes must benefit the peoples of the target society and the outcome ought to enhance cosmopolitan values and norms. Proactive peace operations if guided by a cosmopolitan vision and for cosmopolitan purposes can be perceived as channels of norm diffusion and for spreading cosmopolitan values. UN and more recently EU peace operations can be viewed to promote such norms through their practices. Both the UN and the EU, as previously discussed, can be regarded as cosmopolitan institutions that at times consciously attempt to advance a vision founded on norms pertaining to democracy, good governance, human rights, minority rights and peaceful conflict resolution. Through their peace operations they may attempt to extend these norms.

A "mission civilisatrice"?

Cosmopolitan rhetoric, however, may be used to disguise interventions for other purposes such as great power interests. Clearly, it is important to question whose interests peace operations would serve. Will cosmopolitanism as a tool for peace and security be used selectively and simply reinforce Western or great power or UN Security Council interests? It has been argued that cosmopolitan values may provide the rhetoric for projecting Western power in the world. Furthermore, peace operations have been criticized for being part of a "mission civilisatrice" (Paris 2002) and a new form of imperialism or neo-colonialism (Hartland 2004, Berdal and Caplan 2004).

Clearly, humanitarian intervention or peace operations in the 1990's have, at times, been compromised both by geopolitical interests and by the unwillingness of governments to sacrifice soldiers' lives to save strangers. Contemporary examples illustrate that political leaders often have felt compelled to exploit cosmopolitan values to motivate or legitimate the use of force, suggesting that other justifications based on national self-interest have diminished legitimacy. It is clear that the cosmopolitan rhetoric also can be used as a cover for the promotion of Western power in the world and disguise neocolonial or imperial ambitions. This potential abuse motivates a defense of the norm of sovereignty as the norm of non-intervention provides limitations for the use of armed force and thereby reduces the risk of war. The norm of non-interference may act "as a brake on crusading, territorial and imperial ambitions of states" (Chandler in Elliot and Cheeseman 2002: 25). Alternatively, to counter such misuse of humanitarian peace operations, interventions cannot be determined unilaterally if to be perceived as legitimate. Only through a set of multilateral agreed procedures, such as through decisions taken by the UN Security Council may peace operations be legitimate from a cosmopolitan perspective (Kaldor 2003: 19).

The UN mission UNPREDEP in Macedonia – promoting norms through practice

Macedonia's peaceful separation from Yugoslavia in 1991 provided the United Nations with an opportunity to deploy peacekeepers in a preventive mission. Based on the risk that the Yugoslav conflict would spread to Macedonia, and following the recommendations of the UN reconnaissance mission and the request of the Macedonian government the UN Security Council authorized an extension of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) and added a Macedonian Command (MC) in 1992. In 1995 UNPROFOR-MC was replaced by United Nations Preventive Force Deployment (UNPREDEP) by Security Council Resolution 983. Despite its importance for the region, the UN mission came to an abrupt end when the Macedonian government recognized Taiwan and established diplomatic relations with the country. The recognition coincided with Taiwanese promises of large investments in Macedonia (Björkdahl 1999). In response China vetoed a renewal of UNPREDEP's mandate, thereby ending the mission on 28 February 1999 (S/RES/6648).

UNPREDEP between 1992-1999 provides an illustration of how peace operations may promote cosmopolitan values such as conflict prevention through their practices. The norm pertaining to conflict prevention was put into practice as preventing the Yugoslav war from spreading to Macedonia was the short-term goal motivating the mission. The long-term ambition, as the UN mission evolved, was to promote cosmopolitanism as an alternative to exclusive ethnic based politics and to ease inter-ethnic tension.

Promoting cosmopolitan values through practice

The mandate, but to a higher degree the practice of UNPREDEP reflected certain cosmopolitan values such as the prevention of violent conflict. UNPREDEP was a

first attempt by the UN to deploy peacekeepers in a clearly preventive operation. It was an attempt to translate the novel idea of preventive force deployment conceptualized in the landmark document *An Agenda for Peace* of 1992 into practice. Prevention was at the core of UNPROFOR-MC's/UNPREDEP's mandate as it was to establish a presence on the Macedonian side of the republic's border, primarily with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Albania to monitor and report any developments in the border areas that could undermine confidence and stability in Macedonia or threaten its territory. Furthermore, it was to deter by its presence threats from any source, as well as help prevent border clashes (S/RES/795). The mandate was carefully designed to balance the guiding norms of the UN as formulated by the General Assembly in 1991 (Annexed to A/RES/46/182). Those guidelines stressed three sets of norms: those of humanity, neutrality and impartiality in the provision of aid, those of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in accordance with the UN Charter, and those requiring the consent of the affected country and, in principle, based on an appeal by that state. Although state-centrism dominated the mandate, there were important elements of cosmopolitanism in the sense that it was explicitly preventive initially only in the external dimension, but eventually also when addressing internal causes of conflict such as inter-ethnic tensions.

UNPREDEP was a UN operation, and as such it was guided by the normative context of the United Nations. However, the mission also reflected values that were not only the UN's but also the contributing states' mainly the Nordics and the United States. For example, it has been argued that that the Nordic states attempted to externalize some of the norms that guide the practice of the Nordic states internal as well as external relations such as arbitration of disputes, consensus settlements, social solidarity and the preference of dealing with the roots of conflict rather than just its manifestation (Archer 1994: 377). The US peacekeeping doctrine that emerged at this time gave strong support for preventive peacekeeping and when addressing the General Assembly President Bush stated that "monitoring and preventive peacekeeping, putting people on the ground before the fighting start may become especially critical in volatile regions" (George Bush cited in Lund 2000: 193). In general the peacekeepers from these contributing states acted in accordance with these values and may therefore have been a mechanism for diffusing them. Hence, it is possible that the norms pertaining to conflict prevention more easily translated into practice as it was highlighted in the contributing states' vision of this peace operation and that this in turn strengthened the diffusion efforts both locally and globally.

The practice of conflict prevention affected both the external and the internal dimension of UNPREDEP as the mission evolved from short-term conflict prevention strategy of containment to long-term nation-building. Once the short-term goal of preventing the Yugoslav federal army from intervening in Macedonia, UNPREDEP pursued its long-term goal to prevent the internal tensions from escalating (Ginifer and Eide 1996: 17-21). While Macedonia's declaration of independence provoked no immediate response, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia did not recognize its sovereignty nor did it agree to an international border in place of the internal border (Ackermann 1996: 409-424; Lund 2000: 178). A few cross-border skirmishes was therefore prevented from escalating as the UN presence drew "a line in the sand" and

"created a meaningful political and psychological barrier sufficient to that situation" (Lund 2000: 197).

As with the border threats, the UN mission came to provide deterrence and violence avoidance also for domestic relations. Over time, UNPREDEP became better able to manage the growing internal tensions (S/RES/908). A new mandate elevated the mission's political level as well as gave new impetus to its relations with the host country. Furthermore, as inter-ethnic relations deteriorated in Macedonia, the tasks of the mission transformed and the issue of preventing interethnic violence became increasingly important (Ginifer and Eide 1996: 18; Sokalski 1997: 37-45). The presence of an international military force provided public security and the mission also allayed the insecurities of individuals by providing a neutral police function. Moreover, the international presence and the good office of the appointed Special Representative of the Secretary-General provided the flexibility needed for undertaking additional preventive measures for encouraging dialogue, restraint and compromise between different elements of Macedonian society as well as promoting a cosmopolitan vision to guide the Macedonian state and nation-building efforts (c.f. Sokalski 1997: 37-45; 2003; Björkdahl 2002: 160-165). The UN's long-term efforts in Macedonia were aimed at creating a situation of peaceful co-existence between Macedonia and the rest of Yugoslavia and between the two major ethnic groups within Macedonia. Cosmopolitan ideas were promoted as political alternatives to ethnic identity politics.

Adopting cosmopolitan values

The Balkan wars and the break up of Yugoslavia left the newly independent Macedonia receptive to the normative influence of the international community. After declaring its independence in 1991, Macedonia's ability to survive was depending on its ability to pursue a policy of "active neutrality" and the efforts of the UN preventive peacekeeping mission. The mission successfully prevented the Yugoslav conflict to spill over the borders to Macedonia. The diffusion of the norm pertaining to conflict prevention was to a degree successful, as it could build on the pre-existing normative context and the policy of active neutrality.

Since independence, Macedonian politics has been based on identity politics and few political parties appealed to both ethnic-Macedonians and ethnic-Albanians. The multi-ethnic character of the Macedonian society involves status differences and mutual distrust among communities. Shortly after independence ethnic belonging became salient in day-to day relations, and stereotypes and prejudices flourished. The internal ethnic tensions and identity-based politics remained in spite of UN efforts to establish mechanisms for reaching consensus settlements and promote minority rights as well as other cosmopolitan values pertaining to the equality of individuals. Although the Albanian minority was represented in government, it was in fact excluded from the Macedonian state-building project and was for example not part of constructing the Macedonian constitution (Interview with former Macedonian Minister for Foreign Affairs, November 3, 2004). Despite difficult relations between the majority and the largest minority, Macedonia was regarded as an "oasis of peace" in a turbulent region. The Macedonian government was ambivalent towards the UN's

long-term goal of promoting cosmopolitan values as it challenged the newly estab-lished state's growing nationalism. In Macedonia, ethnic groups were living separated albeit in relative contentment. This type of norm diffusion was perceived as the UN was interfering in the internal affairs of Macedonia (Lund 2000: 198-199, Sokalski 2003: 97). Hence, the Macedonian elite was reluctant to adopt these values.

The EU Operation Concordia in Macedonia – promoting norms through practice

Launched in Macedonia in March 2003, Operation Concordia was the first EU mili-tary operation and signified a deepening in the Union's relations with the Balkans, where the EU currently is the main international organization exerting a strong nor-mative influence and with an ability to promote cosmopolitan visions and values such as the prevention of violent conflict.

The EU in Macedonia

Operation Concordia was undertaken as part of an Europeanization approach to Macedonia, which involved the promotion of a wide spectrum of norms that can be considered as cosmopolitan in character. A number of EU actors such as The Euro-pean Commission, the High Representative for the CFSP, the EU Special Represent-ative (EUSR), the European Agency of Reconstruction (EAR), the EU presidency, as well as the European Union Monitoring Mission (EUMM) supported this process. Through these different representations of the EU, the EU is or has deployed basi-cally all its different approaches – i.e. the CFSP, the ESDP, development cooperation policy and humanitarian aid, but also trade and commercial policies – when attempt-ing to promote a cosmopolitan vision in Macedonia. This article however selects the peace operation conducted by the EU military crisis management mission Concordia succeeded by the EU police mission Proxima to analyze their role in the promotion of the norm pertaining to conflict prevention. This article demonstrates that both the military and the police mission can readily be used to diffuse cosmopolitan values pertaining to conflict prevention.

Promoting cosmopolitan values through practice

In early 2001 inter-ethnic tensions escalated and brought Macedonia to the brink of civil war. As a response to the crisis the Macedonian President Boris Trajkovskij re-quested an international military presence to prevent the escalation of conflict, and to ensure containment of the violent conflict. Once NATO's Amber Fox operation was terminated in March 2003, it was replaced by the EU mission Concordia. As the EU at the time was looking for an opportunity to test its crisis management capacity and the Macedonian conflict provided an "easy" case, one may question whether deploy-ment of Concordia was initiated by the Macedonian request or by EU ambitions to test its new capacity. Furthermore, Concordia was part and parcel of a larger Europe-anization process in the region – a process with certain cosmopolitan visions. Under

the leadership of the EU and NATO, a framework for limiting the conflict and resolving the dispute with peaceful means was negotiated. The Ohrid Framework Agreement, signed in Ohrid on 13 August 2001, contains a cosmopolitan vision including for example numerous provisions on the equal status of both ethnic groups as well as human rights.

The Concordia mission – later replaced by an EU police mission (Proxima) – and the EU Special Representative have played and still play a significant role in the process of implementing the Ohrid Agreement. Interviews with locals as well as internationals in Macedonia indicate that the EU presence on the ground is crucial in promoting a cosmopolitan vision. Proxima staff is for example located within the Ministry of Interior and the HQ in Skopje as well as in regional offices to support, mentor and advice the Ministry of Interior and the Macedonian police force. The actual presence of military and police personnel and EUMM-monitoring personnel does not mean that norms are exported through coercive means. Instead, these individuals can be perceived as carriers of cosmopolitan values and their presence can be regarded as creating possibilities for persuasion. By continued interaction, technical assistance, argumentation and the exchange of views at a very individual level (police officer to police officer), a relationship of trust may be established, which seems to facilitate both norm diffusion and acceptance. This in turn may contribute to change normative convictions. In addition, if the EU representatives such as members of the Concordia and Proxima missions act in accordance with the cosmopolitan vision they promote – i.e. support of and compliance with, for example, human rights, minority rights and the rule of law – they may provide individual examples to be followed. Concordia and Proxima can therefore be viewed as part of the EU's overall process of promoting cosmopolitan values such as peaceful resolution, human rights, minority rights and the rule of law.

Adopting cosmopolitan values

The Macedonian government's aspiration of future EU membership makes this vision even more persuasive (Interview in Skopje with EU official, 4 November 2004). This EU presence on the ground is also an indication of the EU's commitment in assisting the efforts of the government of Macedonia in moving closer towards EU integration by adopting and institutionalizing some of the core norms of the EU. It also represents tangible evidence of how the CFSP and the ESDP may be used in advocating a cosmopolitan vision that in the long run may contribute to stability and security in the EU's near abroad. According to a former Macedonian official, Operation Concordia and Proxima have played an important role in reinforcing the government's and the international community's efforts to consolidate security and ethnic harmony in the country (Interview with former Macedonian official, 3 Nov, 2004). However, it may be possible to detect pockets of resistance against the normative changes promoted by among others the EU. For example, the implementation of the various provisions of the Ohrid Agreement has provoked various resentments among ethnic Macedonians, since it deals with symbolic issues, national identity and minority rights. This became obvious by the call for a referendum in 2004 to repeal

legislative changes introduced by the government to comply with the Ohrid Agreement. The referendum, which took place on 7 November 2004, failed due to a low voter turn-out. This result, which kept the Ohrid Agreement on track, was welcomed by the international community. Externally driven normative transformations as one may interpret the negotiations and implementation of the Ohrid Agreement may create more resistance, particularly if it is perceived as being conducted by overtly or covertly coercive means, than if the adoption was voluntary and the normative change was domestically driven.

Concluding Remarks

To claim that the UN and the EU are important norm entrepreneurs promoting a variety of norms on the global arena and thereby contributing to setting the normative standard of the world may not be very controversial. And, it would not be inconceivable to view these institutions as reflecting certain cosmopolitan values. I suggest that these institutions, in addition, exert a normative influence through their practices, including military peace operations. If these peace operations are guided by a cosmopolitan vision and undertaken for cosmopolitan purposes, they may contribute to advance cosmopolitan norms. It may seem controversial to argue that operations such as UNPROFOR-MC/UNPREDEP, Concordia and the policing mission Proxima can promote cosmopolitanism and contribute to diffusing cosmopolitan values. Clearly one may question the authenticity of norm acceptance under these conditions. However, both the UN and the succeeding EU missions can be regarded to have been deployed in order to achieve among other things certain cosmopolitan objectives such as preventing violent conflict and establishing peaceful co-existence between two ethnic communities within one state. Since all three operations were requested by the Macedonian government and hence deployed with the consent of the host country, they did not clash with the norm of sovereignty and can hardly be perceived as hostile intervention in internal affairs. The UN mission with its explicit preventive mandate and practices demonstrated the usefulness of the idea of conflict prevention through its preventive action both to the local audience as well as to the global. However, despite its effort to promote cosmopolitanism as an alternative to the antagonistic ethnic-based politics, ethnic relations deteriorated in Macedonia.

The Concordia and Proxima operations were part of the Europeanization process and combined with aid, trade arrangements, cooperative arrangements etc and were as such successful in preventing the escalation of antagonism between the two ethnic communities. Another reason behind EU's successful exertion of normative power is the attractiveness of a future EU membership. Both communities are for somewhat different reasons positive to a future membership in the EU and well aware that a precondition for membership is stable and peaceful ethnic relations. Yet, even on their own Concordia and Proxima were useful for promoting cosmopolitan values such as conflict prevention as their main purpose was to prevent the internal tensions from escalating beyond control. Hence, they provided the practice to the norm pertaining to conflict prevention and demonstrated its feasibility. In addition, the presence of military and police personnel on the ground provided opportunities for inter-

action, communication, persuasion and expert advice, which in turn may contribute to change normative convictions. Cosmopolitanism was not adopted as identity is still the foundation for Macedonian politics. However, the Ohrid agreement that ended the 2001 conflict reflected a cosmopolitan vision and cosmopolitan values.

Cosmopolitanism could in the case of Macedonian provide an alternative to the identity-based politics and contribute to bridge the divide between the two main ethnic communities within the Macedonian state. Furthermore, it could as part of the Europeanization process move Macedonia closer to the EU and to a potential future membership in the Union.

Bibliography

Ackermann, Alice, 1996. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia – A Relative Successful Case of Conflict Prevention in Europe, *Security Dialogue* vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 409-424.

Annan, Kofi, 1999. Two Concepts of Sovereignty, *The Economist* 18 September 1999.

Archer, Clive, 1994. Conflict Prevention in Europe: The Case of the Nordic States and Macedonia, *Cooperation and Conflict* vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 367-386.

A/RES/46/1B2.

Archibugi, Daniele and Held, David (eds.) 1995. *Cosmopolitan Democracy.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Archibugi, Daniele, Held, David and Köhler, Martin (eds), 1998. *Re-imagining Political Community. Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy.* Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press.

Barbar, Benjamin, 1996. The Constitutional Faith, pp. xx in Cohen, Joshua (ed.) *For Love of Country.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Beck, Ulrich, 2002. The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the second age of modernity*, pp.61-85 in Vertovec, Steven and Cohen, Robin (eds.) *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context, and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berdal, Mats and Caplan, Richard, 2004. The Politics of International Administration, *Global Governance* vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1-5.

Bienen, Derk, Rittberger, Volker and Wagner, Wolfgang, 1998. Democracy in the United Nations System: Cosmopolitan and Communitarian Principles, pp. 287-308 in Archibugi, Daniele, Held, David and Köhler, Martin (eds) *Re-imagining Political Community. Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy.* Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press.

Björkdahl, Annika, 1999. Conflict Prevention from a Nordic Perspective: Putting Prevention into Practice, *International Peacekeeping* vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 54-72.

Björkdahl, Annika, 2002. *From Idea to Norm, Promoting Conflict Prevention.* Lund University.

Björkdahl, Annika, 2005. Norm-maker and Norm-taker: Exploring the Normative Influence of the EU in Macedonia, *European Foreign Affairs Review* vol. 10, no. 2. pp. 257-278.

Björkdahl, Annika, 2006. Peace keeping missions as a channel of norm diffusion

– UNPREDEP and the promotion of the norm of conflict prevention, forthcoming *International Peacekeeping.*

Brown, Chris, 1992. *International Relations Theory: New Normative Approaches.* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Carlsnaes, Walter, Sjursen, Helene and White, Brian (eds) 2004. *Contemporary European Foreign Policy.* London: Sage Publications.

Cheah, Peng and Robbins, Bruce (eds), 1998. *Cosmopolitics: thinking and feeling beyound the nation.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cohen, Joshua (ed.) 1996. *For Love of Country.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Cooper, Robert, 2002. The Post-modern State, *the Observer* 7, April.

Duchêne, François (1972) Europe's Role in World Peace, in Mayne R. (ed.) *Europe Tomorrow: Sixteen Europeans Look Ahead.* London: Fontana.

Dunne, Tim and Wheeler, Nicholas, 2004. 'We the peoples': Contending Discourses of Security in Human Rights Theory and Practice, *International Relations* vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 9-23.

Eade, John and O'Byrne, Darren (eds.) 2005. *Global Ethics and Civil Society.* Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Elliot, Lorraine and Cheeseman, Graeme, 2002. "Cosmopolitan Theory, militaries and the deployment of force". Working paper 2002/8, Australian National University, Canberra.

Falk, Richard, 1996. The Complexities of Humanitarian Intervention: A New World Challenge, *Michigan Journal of International Law* vol. 17, no. 2, 491-513.

Falk, Richard, 1998. The United Nations and Cosmopolitan Democracy: Bad Dream, Utopian Fantasy, Political Project, pp. 309-311 in Archibugi, Daniel, Held, David and Köhler, Martin (eds.) *Re-imagining Political Community. Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy.* Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press.

Featherstone, Mike (ed.) 1990. *Global Culture.* London: Sage.

Ginifer, Jeremy and Barth Eide, Espen, 1996. "Ethnicity as a Source of Conflict". Paper presented at the International Workshop in Skopje, 16-19 October.

Habermas, Jürgen, 2003. Making Sense of the EU. Toward a Cosmopolitan Europe, *Journal of Democracy* vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 86-100.

Hannerz, Ulf, 1990. Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture, pp. 237-251 in Featherstone, Mike (ed.) Global Culture. London: Sage.

Hannerz, Ulf, 2005a. Cosmopolitanism, pp. 69-85 in Vincent, Joan and Nugent, Daniel (eds.) Companion to the Anthropology of Politics. Oxford: Blackwells.

Hannerz, Ulf, 2005b. Two Faces of Cosmopolitanism: Culture and Politics, *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift* vol. 107 no. 3. pp. xx

Hartland, David, 2004. Legitimacy and Effectiveness in International Administrations, *Global Governance* vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 15-19.

Himmelfarb, Getrude, 1996. The Illusions of Cosmopolitanism, pp. xx in Cohen, Joshua, (ed) *For Love of Country.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Hill, Christopher, 2001. The EU's Capacity for Conflict Prevention, *European Foreign Affairs Review* vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 315-333.

Interview with former Minister of Foreign Affairs Macedonia, Skopje 3 Nov. 2004.

Interview with EU official, Skopje 4 Nov. 2004.

Interview with former Macedonian official, Skopje 3 Nov. 2004.

Jentleson, Bruce (ed.), 1999. Opportunities Missed and Opportunities Seized: Preventive Diplomacy in the Post-Cold War Era. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Kagan, Robert, 2002. Power and Weakness, *Policy Review,* no. 113.

Kaldor, Mary, 1999. *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kaldor, Mary, 2002. Cosmopolitanism and Organized Violence, pp.268-279 in Vertovec, Steven, and Cohen, Robin (eds.) *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context, and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kaldor, Mary, 2003. American power: from 'compellance' to cosmopolitanism?, *International Affairs* vol. 79, no. 1, pp. 1-22.

Kuper, Andrew, 2000. Rawlsian Global Justice: Beyond the Law of Peoples to a Cosmopolitan Law of Persons, *Political Theory* vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 640-674.

Linklater, Andrew, 2001. Citizenship, Humanity and Cosmopolitan Harm Conventions, *International Political Science Review* vol. 22, no. 3, pp.261-277.

Linklater, Andrew, 2002. Cosmopolitan Political Communities in International Relations, *International Relations* vol. 16, no. 1, 13-150.

Lund, Michael, 1996. *Preventing Violent Conflict.* Washington DC.: United States Institute for Peace Press.

Lund, Michael, 2000. Preventive Diplomacy for Macedonia, 1992-1999: From Containment to Nation Building, pp. 173-211 in Jentleson, Bruce (ed.) *Opportunities Missed and Opportunities Seized: Preventive Diplomacy in the Post-Cold War era.* New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Manners, Ian (2002) The Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms, *Journal of Common Market Studies* vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 235-58.

Nicolaïdis, Kalypso and Howse, Robert, 2002. 'This is my Eutopia…': Narrative as Power, *Journal of Common Market Studies* vol. 40, no. 4 pp.767-792.

Nussbaum, Martha, 1996. Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism, pp. xx in Cohen, Joshua (ed.) *For Love of Country.* Boston: Beacon Press.

O'Byrne, Darren, 2005.Globalization, Cosmopolitanism and the Problem of Civil Society: Some Introductory Remarks, pp. 1-15 in Eade, John and O'Byrne, Darren (eds.) *Global Ethics and Civil Society.* Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Paris, Roland, 2002. International Peacebuilding and the Mission Civilisatrice, *Review of International Studies* vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 637-656.

Pogge, Thomas, 1992. Cosmopolitanism and Sovereignty, *Ethics* vol. 103, no. 1, pp. 48-75.

Pugh, Michael, 2001. The Challenge of Civil-military Relations in International Peace Operations, *Disasters* vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 345-357.

Rosecrance, Richard, 1998. The European Union: A New Type of International Actor, pp. xx in Zielonka, Jan (ed.) *Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy.* The Hague, London, Boston: Kluwer Law International.

2000. *The Responsibility to Protect.* Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty.

S/RES/908United Nations Security Council Resolution 908 of 31 March 1994.

S/RES/983United Nations Security Council Resolution 983 of 31 March 1995.

S/RES/1027 United Nations Security Council Resolution 1027 of 30 November 1995.

S/RES/1058 United Nations Security Council Resolution 1058 of 30 May1996.

S/RES/1082 United Nations Security Council Resolution 1082 of 27 November 1996.

S/RES/1110 United Nations Security Council Resolution 1110 28 May 1997.

S/RES/1140 United Nations Security Council Resolution 1140 of 28 November 1997.

S/RES/1142 United Nations Security Council Resolution 1142 of 4 December 1997.

S/RES/1186 United Nations Security Council Resolution 1186 of 21 July 1998.

Sjursen, Helene, 2004. Security and Defence, pp. 59-74 in Carlsnaes, Walter, Sjursen, Helene and White, Brian (eds.) Contemporary European Foreign Policy. London: Sage Publications.

Sokalski, Henryk, J. 1997. Preventive Diplomacy: The need for a comprehensive Approach, *Balkan Forum* vol. 5, no. 1(18). pp. 33-53.

Sokalski, Henryk, J. 2003. *An Ounce of Prevention. Macedonia and the UN Experience in Preventive Diplomacy.* Washington DC.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Taylor, Paul, 1999. The United Nations in the 1990s: Proactive Cosmopolitanism and the Issue of Sovereignty, *Political Studies* vol. XLVII, 538-565.

Van den Anker, Christien, 2000. Introduction: The need for an integrated Cosmopolitan Agenda, *Global Society* vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 479-485.

Vertovec, Steven, and Cohen, Robin (eds.) 2002.*Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context, and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vincent, Joan and Nugent, Daniel (eds.) 2005. *Companion to the Anthropology of Politics.* Oxford: Blackwells

Zielonka, Jan (ed.) 1998. *Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy.* The Hague, London, Boston: Kluwer Law International.

Zolo, Danilo, 1997. *Cosmopolis: prospects for world government.* Oxford : Polity