Dueling labels in International Relations: The two faces of "Coalitions of the Willing"

Andrew F. Cooper

University of Waterloo/CIGI

You don't have to be a student of the "linguistic turn" or discourse analysis to appreciate the importance of labels. This theme is as relevant in the study – and practice – of international relations as it is in other spheres of activity.[1] Words or phrases that have taken on different meanings among both academic specialists and practitioners become the reference point for controversy and contestation. A case in point is the use of the expression "coalitions of the willing." For many casual observers the meaning of coalitions of the willing is linked indelibly with the United States' led and dominated war against terror, animated by the trauma of September 11th and culminating in the war against Saddam Hussein's Iraq in 2003. Indeed a good deal of this initiative was constructed and justified through the use of this slogan, which burst onto the scene in the context of mobilized pressures to disarm Saddam whereby a marker was set between those ready to join in this campaign and those unwilling to do so. As evoked by President George W. Bush, when he spoke at a news conference just prior to the November 2002

NATO summit in Prague, choices had to be made between all nations "whether or not they want to participate" in this coalition.[2]

Notwithstanding the power of this close association, however, a closer reading of how, when, where and why the phrase has entered the lexicon of international relations tears away the simplicity of this perception. What appears to be a relatively new and targeted tool is found to have a far more complex life and trajectory. The move to locate coalitions of the willing at the core of the U.S. strategic doctrine – far from being a sudden and novel response to the exigencies of the moment – may be viewed in itself as being part of a far more incremental process of adaptation. Even more dramatically, however, the sense of exclusivity in terms of ownership for this phrase can be disputed from other quite divergent sources. At odds with its branding as a tool of a coercive process, coalitions of the willing have a longer identification as well with a very different project, one based on extending a rules-based system via governance practices. From this perspective, the authentic and influential coalitions of the willing are not related to the initiative on Iraq but those generated on diffuse issues such as the prohibition of land mines and the International Criminal Court.[3]

At one level the purpose of this paper is to simply trace the dual – and dueling – dynamic between the divergent meanings accorded "coalitions of the willing." If utilizing the same phrase or expression this label may be interpreted in highly variant ways – with juxtaposed connotations for the practice of world politics – depending on which lens it is presented through. At another level, nonetheless, the argument is made that despite the distinctions and tensions both in terms of conceptualization and narrative lines between them, this debate about labeling should not be treated as if the two meanings or faces of

coalitions of the willing as if they existed in two solitudes with little or no interaction between them. Paradoxically the gap between these faces can be considered to be both less and more salient than allowed through this dualistic – and rigid – framework. Less because there is a surprising amount of blurring between the faces with respect to timing, styling and even some elements of substance. More because far from being an argument merely about words the debate about meaning towards coalitions of the willing offers enormous insights about how core practices in international relations are and continue to be played out.

Juxtaposing Coalitions of the Willing on the basis of How, Why, With Whom, and Under What Conditions

Before delving more deeply into these added complexities of the intersection between the different faces of coalitions of the wiling, a platform must be established to demonstrate that this duality is based on different interpretations on how, why, with whom and under what conditions they have performed in practice. This starting point allows for a series of snapshots about the nature and extent of the juxtaposition between them. In providing a stylized mode of depiction into the two faces of coalition of the willing this means of depiction allows a quick entry into the operational realities.

The first and perhaps the most distinctive difference between the two faces of the coalitions of the willing relates to the contrasting manners by which they were organized. Consistent with the overall tenor of the campaign on "the war against terror" the overarching feature of the U.S.-led model is its top-down, hierarchical and asymmetrical framework. Several of the most prominent states mobilized through this form of

coalitions of the willing are considered – either objectively or subjectively – to possess special relations with the U.S. On a temporal scale some of the states in this category had the status of being longstanding partners in times of crisis, most notably the United Kingdom[4] but arguably Australia or even Japan and South Korea as well. Others were newcomers to this role, such as representatives of so-called new Europe (Poland/Ukraine/The Czech Republic/Bulgaria) guided by what at least one commentator has termed basic survival instincts.[5] On a like-minded continuum there existed an even greater leap between the traditional "Anglo-sphere" component of the coalition and the variety of other states that joined the coalition, stretching over to Russia, China, Pakistan and a number of the "stans" in Central Asia.

Amidst this uneven mix one dominant trait stood out: the primacy of the U.S. To borrow John Ruggie' s view of the post-1945 order, what was crucial about this coalition of the willing was not the coalitional aspect but that it was a U.S.-led constellation.[6] Although the ownership of the label "coalitions of the willing" could be contested conceptually what was not in dispute was the degree to which U.S. leadership mattered in this expression of coalitional activity. If supported by others the U.S. made and shaped the project with absolute authority. Through one lens this behaviour meshed squarely with the image of the U.S. as a sheriff – round up a posse of deputy-sheriffs.[7] Through another lens this model could be said to fit the image of a hub and spoke design.

Still, along side with this increasingly familiar stereotype of what a coalition of the willing is, exists the quite distinctive face emerging not from the apex of the international order but in its middle (or even lower) ranks as exhibited on initiatives such as land mines and the ICC. The most common – albeit incomplete and sometimes

misleading – image of this formulation of coalitions of the willing is that of this cluster of minor states attempting to hold down the U.S. as Gulliver. Another less appraised, but privileged in this study, is that of a grouping of secondary but still autonomous and selectively influential states which band together in a loose fashion to work on an issue-specific basis. Although lacking the power (and coercive) ability of the U.S. and other dominant states these actors possess some balancing skills and resources. For one thing, they sometimes act as energetic entrepreneurs of ideas. For another, they commonly have at this disposal well trained and reliable bureaucratic cohorts.

Leaving aside the details of the appearance of these two models for a moment, this sketch highlights how the unit of analysis will differ in analyzing coalitions of the willing. In the top-down model the focus is a highly restricted one examining the core concerns and modes of operation of U.S. foreign/strategic policy and how this agenda translates into coalitions of the willing. One fundamental issue here relates to the way this approach differs and/or complements U.S. unilateralism. Does a move towards a top down "coalition of the willing" signify anxiety on the part of the U.S. with over-stretch, with a move to shift some of the burdens to others? Or, alternatively, does this approach reflect a concern not with instrumental delivery but rather with symbolism. That is to say a concern with deflecting criticism from the wider international community about what has widely considered in the Iraqi war an illegitimate action. Or, as the occupation of Iraq has been extended and other possible interventions onto the horizon, is it as one conservative observer suggests a combination of both rationales: ''Other states then share the financial and other burdens of occupation; they provide a patina of multilateral respectability to the enterprise (don't laugh – it shuts up France and the UN General

Assembly); the native population has little or no pretext to become anti-American; and the U.S. is able to call the shots on most things."[8]

Another key issue arising from this analysis concerns the putative outcome of this model. Is this U.S- led top-down face of coalitions of the willing intended to be an improvised short term solution to a particularly difficult problem as showcased by the cases first of Afghanistan and then of Iraq? Or, moving from an ad hoc technique to one that is more strategic in connotation, does this model of coalitions of the willing become an integral component of empire building,[9] if not formally at least informally, directed at dangerous or failed states. Richard Haass, in one interview he gave about the case of Afghanistan suggests that the ad hoc model was predominant: "This was not something for which we had a detailed game plan.[10] In another address, though, he put this response into a strategic framework: "The attacks of September 11th, 2001, reminded us that weak states can threaten our security as much as strong ones, by providing breeding grounds for extremism and havens for criminals, drug traffickers, and terrorists. Such lawlessness abroad can bring devastation here at home. One of the most pressing tasks is to prevent today's troubled countries from becoming tomorrow's failed states."[11]

What is clear throughout is that the asymmetry associated with membership of this model of coalitions is extended to the intensity of analysis. In contrast to the concentration of attention on the U.S. the foreign policy of other states (with the exception notably of other great powers, whether the UK or Russia and China) is left under-examined even amidst efforts (as we will see) to explain why states were or not motivated to join in the coalition. The dominant manner by which the coalition was scrutinized was in terms of a list of which countries had joined in.

6

In looking at what can be termed the bottom up forms of coalitions of the willing the method is far more expansive. As in the case of the U.S.-led coalitions considerable attention is placed on scrutinizing the means deployed by the secondary powers as part of this approach. A parallel onus is placed on teasing out the operational dimensions of selective (or self-selective) "middle power" actors. For example, the catalytic effect of key foreign ministers such as Lloyd Axworthy of Canada or even prominent bureaucrats is given considerable consideration.

The major difference in treatment is the manner by which the bottom up model is examined as a collective entity not just as an extension of the foreign policy of its dominant player. The collective dynamics found in initiatives such as the land mines and the ICC has elicited some detailed review with a mind to teasing out a variety of questions relating to the nature of leadership, task distribution, and the ability (or inability) to rotate responsibility located within this model. As will be elaborated upon below constant tensions are found in even this loose form of collective behaviour even amidst a strong commitment to issue-specific or niche delivery.

A second axis along which the two models are divided relates to the issue of motivation. On the question of why states join the coalition the top-down U.S. led model assumes the essentialism of power whether soft or hard. Through the first prism weight is accorded the influence of like-mindedness. The emphasis here is on the benign influence of the forces of globalization/universalism through a potent process of socialization. As Richard Haass, arguably the central architect of the coalitions of the willing approach, attests: "The best way to describe our approach in this new, cooperative environment is as a process of integration…a world consistent with the interests and values we share

with our partners – values such as rule of law, limits on the power of the state, respect for women, private property rights, equal justice, religious tolerance."[12]

Through a second prism the focus transfers towards a heavier hand. States join in not only because they want to but because they feel that they need to because of either disciplinary pressure and/or the prospect of material benefits. In the first manifestation coalitions of the willing become in essence coalitions of the coerced with behaviour dictated by a sense of obligation cum compulsion. In the second expression they become coalitions of the bribed. Without much if any analysis of how this process played out in foreign policy decision-making, individual coalition partners received some extensive examination in the context about how they expected and received tangible rewards from joining in. Poland, for example, was said to have asked for tangible benefits for their support – rewards they were duly provided with in terms of loans guarantees, participation in the Iraqi reconstruction process and the promise of direct access to oil.[13]

The bottom-up secondary power-oriented model shifts the bias from a concern with structural power to the potential of agency. Rather than constraints, the voluntary attributes of the coalitions of the willing is stressed. To be sure, the motivations of these coalitional partners may be mixed blending elements of status seeking with a custodianship of good international citizenship. Yet, if a mélange, it is one of their own making with pushes and pulls from both their domestic as well as international environments.

The third axis along which the faces of coalitions of the willing split relates to the question of actorness. The top-down U.S.-led model remains resolutely state centric. When domestic political characteristics are touched it is the traits of political leadership

and the machinery of government that are highlighted. One of the key clues to the quality of membership – if not the decision to join itself – relates to the relationship at the leadership level. By way of contrast the impact of societal actors are downplayed. The exception of course is the notice given to the role of business interests in the mobilization process on Iraq. Yet even in this context the main theme that was scrutinized related to the inter-connection between the economic and political elites not the autonomous activities of firms themselves.

The actorness brought out through the bottom up model of coalitions of the willing severely stretched these boundaries. At the state level, one of the features that stands out is the sheer scale of participation. On the land mines campaign the work of a group of like-minded countries, led by Canada, Australia, Norway and a host of other secondary states, received much kudos. In similar fashion a loose coalition of the willing comprising a group of approximately countries 63 countries pushed for progress on the ICC agenda. A smaller group of states supplemented this mass declaratory support by skilful legal work in developing a draft treaty. At the heart of this core group remained the self-identified cohort of traditional middle powers such as the Nordics, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. Nonetheless, here was an additional group of non-traditional states within the leadership group. Of these states South Africa stands out. South Africa played a key role in the so-called group of "Lifeline Nations" advocating an independent court and independent prosecutor as opposed to an ICC under the control by the Security Council.

If this type of like-minded states were necessary it was not sufficient in setting the profile of this second model of coalitions of the willing. What provides the strong and

unique accent to this model is the additional element of partnership between states and NGOs. Unlike the closed quality of the top down face the ingredient of bringing society actors in imparted a more inclusive component akin to open forms of networking. It also provided a distinctive normative element. In Axworthy's words, this model provided "a new approach to international diplomacy…a coalition of the willing, including governments and civil society as equal partners, united around…core principles."[14]

Operationally, both the campaigns against land mines and for the ICC showcase the activities of a crosscutting state/societal coalition. In the land mines case the like-minded states were joined by a wide variety of NGOs. Going beyond the organization's traditional low-key/technical mode of operation, the International Committee of the Red Cross took the lead in gathering a broad-based NGO coalition calling for a "total ban on the production, export and use of anti-personnel mines."[15] Eventually united under the auspices of the International Campaign To Ban Landmines, this NGO coalition included the Vietnam Veterans of America, the German group Medico International, and the French group of Handicap International, together with Human Rights Watch and Physicians for Human Rights. In the case of the ICC the like-minded states were supported by a similar group of NGOs, ranging from the World Federalists, to Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, to the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights.

Among the many interesting features about this state/societal coalition is the fact that – amidst its transnational qualities – the U.S. provided such an abundant source of resources and commitment. The role of Jody Williams serves as just the most publicized component of this ingredient. Counterpoised to the U.S.-state leadership of the top-down model was the very different sense of American like-mindedness found in the bottom up

approach – a counter-consensus form of mobilization that drew it must be mentioned as well from a number of prominent U.S. politicians and ex-military commanders.

The fourth and final axis along which the two models ran different courses hinged on the question of what conditions triggered them into motion. What distinguishes the top down-face of coalitions of the willing is its connection with a hard security agenda driven by war preparation and management. This sense of crisis contained in it the logic of "with us" or "against us" in that there was little middle ground for equivocation.[16] In the phrase popularized by Colin Powell the world was perceived as having moved into the post-post Cold War era dominated by the specter of terrorism and the rogue use of weapons of mass destruction.

By way of contrast the bottom-up model retained its grounding in the post-Cold War long moment. Instead of fearing the shock of the new, a certain faith was retained by these secondary states that the end of bipolarity and competing superpowers had brought with it reduced disciplines. While accentuated interdependence threw up a formidable array of challenges and exposed them to different vulnerabilities, especially in terms of economic competitiveness in the context of globalization, this mental map pointed to a greater freedom of action at least in some functional spaces. This was true in areas of the so-called post-material agenda such as the environment and the human rights. But it was also witnessed in the inter-connected domain of non-traditional security, above all the push towards the human security agenda.

Although most of this coalitional activity was produced on a selective issue focused basis it is worth mentioning that a concerted attempt was made to establish a coalition of the willing directed towards this agenda on a more permanent foundation.

The most obvious sign of an operational advance in this direction was the creation of a

Human Security Network initiated by Canada and Norway. Broader in scope than an

earlier Canada-Norway bilateral (Lysoen) Declaration, this initiative included eleven

countries and nine NGOs at its first meeting in May 1999 at Bergen.

Some Blurring of the Faces of Coalitions of the Willing

Providing a template juxtaposing the faces or models of coalitions of the willing on the

basis of these extended snapshots is to a large degree both a valuable and accurate

exercise. However, because of both the stylized and parsimonious nature of its

application it still leaves an incomplete picture. Above all it over-blows the extent to

which the two models of coalitions of the willing live and operate in two separate worlds

with little or not contact or interaction between them.

First of all, the impression coalitions of the willing have come in two very

temporally segmented waves needs to be tempered. Although the label of coalitions of

the willing captured the most public attention during the lead-up to the 2003 Iraq war, the

top-down model of coalitions of the willing has had a much longer existence. One line of

argument suggests that this approach was born with the U.S.'s mobilization of support for

the 1990/91 Gulf War. Certainly from the standpoint of burden shifting and legitimacy

there is much to support this premise of continuity. Where the application falls down is

both in terms of the size of the coalition (with the coalition stretching the limits of "club"

membership) and with respect to control (with states such as France acting as mavericks

within the coalition). The added component that pointed to change was that of the

speeding up of events. As Haass contrasts the two situations: "Last time around in 1990

and '91…we did work with the United Nations. We did have a powerful response but we also had time. The nature of our military build-up, the so-called Desert Shield period before Desert Storm, gave us roughly six months."[17]

Another even stronger contention is that this face of the coalition of the willing owes its creation to the Kosovo crisis where the constraints of the traditional alliance structure rose to the surface. Donald Rumsfeld is often seen as the engineer – if not the architect – of U.S.-led coalitions of the willing. However, the main thrust of this strategic transformation – that the U.S. should avoid "talking shops" at times of crisis was an echo of what Gen. Wesley Clark had laid out a few years earlier. The messages – although not the messengers – were quite compatible. In Rumsfeld's words: "Wars are best fought by coalitions of the willing – but they should not be fought by committee. The mission must determine the coalition. The coalition must not determine the mission. If it does, the mission will be dumbed down to the lowest common denominator, and we can't afford that."[18]

If top-down coalitions of the willing have a longer trajectory the bottom-up face may be expected to have a longer span of existence than commonly suggested. There is no question that many of the best known initiatives of this model were pushed from the margins of public mindfulness (if not specialized attention) by the sheer force of the Iraq crisis. Nonetheless, scenarios for a rebound in these activities have shown some hints of regaining momentum. This rebound is in part due to the resurgence of thinking and activity about "coalitions of the willing" in the NGO communities.[19] It is also a function though of the persistence – if not the ascendancy – of the view that even post-September 11th and Iraq – that there is room available for secondary states to run with issues on a

collective and constructive basis. True, some of this running is coalition building grounded on country-specific solidarity not on a wider cross cutting state/societal design (for example, the triple alliance between Brazil, India and South Africa in the WTO context).[20] In other areas (most notably, on health areas generally and HIV/AIDS generally) new initiatives featuring prominent individuals (Bono), NGOs (Doctors Without Borders, Oxfam), and selective secondary states indicate a robustness of enterprise that augers well for this model.

Secondly, the image that the modes of operation driving the two models are completely removed from each other requires some nuance. What stands out about the brief overview on the origins of the top down model is how it has been shaped to a large extent by frustration. For all the talk about primacy and "hyper-powerism" the lessons learnt by the ascendant current of U.S. decision-makers was that the U.S. risked being trapped by its alliance entanglements. Just as the American military needed to concentrate on agility and rapid movement so U.S. strategic power needed to be freed from its slow and cumbersome moorings. Established clubs – even one so vital as NATO never mind the UN – had to be circumvented when they risked slowing down or immobilizing in high stakes situations.

The bottom up model shared this sense of impatience with established institutional structures. On the land mines campaign this type of architecture was epitomized by the traditional arms control fora which had long been stalled on this issue. On the ICC one of the priorities of the campaign was to allow the new structure to be autonomous from the UN Security Council. In both cases considerable onus was placed

on hurdling or circumventing these obstacles as quickly as possible by working through alternative channels.

Thirdly, there are some cases where the top-down and bottom-up faces coincide in their activities, with a combination of features taken from both models. A number of operations in the Balkans (such as Albania) fit into this typology. So do some elements of the operations in Afghanistan. In both cases there is some form of distribution of activities, where different actors take on selective responsibilities. While there remains a heavy dose of U.S.-led initiatives there are also substantive touches where members of the coalition of the willing (or the ambivalent) have taken the lead in selective domains including Germany and Canada.[21]

The dominant feature of commonality remains, however, not substance but style. If most often working in parallel rather than in tandem both faces of coalitions of the willing share not only an intensity of design but a bottom line results-oriented mentality. In both cases traditional diplomacy (as Rumsfeld put it, "I don't do diplomacy")[22] is subordinated to mobilization campaigns conducted via modified forms of public diplomacy. Instead of the formality of by the book statecraft these campaigns are directed towards informal mechanisms. In the case of the top-down coalitions of the willing this approach emerges most vividly in the use by both the architect (Haasss) of techniques such as one to one interviews and the engineer (Rumsfeld) of mass scrums and informal press conferences. In the case of the bottom up face appeals are made directly over the heads of other governments/negotiators to opinion leaders and the mass public often through the use of forms of cyber-diplomacy. In both cases, they represent variants of

"mission-oriented" initiatives displayed and sold on an ad hoc basis as Gil Winham has suggested conceptually "when and where you needed it."[23]

Much of the strength of both faces of the coalitions of the willing stem from an ability to ramp up "just in time" initiatives. While many of the coalitions on the list of the "willing" in the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq remained paper or shadow partners, up to three dozen countries have made contributions to the effort (including some 26, 500 troops). As in other operations of a more hybrid nature most of the work has concentrated on specific areas of reconstruction. In the bottom-up model, a sense of mutual encouragement stands out in both the land mines and ICC initiative. Jody Williams, for example, lauded the actions of Canada and other like-minded countries for challenging the status quo. Axworthy for his part suggested that this model for co-operation between governments and NGOs might serve as a model for other endeavours. As he stated: "I'm not advocating such partnerships as some sort of feel-good diplomacy. I'm advocating them because they work."[24]

However, there remains a huge downside to this type of intense approach. Both models took on characteristics more akin to social movements than standard institutional or corporate structure. In the mode of boundary spanners both models remain constantly in flux. Their highly-charged mode and status lends an unpredictable quality to both enterprises. In the case of the top-down model the power of muscle and quid pro quos was never as successful as its designers expected. Many countries (even those high on the list of expected partners such as Turkey) were not cajoled to join in on this basis. Others (such as Canada, Mexico, and Chile) remained highly ambivalent to the cause even in the face of possible economic repercussions.

On top of these problems in building an inclusive club (along the same lines as on the Gulf War), there is also the dilemma of keeping the coalition in tact as the risks of participation loom larger. It is difficult enough to keep members of an established alliance on side. With voluntary members of a top-down coalition the task is accentuated. At the technical level there is the issue of inter-operability. At the political level there is the need to stymie defections when the situation goes bad as it done so in March/April 2003. Spain, until the recent election a steadfast deputy to the U.S. (with about 1300 troops in Iraq) has reversed it course and is sidling up to Germany and France, two of the leading "unwilling" states. Poland at least in declaratory language is opening the door to an exit. Leszek Miller, the Polish prime minister, has stated: "When people see dramatic scenes in which soldiers are killed, there will be more pressure for a pullout."[25]

Nor is the bottom-up model immune from similar problems. All of the positive virtues of adaptation towards a more inclusive coalitional membership are obvious. But there are also downsides paralleling the built in flaws of the top down approach. This criticism is especially evident in regard to charges that these initiatives harm or subvert the international architecture not just help or improve it. As two academics have put it: "It can perhaps be described as an end-run around the practical and political roadblocks that are a frequent feature of international discourse."[26]

Difficulties of keeping the coalition assembled rear up as well. Rivalries and status seeking competition at the state level persisted through the span of the land mines and ICC initiatives. Suspicions remained on both sides of the state-societal continuum about whether governments were taking civil society "hostage" or if states were co-opting NGOs.[27] And no less than the US-led top-down coalitions, bottom-up coalitions

17

suffered defections – a development exacerbated when at least two partners in these

endeavours (Australia and Denmark) embraced the U.S.-led campaign against Iraq.[28]

Future Directions of Coalitions of the Willing

The attempt to tease out various – and often paradoxical – lines of intersection between

top-down and bottom-up coalitions of the willing should not detract from the major thrust

of this paper: that at the core these two faces show off very different faces of construction

and value representation. The degree of differences between them may be tempered by

normative appeals to democratization and human rights by the top-down face; or for that

matter by the penetration of the bottom-up face to embrace "like-minded" segments of

U.S. society. Abetted by the embrace of neo-conservatives on one side and hyper-activist

secondary powers (and foreign ministers) on the other side, an image remains, however,

of polarization. Indeed, it does not seem too far-fetched to see, the two faces of coalition

of the willing as microcosms of one the great – if not the most fundamental – chasms in

international relations today; i.e. the schism between those actors that operate (and wish

to continue to do so) on the basis of Hobbesian principles and those that favour an

expansion of a Kantian more co-operative universe.[29] "Mars versus Venus", as some

observers would have it; or, in an even stronger escalation of populist language,

coalitions of the warriors versus that of the wimps. In more sophisticated language   the

Secretary General of the UN, Kofi Annan, has talked of the contrast between those in the

international system that concentrate on "hard" threats and those that see the solution to

"soft" threats as the key to stability and security around the world.[30]

The big question that needs to be addressed is not just what is meant by coalitions of the willing as currently understood. Although that question must continue to be teased out by more systematic research, a complementary line of investigation must be what the phrase – or phrases – coalitions of the willing will mean in the future. As rehearsed throughout this paper it is wrong to think about coalitions of the willing as if there was is only one right model to adopt. Not only is there a duality of meanings but what is considered the dominant face now (the top-down model) has had an ongoing serious challenger in the form of the bottom-up model. The manner by which the interplay and struggle between them morph over time, therefore, has huge implications for the future of international relations.

One scenario that may lie ahead is a move to reinforce the split between the two models, confirming the "different worlds" view consistent with the dualistic typology developed at the outset of this paper. According to this scenario these significant differences in mindset and operational practices will – far from being muted – be encouraged and become more pronounced. The duel between them will become even more adversarial, fuelled generally by different worldviews but also by specific frustrations with how the current U.S.-led coalition in Iraq is working and by animosity between the willing and unwilling. An attendant feature of this scenario is a spillover of this division from the security domain to other spheres of activity. Jagdish Bhagwati, for instance, has expressed apprehension that the U.S. will tilt its focus away from institutionalized multilateralism towards trade coalitions of the willing in the post-Cancun atmosphere – with favoritism towards "bilateral agreements with 'will-do' nations."[31]

Another scenario might play out in the completely opposite direction, pointing some forms of a functional rapprochement between the two faces. Given the relationship between them it is likely that this shift would remain fuzzy, fragmentary and awkward. But – given the compelling claims of the non-security agenda – it could still be a vital and telling development. Richard Haasss, for one, has not ruled the possibility of a meshing of the models. Speaking about the build-up of the coalition of the willing on Afghanistan immediately after September 11th, the current President of the Council of Foreign Relations denotes that this model of collective response could have been directed towards "HIV/Aids or proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or the environment."[32]

One thing is clear: coalitions of the willing will not be composed and conducted according to one set script, even (perhaps especially) one established by such a powerful actor as the U.S. Coalitions of the willing have never had one owner. Coalitions on both sets of models have long been worked on an improvised manner with a premium on flexibility and results. The question of whether and how the two dividing faces exist in place – too far apart to be nudged along a new trajectory – or still open to normative and instrumental re-tooling needs to be considered and analyzed. Are they locked in place in mutual hostility or is there still some room to pry this relationship for improvisation in common pursuits?

---

[1] Iver B. Neumann, "Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy," *Millennium; Journal of International Studies*, 31, 3 (2002), 627-651.
[2] Bush: Join 'coalition of the willing,' CNN.com./world 20 November 2002.
[3] See for example, Andrew F. Cooper, John English and Ramesh Thakur, eds., *Enhancing Global Governance: Towards a New Diplomacy?*, Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2002; Andrew F. Cooper, "Coalitions of the Willing: The Search for Like-Minded Partners in Canadian Diplomacy," in Leslie A. Pal, eds., *How Ottawa Spends 1999 –*

2000 Shape Shifting: Canadian Governance Toward the 21st Century, Don Mills, Ont: Oxford University Press, 1999, 221-50.

[4] On the UK's explicit move towards support for such coalitions see "Maximizing the UK's Influence in the Formation and Conduct of Future Coalition Operations," <http://www.icsa.ac.uk/Projects/co-findings.html> 1999.

[5] Jonathan Steele, "The new vassals," *The Guardian*, 7 February 2003.

[6] John Gerard Ruggie, "International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order," in Stephen D. Krasner, eds., *International Regimes*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983, 195-231.

[7] Richard N. Hass, *The Reluctant Sheriff: The United States After the Cold War*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1997.

[8] John O'Sullivan, "The End of unilateralism," *National Review*, 22 March 2004, 18. Even American neo-conservatives at their most triumphalist support for "coalitions of the willing" allowed that the U.S. could not do everything. Guy Dinmore, "Ideologues reshape world over breakfast," *Financial Times*, 22 March 2003. For a robust call for top-down coalitions of the willing to defend international order see Richard Perle, "Coalitions of the willing are our best hopes," *National Post* [Toronto] 21 March 2003.

[9] For some of this extensive commentary see Max Boot, "The Case for American Empire," *The Weekly Standard* 7 (15 October 2001); Robert Cooper, "Why We Still Need Empires," *The Observer*, 7 April 2002; Sebastian Mallaby, "The Reluctant Imperialist," *Foreign Affairs* (Mar/April 2002), 2-7; G. John Ikenberry, "America's Imperial Ambition," *Foreign Affairs*, 81.5, September/October, 2002; Niall Ferguson, "The Empire Slinks Back," *New York Times Magazine*, 27 April 2003; Joseph Nye, "Lessons in Imperialism," *Financial Times*, 16 June 2002); Michael Ignatieff, "The American Empire; The Burden," *New York Times*, 5 January 2003; Stanley Hoffman, "The High and the Mighty: Bush's National Security Strategy and the New American Hubris," *The American Prospect*, 13.24, 2003.

[10] Interview with Richard Haass, U.S. Director of Policy Planning "With Us or Without US," BBC Radio 4, 12 April 2002.

[11] "Existing Rights, Evolving Responsibilities," remarks by Ambassador Richard Haass, director of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, to the School of Foreign Service and the Mortara Centre for International Studies at Georgetown University, Washington DC, 14 January 2003.

[12] Ambassador Richard N Haass, Director, Policy Planning Staff Remarks to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago June 26 2002.

[13] William D. Hartung and Michelle Ciarrocca, "Buying a coalition," *The Nation*, 17 March 2003; Jim Krane, "Coalition partners seek payback for their support,"*AP*, 27 September 2003.

[14] Notes for an address by the Hon. Lloyd Axworthy, Minister of Foreign Affairs [Canada], to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, Geneva, Switzerland, 30 March 1998, 98/24.

[15] Quoted in John R. English, 'The Landmine Initiative: A Canadian Initiative?', in Andrew F. Cooper and Geoffrey Hayes, eds., *Worthwhile Initiatives? Canadian Mission-Oriented Diplomacy*, Toronto: Irwin Publishing, forthcoming 1999. See also ICRC, *Landmines must be stopped*, Geneva, 1995.

[16] See for example, the extended interview with Haass, "With Us or Without US," BBC Radio 4, 12 April 2002.

[17] *Ibid*.

[18] Annual report to the President and Congress, 15 August 2002. On Clark's own critical views about the problems of waging "war by committee' in which other NATO members could raise objections to the choice of target during the campaign against Serbia see *Waging Modern War*, New York; Public Affairs, 2001.

[19] See for example, Ramesh Thakur, "Rectifying NGO practice: New coalitions of the willing seek change," *Japan Times*, Sunday, 21 March 2004.

[20] "Like-mindedness" has also been evoked by states such as China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and Vietnam that are fearful of country-specific resolutions on human rights in the UN system.

[21] In some non-strategic areas the label "coalitions of the willing" have been attached – somewhat indiscriminately – to any initiative involving the U.S. and other countries. One illustration of this phenomenon is the push by the U.S. with Argentina, Canada and Egypt against the European Union on the issue of the sale of genetically modified crops. See Council for Responsible Genetics, "'Coalitions of the Willing' files complaint against EU GM food restrictions," 14 May 2003.

[22] 22 Department of Defense, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, Town Hall Meeting in Baghdad, April 30, 2003 < www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/ 2003/tr20030430-secdef0139.html>

[23] Gilbert R. Winham, "The Impact of Social Change on International Diplomacy," paper delivered to the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Ottawa, June 1993, 1-40.

[24] Quoted in Murray Campbell, "Axworthy praises new world teamwork," *Globe and Mail*, 3 December 1997.

[25] 25 Quoted in Robert H. Reid, "'Coalition of the Willing' stands firm despite domestic pressure," *Reuters*, 8 April 2004.

[26] Fen Osler Hampson and Dean F. Oliver, "Pulpit diplomacy; A critical assessment of the Axworthy doctrine," *International Journal,* LIII, 3 (Summer 1998).

[27] For a good analysis of these debates see Maxwell A. Cameron, "Democratization of Foreign Policy: The Ottawa Process as a Model," *Canadian Foreign Policy*, 5, 3 (Spring 1998), 147-165.

[28] On the traditional Danish support for bottom up coalitions see "Plan-Cooperation with like-minded member countries,"
www.um.dk/publikationer/fremmedsprog/English/Plan/Active Multilateralism/plan.3
2/11/2003. Australia – and Prime Minister John Howard – was caught between avid followership to the U.S. with sensitivity to how its own role was defined, i.e., as a deputy sheriff or even a sheriff in the Asia-Pacific region. See for example, "Australia plays sown U.S. president's 'sheriff' remarks," ABC Radio A, 17 October 2003.

[29] Robert Kagan, "Power and Weakness: Why the United States and Europe see the World differently," *Policy Review*, June-July 2002.

[30] Quoted in Stephen Edwards, "War on terrorism may find few supporters, Annan says," *National Post* [Toronto], September 9, 2003.

[31] Jagdish N. Bhagwati, "Don't Cry for Cancun," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2004.

[32] Haasss, "With Us or Without US," BBC Radio 4, 12 April 2002.