T. A. Zearat Ali

THE CHANGING NATURE OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

I. Introduction

The first half of the present century has been a tumultuous period. The world suffered two world wars with more than 70 million deaths. The horrors of these wars finally convinced everyone that peace was too precious a commodity to be left to the machinations of a few. After the First World War, the League of Nations was indeed created to maintain peace, but it was essentially an Anglo-French-American formulation that sought to retain their colonial interest under fancy names and institutions. The main methods of maintaining peace were alliance-building, balance of interest and balance of power. That, in turn, resulted in inadequate empowerment of the League. Thus, the League failed to take any action in the Manchurian war between Japan and China in the early 1930s. Later, its total passivity in the face of increasing militarism of Japan, Italy and Germany, rendered the League completely ineffective by the middle of 1930s, resulting in the Second World War. It was then time to construct a better mechanism to maintain world peace. The United Nations (UN) organization was the result of those agonizing experiences.

T. A. Zearat Ali, a Group Captain in the Bangladesh Air Force, is an M. Phil Researcher in International Relations, Dhaka University.

The United Nations Charter was signed by 50 countries at San Francisco on 26 June 1945[1]. The UN officially came into existence on 24 October 1945 when its Charter was ratified by Nationalist China, France, the USSR, the UK, the USA and a majority of other signatories. Today, there are 185 of them. The founding fathers of the UN, benefiting from the unhappy memories of the League, attempted to institutionalize enforcement action to achieve justice and universal peace. Unlike the League, the UN did not put great emphasis on legalistic approach to address issues. It also did not relegate economic problems to a position of lesser importance in solving world problems while attempting to maintain peace through political means as well. One of the many methods available to the United Nations to maintain and make peace is the use of military personnel.

The first such opportunity came in 1948 when the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization(UNTSO) was formed to supervise the truce following the Arab-Israeli war of 1948. Next, the United Nations Military Observer Group(UNMOGIP) in India and Pakistan was established in 1949 following the Indo-Pak conflict over Kashmir. Both these missions were observer missions only, and are in operation still today. The United Nations established its first Emergency Force (UNEF-1) after the Suez war in 1956. The term 'Peacekeeping' was, however, formalized in February 1965 when the UN established a Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations[2]. Since then, there have been 42 UN missions until 1995, but the growth has not been uniform. In the first 40 years of UN's existence, leaving aside the observer missions, there were only 13 peacekeeping missions. Since 1988,

---

1. Poland, not being represented at the conference, signed it later and became one of the original 51 signatories.

2. A. N. M. Muniruzzaman (Colonel), "Second Generation Peacekeeping - New Factors in Peacekeeping Operations", Proceedings of a Conference on 'Peacekeeping Operations' held at the DSCSC on 7 January 1994, p. 1(47).

there have been 23 UN missions till 1996. The UN budget for peacekeeping also increased correspondingly. From US$ 230 million in 1987, it rose to US$ 3.6 billion in 1994, roughly three times the rest of the UN budget[3]. The number of troops deployed in the Cold War era was about 2000, but rose to 10,000 troops in 1987. In 1994 more than 76,000 troops were engaged in UN operations, of which more than 19,000 personnel were deployed in Somalia and more than 36,000 personnel in Bosnia-Herzegovina area[4].

All these indicate not only an increasing confidence in the role of the UN, but also an increased willingness of the world body to commit itself for global peace. In spite of the considerable increase in the UN commitment in peacekeeping in the past decade, its overall effectiveness has not been very impressive. There has been more than 100 conflicts in the world since WW-II, but the UN could intervene in only 42 of them till 1995. Even in the ones that the UN committed itself, it did not always come out successful. Reasons for all these are varied and complex. In many ways, UN peacekeeping operations are in an evolving process. Because of not having adequately clear guidelines in the Charter of the United Nations, the peacekeeping process had to adapt to the changes in security perceptions of the powerful contries. With the changes in global politico-economic scenario and changes in the nature of conflicts, the concepts of UN peacekeeping operations have been taking shapes in newer dimensions. The objectives of this paper would be to explain the evolutionary nature of the peacekeeping process, and identify

---

3. Jamil Majid, DG UN Desk, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Unpublished paper presented at the DSCSC on 21 January 1996, p. 5.

4. Boutros Boutros-Ghali (A), *Building Peace and Development*, Annual report on the work of the organization, (New York, Department of Public Information (DPI), UN, 1994), p. 155.

some of the problems. The paper examines five main aspects of UN peacekeeping under the following broad headings :

    a. Concepts of Peacekeeping;

    b. Emerging Concepts of Peacekeeping;

    c. Organizational Framework for Peacekeeping;

    d. Mounting of Peacekeeping Operations; and

    e. Finance : The Burden of Peace.

II. Concepts of Peacekeeping

Legal Dimension

Learning from the failures of the League of Nations, the signatories of the UN Charter of 1945 did intend to provide the UN with some capability to maintain world peace. The main purposes of the UN, as is delineated in Article 1 of Chapter I of the Charter[5], are:

(i)   To maintain international peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for suppression of acts of aggression . . . . . ;

(ii)   To develop friendly relations among nations .... and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

(iii) To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character . . . . .; and

(iv) To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

---

5.   Jamil Majid, *Op. Cit.*, p. 3.

The concept enshrined in the Charter was to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war[6]. But the Charter is a collection of words, which are subject to different interpretations. The Charter also lacked precision in identifying the kinds of actions that are to be taken in different circumstances. There is no mention of 'peacekeeping' in the Charter of the United Nations. The Chapters that somehow relate to peacekeeping are Chapter VI[7] and Chapter VII[8]. The main focus of Chapter VI is to 'determine' the level of threat and 'recommend' measures. Chapter

---

6. Charter of the United Nations, Article 1, Paragraph 1, Cited in Indar Jit Rikhye, *The Theory & Practice of Peacekeeping*, (London, C. Hurst & Co Ltd, 1984), p. 3.

7. The Articles of Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations that relate to peacekeeping are as follows:
   a. Article 34:
      'The Security Council may investigate any dispute or any situation which may lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security'.
   b. *Article* 36.1:
      'The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute, of the nature referred to in Article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or measures of adjustment'.
      Cited in David Ramsbotham, 'The Changing Nature of Intervention: the Role of UN Peacekeeping', *Conflict Studies*, risct, London, August 1995, p.1.

8. The Articles of Chapter VII of the UN Charter that are relevant to Peacekeeping are:
   a. *Article 39:*
      'The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and shall make recommendation, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42 to maintain or restore international peace and security'.
   b. *Article 41:*
      'The Security may decide what measures not involving the use of the armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it

VII repeats the same terminology in Articles 39 and 41; and Article 42 suggests military actions by the use of terms like 'demonstration', 'blockage,' and 'other operations'[9]. However, these are hardly any positive means of taking military actions; and it is also not clear as to what 'other operations' include.

For some peacekeeping operations, Chapter VI is invoked despite its vague language. In a few other cases where peace needed to be enforced, as in Congo, Korea and *Operations Desert Storm in* Kuwait, Chapter VII was invoked. Operations carried out under Chapter VI is defined by UK as "operations carried out with the consent of belligerent parties, in support of efforts to achieve or maintain peace in order to promote security and sustain life in areas of potential or actual conflict"[10]. Operations conducted under Chapter VII is defined as "operations carried out to restore peace between belligerent parties who do not all consent to intervention and who may be engaged in combat activities"[11]. A useful distinction between the two types of operations is made by the word 'consent'. These definitions of operations are only one

---

may call upon members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations'.

c. *Article* 42 :

'Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 *would be inadequate, or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockage and other operations by air, sea or land forces of members of the United Nations'.*

Cited in David Ramsbotham, *Op. Cit,* pp. 1-2.

9. A 'demonstration' in military parlance would generally mean show of force, power projection, pre-emptive deployment, threatening posture, etc.

10. "Wider Peacekeeping", *Army Field Manual: Operations other that War,* Vol. 2, HMSO, London, Cited in David Ramsbotham, *Op. Cit.,* p. 2.

11. *Ibid.*

interpretation. Other countries may define them differently. Seeing such confusion, Dag Hammarskjold, the first Secretary General of the United Nations, suggested to evolve a new chapter, Chapter $6\frac{1}{2}$, to fit the wide ranging requirement of peacekeeping[12]. Behind his light-hearted suggestion lie the undeniable realization of the need for amending the Charter by including clearer directions.

Changing Nature of Conflict and Intervention

Lester Pearson, the then Foreign Minister of Canada and the President of the 7th UNGA, is generally credited with the evolution of the concept of peacekeeping after the Suez crisis in 1956. What Pearson actually advanced was 'interpositional peacekeeping'. That concept was further developed by the then Secretary General Dag Hammaerkjold into what popularly came to be known as 'traditional peacekeeping'. The concept that Dag Hammarskjold developed has been the only basis of most of the peacekeeping operations ever since. The basic characteristics of traditional peacekeeping are the following[13] :

a.   Only lightly armoured UN troops could be deployed between the belligerents' position;

b.   Remaining responsible to the Security Council, the Secretary General would exercise overall command and control of all peacekeeping operations;

c.   Operations would be financed by the member states;

d.   Operations could be initiated only with the consent of the antagonists;

e.   UN peace keepers must maintain strict neutrality;

---

12. *The Blue Helmets*, A Review of United Nations Peace-keeping, (New York, DPI, UN, 1990), P.5.

13. Jamil Majid, *Op. Cit.*, p. 7.

f.   Troops would be contributed voluntarily by member states at the request of the Secretary General;

g.   Peace keepers could use force only in self-defence;

h.   Peacekeeping was an interim arrangement and not a final solution of the basic problems. Therefore it served only as a confidence building measure while efforts were made through different means to bring about permanent peace; and

j.   The main tasks of the UN troops were to supervise and monitor cease-fire, assist in troop withdrawal and act as a buffer between the rival forces.

With such conditions imposed on the early peace missions, the success of peacekeeping had to be limited in scope. Difficulties also arose with the concept of peacekeeping. In spite of several attempts, 'peacekeeping' has not yet been formally defined. The word 'peacekeeping' has been variously defined by various people. The International Peace Academy(IPA) has defined it as :

> " . . . the prevention, containment, moderation and termination of hostilities between or within states through the medium of third-party interventions, organized and directed internationally, using multinational military, police and civilian personnel to restore peace"[14].

The former UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali defines peacekeeping as:

> "Peacekeeping is the deployment of United Nations presence in the field hitherto with the consent of all the parties concerned, normally involving United Nations military and/or police personnel and frequently civilians as well. Peacekeeping is a technique that expands the

---

14.   Cited in Rikhye, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 1-2.

possibilities of both the prevention of conflict and the making of peace"[15].

The IPA's definition place the onus of peacekeeping on a 'third party', to be organized and directed 'internationally', using multinational forces. The Secretary General is more specific in identifying the UN as the main body to execute the peace process. Boutros-Ghali's definition can serve as a reference, although it is not the UN's official definition. Many of the definitional dilemmas arise from the changing nature of conflict and interventions. The UN Charter and the IPA definition of peacekeeping consider conflict occurring essentially between states. This realist's view of international conflict could not provide an adequate mechanism for preventing many conflicts. In fact, the UN, its Charter and its interpretations are the legacies of the Second World War and the Cold War that followed. Many conflicts were either resolved or suppressed by the superpowers, as seen through the partisan prism of the bipolar world order. During that period, many conflicts went unaddressed because of lack of consensus among the Permanent Members of the Security Council. In a way, peace was hostage to a game of veto.

In the post-Vietnam period, both the superpowers used to view the UN's role in peacekeeping with suspicion. Ronald Reagan's presidential campaign theme was that America, during the Carter era, had gone 'soft'. It was also perceived in the USA that unchecked Soviet initiatives had increased Soviet clientele in the Third World, and that the USA had to do something about it[16]. Both the superpowers had a tendency to seek unilateral solution to solve world problems according to their own perceptions. The USA had intervened in Grenada and Libya, and armed guerrillas

---

15. Muniruzzaman, *Op. Cit.*, p. 1(48).
16. August R. Norton and Thomas G. Weiss, "Superpower and Peace-keeper". *Survival*, Vol. XXXII, No. 3, May/June, 1990, p. 212.

in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Nicaragua and Angola[17]. This unilateralism had effectively replaced the UN concept of collective security. While the Red Army remained bogged down in Afghanistan for too long and the Soviet military assistance abroad was draining its treasury, the USSR began to rely more on the UN in its management of world peace. At the 27th Party Congress in February 1986, Moscow called for a 'comprehensive system of international peace'. This was strongly reiterated by Mikhail Garbachev in his speech at the 1988 General Assembly[18]. Seeing such a change in Soviet attitude, and also after seeing some of the disastrous consequences of its own interventions abroad, Washington cautiously began to rely more on 'collective security' under the auspices of the UN. This was highlighted by Ronald Reagan, in a complete about-face to his earlier unilateral tone, when he said at the General Assembly in the same year that, "the United Nations has the opportunity to live and breathe and work as never before"[19]. This was at the end of the Cold War, and a collegial spirit for the maintenance of international peace and security began to emerge.

With the end of the Cold War, the world also witnessed a rise of nationalism and many intra-state conflicts of ethno-religious nature. Three problems arise from this situation. Firstly, not all the warring parties are represented at the UN; therefore, they cannot seek the intervention of the UN. Secondly, many of these conflicts are internal affairs of states. If we consider that the primary aim of the UN is to prevent war, it is morally bound to resolve all conflicts, not only the inter-state ones. This is not only for humanitarian reasons, but also for the fact that many internal conflicts have a way of spilling over to neighbouring countries

17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*, p. 213.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 214.

creating global problems. Such a situation is exemplified by the conflicts in Rwanda and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Therefore, the UN's earlier sacrosanct dictum of not interfering in the internal affairs of any state will have to be suitably modified to accommodate resolution of many inter-state conflicts. This gives rise to the third problem, that is the 'consent' of all parties for UN intervention may not be available, especially when a stronger community, or state, is in a clearly winning situation.

As mentioned earlier, peacekeeping started in 1948 and 1949 as observer missions with clear consent of all the rival parties, and with strict neutrality. But events like Israeli non-compliance of the UN mandate in the 1960s raised the question of credibility of the UN, especially after the unresolved Middle-East dispute resulted in the 1973 Arab-Israeli war. The instance of how a local dispute can turn into an all-out war ended the taciturnity of the superpowers[20]. After a dormant period (1967-73) of UN's involvement in peacekeeping, the super powers found renewed interest in the mechanism of the UN. They also realized that the meaning of peacekeeping and the UN's capabilities have to be expanded, if peace is to be maintained in the world. Such thoughts gave rise to the concept of peace enforcement. One extreme form of peace enforcing is found in the example of the 1991 Gulf War after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. This was the first true peace enforcement action, although some put forward Korean War also as an instance of peace enforcement. Since the USSR delegation was absent in the Security Council meeting, the subsequent mandate of the UN can hardly be called unanimous and a true peacekeeping mission. Another problem arises from the meaning of the word 'neutral'. Should UN remain neutral and watch events go by ? In the 1991 Gulf War, the Multinational Forces did take the side of Kuwait, and rightly so.

---

20. Muniruzzaman, *Op. Cit.*, p. 1(49).

III. Emerging Concepts of Peacekeeping

The example of Korean war, as mentioned above, reveals another red herring. The war may have ended at the 38th parallel, and peace may have been maintained ever since, but it has not removed the possibility of war. Even after the break-up of the USSR and the end of the Cold War both North Korea and South Korea remain at the precipice of war even today. Therefore, it was felt that, to bring about peace in the world, it is simply not good enough to maintain a semblance of peace by maintaining a *status quo*. To maintain peace effectively, the UN will need to remove the causes of war. The widely shared present pluralist understanding is that conflict can arise out of environmental, economic, and social causes. Therefore, a broader concept of peacekeeping would include not only the resolution of conflicting issues, but also resolving the humanitarian, economic, environmental and social problems that go on to create conflict in the first place. Much of those emerging concepts were indeed recognized by the then UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali in his position paper, *An Agenda for Peace*[21], which was published in 1992, and presented on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the UN. This was also reiterated by him in Building Peace and Development by saying[22]:

> "Today, we have a deeper understanding of where the sources of trouble lie in our world. We now know that security involves far more than questions of land and weapons. We further realize that the lack of economic, social and political development is the underlying cause of war."

Presently, peacekeeping activities draw inspiration from three documents - the UN Charter, *An Agenda for Peace* and its supple-

---

21. David Ramsbotham, *Op. Cit.*, p. 2.
22. Boutros Boutros-Ghali (A), *Op. Cit.*, p. 279.

ments, and *An Agenda for Development*[23]. *An Agenda for Peace* does not include "a comprehensive overview of the problems of international order in the Post-Cold War world"[24]. Since its publication, it has received a positive but limited response. Even Boutros-Ghali viewed *An Agenda for Peace* as the beginning rather than the end of a debate[25].

The roles and the functions of second generation peacekeeping may vary greatly. Considering the emerging natures of peacekeeping, the UN Under-Secretary General of Political Affairs Marrack Goulding, who had earlier headed the Peacekeeping Department, identified seven distinct types of functions of peacekeeping[26].

> * *Preventive Deployment.* This concept needs to visualize a potentially threatening situation; and at the request of one of the parties, the UN can deploy troops as a measure of confidence building and to deter any potential aggressor. The idea was first mooted by the former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. Preemptive deployment was first applied in Macedonia in the early 1990s.

> * *Traditional Peacekeeping.* Traditional peacekeeping is still in practice in Kashmir, Cyprus and the Iraq-Kuwait border. In this sense, Goulding considered traditional peacekeeping to be only observer missions.

> * *Negotiated Settlement.* Concept of such operation evolved in the late 1980s[27]. Its basic aim is to help the parties implement a comprehensive settlement after a

23. David Ramsbotham, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 3-4.
24. Adams Roberts "The United Nations and International Security", *Survival*, Vol. 35, No. 2, Summer 1993, p. 4.
25. *Ibid.*
26. Jamil Majid, *Op. Cit.*, p. 11.
27. David Ramsbotham, *Op. Cit.*, p. 2.

certain process of negotiation. Negotiated settlement involves not only military arrangements, but also wide ranging socio-political-economic issues. Namibia was the first example of negotiated settlement in which the UN forces, after a decade of negotiations, supervised a free and fair election, and helped in its transition from South African rule to independence. Some of the later examples include UN operation in Cambodia, Mozambique, Angola and El Salvador. This can also be termed as peace making.

* *Humanitarian Operations.* To mitigate human sufferings in any conflict, either civil or inter-state conflict, humanitarian supplies are provided as a function of peacekeeping operations. Humanitarian aid was provided both in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Somalia. Such an operation, however, poses certain difficulties in maintaining neutrality of the peacekeeping forces. Humanitarian operations can run counter to the war objectives of either one, or both the parties. For example, humanitarian aid to the Muslims of Bosnia was clearly against the war objectives of the Bosnian Serbs.

* *Assistance to Failed States.* This requires the UN personnel to intervene in a country of total disorder originating from the complete collapse of the government machinery. Recently, in Somalia, government institutions had collapsed; and the political authority, with which to negotiate, did not exist. Yet the UN attempted to provide humanitarian aid, and undertook to bring about national reconciliation between the warring factions. The operations, however, failed due to the lack of consensus of the parties involved for such a UN role. The UN operation in Congo during the Cold War was launched with similar objectives in mind.

* *Cease-fire Enforcement.* After a cease-fire agreement is reached by the rival parties, if one of the signatories violates that agreement, the UN could intervene with a mandate to enforce peace by taking action against the violator. In such cases, the peacekeeping force would maintain neutrality. They would simply take action against anyone who violates the cease-fire.

* *Peace Enforcement.* This means that the UN forces maintain peace by taking action against the aggressor in a situation where no previous cease-fire was agreed upon. In such cases, troops normally remain under one national command, being so authorized by the Security Council to use force for a particular purpose. In the 1991 Gulf War, the task of the Multinational Forces was only to evict Iraq out of Kuwait.

One can forward several reasons for the limited response generated by *An Agenda for Peace*. First, Boutros-Ghali's formulation was a little futuristic in the sense that the world, especially the major powers, may not be ready for it yet. Since the recommendations of *An Agenda for Peace* have implications of impingement on absolute sovereignty of states, many major powers may not be keen to accept the implications. Second, to implement his recommendations, the kind of organization the UN needs to have and the structural networks that need to be built around the world are not yet available. Foremost, it will need a thorough review of the UN Charter. In this position paper, Boutros-Ghali recognized most of the factors that Marrack Goulding mentions, but considers them under different perspectives. He also emphasized the importance of using the regional organizations not only to cut cost, but to control the conflicts effectively. Implicit in these measures are also the procedural methods like arms control, banning of certain weapons, etc. In *An*

Agenda for Peace, Boutros Boutros-Ghali puts forward four main methods of maintaining peace in the world - Preventive Deployment, Peace Making, Peacekeeping and Post-conflict Reconstruction.

Preventive Diplomacy

The former Secretary General goes beyond Goulding's 'Preventive Deployment'. He believes in the idea of making peace peacefully, with the tool of diplomacy. Thus he considers preventive deployment applicable only when Preventive Diplomacy fails, or is likely to fail. Therefore, he puts greater emphasis on Preventive Diplomacy. He also divides the range of peacekeeping operations into three broad categories: preventive diplomacy, peace making and peacekeeping[28]. Preventive diplomacy means diplomatic actions taken by either the UN, any other organization, or individuals, so commissioned by the Secretary General. Its purpose is to prevent an existing dispute from turning into outright conflict, or to limit its severity and scope, if it does end up in a war. To achieve those objectives, preventive diplomacy may have several approaches. For preventive diplomacy to succeed, the first thing that it will need is confidence building. It will need a general confidence in the UN and its effort in keeping peace. For that the UN has to maintain moral neutrality, ensure justice and show frequent successes in its peace missions. Confidence building measures will also include balanced regional order, free flow of information, adherence to treaties, and regional arms control mechanism, etc.

Preventive diplomacy's success will largely depend on accurate and timely information to the UN about the nature of conflicts that may be brewing anywhere in the world. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, thus, envisioned a dense network of organizations - state,

---

28. Boutros Boutros-Ghali (B), *An Agenda for Peace* (Bengali Version), (Dhaka, UN Information Centre, 1993), p. 11.

non-state and private - all around the world, providing continuous information to the UN. It may be quoted, as an example, that the United States did provide valuable information to the UN about the massacres in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Without that, it would not have been possible to detect the burial sites of the genocide committed by the Bosnian Serbs. This example has shown that high-tech equipment, aircraft and satellites are needed for information gathering. Since such supply of information by a particular state will largely depend on the stand that it takes in the conflict, it would be worthwhile to have UN's resources for information gathering. The UN has, to a large extent, already built an information network in matters of environmental hazards, natural disaster, nuclear accident, human exodus, epidemic, famine, etc. This networks can be expanded to include information regarding conflicts also.

The next component of preventive diplomacy is preventive deployment that was mentioned earlier. Normally, preventive deployment can be originated only after the parties concerned make request to that effect. Naturally then, consent of both the parties is a desirable criterion; but the former Secretary General recommended that preventive deployment can be made even when one party declines to offer consent. If so, it may be a sign of ulterior motive of that party; thus all the more reason for wanting to preserve the peace by preventive deployment. In such cases, deployment will have to be on one side of the border. Preventive diplomacy may also need to create a demilitarized zone. In a sense, it is preventive demilitarization of a zone. Again, consents of both the parties are desirable, but in extraordinary circumstances, as is mentioned above, the Security Council may decide to create a demilitarized zone on one side of the border.

Peace Making

Peace making falls between preventive diplomacy and traditional peacekeeping. It aims to resolve disputes by bringing

the rival parties to an agreement. Some of the tools of peace making and peace building are re-negotiation, mediation or arbitration of disputes. If all efforts fail, peace enforcement may be necessary in special cases. Holding a successful election in Namibia and enabling the country's transition to independence is a good example of peace making. For making peace, Boutros-Ghali foresaw greater reliance on the International Court of Justice in resolving many disputes. Another component of peace making is to extend economic, humanitarian, and other structural developmental assistance. In this regard, the UNHCR and other humanitarian organizations will, no doubt, play greater roles. In the post-Cold War period, political, military and economic sanctions have also become tools of either keeping the peace, or preventing spread of existing conflicts. As mentioned earlier, enforcement of peace, as a last resort, cannot be ruled out. Of course, such methods were indeed successful in a few instances; but the availability of well trained, well equipped and a homogeneous body of troops cannot always be ensured. Besides, the question of finance, delay in decision making and unwillingness to risk one's own troops abroad may become stumbling blocks. Therefore, it would only be appropriate to maintain UN's own enforcement unit. Recently, the UN proposed to create a Rapid Reaction Force, but nothing concrete has been heard about it as yet.

Peacekeeping

Peacekeeping in this context refers to traditional peacekeeping, which was discussed earlier in detail. Traditional peacekeeping takes place only after a conflict breaks out and both the parties agree to UN's intervention.

Post-Conflict Reconstruction

As mentioned earlier, peacekeeping is an interim arrangement, and its results can often be transitory. Without establishing mini-

mum infrastructure and fundamental social order, and without the economic machinery on sound footing, the country can quickly relapse into chaos. United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) in 1992-93 had the aim of establishing peace by holding a free and fair election. It was successful, but the mandate did not address any other problem of the country[29]. No wonder, peace is not yet established there in the truest sense. For that, it is necessary to have a strategy of post-conflict reconstruction. This should not only address infrastructure building, establishing socio-political order and economic reconstruction, but also issues like disarming, de-mining, rehabilitation of refugees, training of the security forces and the administrative staff, etc.[30]. For an effective reconstruction programme, the UN needs to involve not only the concerned governments, but also other UN agencies, the World Bank, the IMF, donor countries, organizations willing to fund particular ventures, NGOs and the private sector[31]. This will, therefore, need a different command and control system, preferably a separate organization within the UN.

IV. Organizational Framework for Peacekeeping

The main aim of the Charter of the UN is 'the maintenance of international peace and security'. At the highest level the organs that directly relate to peacekeeping are the following[32]:

* The General Assembly

* The Security Council

29. David Ramsbotham, *Op. Cit.*, p. 21.
30. Boutros Boutros-Ghali (B), *Op. Cit.*, p. 31.
31. David Ramsbotham, *Op. Cit.*, p. 22.
32. *Peacekeeper's Handbook*, International Peace Academy, 1978, pp. II/2-II/6.

The General Assembly

The General Assembly consists of all the members of the United Nations. As far as peacekeeping is concerned, the Assembly has no specific power. Nonetheless, it can consider its general principles and international cooperation regarding peace, security, and disarmament, etc. It can also discuss any matter relating to international peace and make recommendations to the Security Council. Where follow-up action is required, the General Assembly has to refer the matter to the Security Council. The Assembly, however, cannot make any specific recommendation regarding any particular dispute unless requested by the Security Council. Subject to the Council's consent, the Secretary General may notify the Assembly, at each session, of any matter relating to peace and security, matters that concern on-going missions, and when a particular operation ceases.

Subject to the provisions of Article 12, the Assembly may recommend steps that might be required to be taken for peaceful settlement of any dispute, and which is likely to impair general welfare or friendly relations among nations. The General Assembly also receives and considers annual and special reports, submitted by the Security Council, on matters involving peace and security. The Assembly approves the budget for all peacekeeping operations; but, otherwise, it is limited in power to act. However, there have been exceptions. For example, to find an acceptable solution when there was a lack of consensus of the Permanent Five, the General Assembly did take a resolution known as Uniting for Peace Resolution. That Resolution resulted in a new mission called UNEF-1. In many early operations under such resolutions, the General Assembly had to depend totally on the consent of the host countries.

The Security Council

Consisting of five permanent and 10 non-permanent members, the Security Council is the main body entrusted with the

responsibility of maintaining peace and security. It derives its authority from Article 24 of the Charter. The Permanent Members have the right to veto; and thus, any motion can be blocked by a single dissenting vote. The Council, according to Article 28, was to have organized itself adequately to be able to function continuously, an expectation that has not been fulfilled yet. According to Article 28, the Security Council can, in addition, create subsidiary organizations that may be deemed necessary at any time. It has the authority to invite any state, which is a party to a dispute, for discussion, even though it is not a member of the UN.

The Security Council is entrusted with the responsibility of determining the existence of any threat, breach of peace and act of aggression. It is also to make recommendations on the course of actions to be taken to maintain global peace. The Council is the ultimate authority in matters of enforcement of peace using any means - military and non-military. The council is, thereby, responsible for organizing the armed forces according to Article 43, exploring "other" means of peacemaking, and finally deploying peacekeeping forces. To assist in the function of the General Assembly and the Security Council, two supporting organizations are also created[33]:

a. The Military Staff Committee(MSC)

b. The Secretariat

The Military Staff Committee

The function of the Military Staff Committee is to assist and advise the Security Council on all matters relating to the military requirements in peacekeeping operations including employment, command and control, regulations, armament, etc. The Committee consists of a Chief of Staff from either a member state of the

---

33.   *Ibid.*, pp. II/7-II/8.

Council, or its representative. The Committee is to provide the strategic direction to the forces under the command of the UN; but due to lack of unanimity, its effectiveness has diminished. The main reason for keeping the MSC outside the businesses of peacekeeping is that many on-going operations may get bogged down if disagreements among the Permanent Members arise on any issue. The MSC still sits in bi-weekly meetings, but it is hardly consulted.

Although there is an Assistant Secretary General of the rank of a 3-star general for planning and supporting the Department of Peacekeeping Operation (DPKO), there is no Military Adviser to the Secretary General. That means that the resolutions of the Security Council are not subjected to hard scrutiny for military viability and feasibility of an operation[34]. It is also not proper that the MSC should consist of only the representatives of the Permanent Five. It would be appropriate to have the senior military officers of the troop contributing countries as advisers instead[35]. A separate appointment of a Military Adviser may be instituted to assist the Secretary General, who may 'double' as the head of the MSC also[36]. The appointment of a Military Adviser to the Secretary General was indeed created during the Suez crisis, but it was kept in abeyance in 1969. The Adviser was then replaced by a Military Liaison Officer.

The Secretariat

This organization works as the headquarters staff to the UN. The Secretary General is the head of this organization. It is composed of international civil servants drawn from the member states based on proportionality. The Secretariat provides civilian

---

34.   David Ramsbotham, *Op. Cit.*, p. 17.
35.   *Ibid.*
36.   *Ibid.*

field staff for peacekeeping missions. Since 1956, after the launching of UNEF-1 under the Uniting for Peace Resolution, it has been the practice for the Secretary General and this staff at the Secretariat to be responsible for mounting peacekeeping missions and overseeing the day to day conduct, management and direction of peacekeeping operations[37]. The Secretary General also undertakes many personal 'good offices' missions and individual peace initiatives.

The Secretary General has two Under Secretaries General-one for Special Political Affairs(SPA) and the other heads the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)[38]. The DPKO was created in 1992; and before that, it was under the purview of the SPA. In 1993, the DPKO has been expanded to include the Field Operations Division. The power to conduct peacekeeping operations is delegated to the Secretary General by the Security Council.

V. Mounting of Peacekeeping Operations

The UN is a civilian organization having practically no military staff. The MSC is emasculated and takes no part in UN operations. As mentioned earlier, there is no Military Adviser to the Secretary General as of now. Major General Indar Jit Rikhye of India held the post for ten years, and was forced to relinquish the appointment in 1969. The purpose, as was told, was to bring the military activities under the overall control of the civilian elements of the UN[39]. However, there is no denying that a Military Adviser to the political authority can be of great assistance in providing sound judgement on military situations. If such advises were provided for all the missions, many peacekeeping disasters

---

37. *Peacekeeper's Handbook, Op. Cit.*, p. II/8.
38. *A Guide to Information at the United Nations*, (New, DPI, UN, 1995), pp. 4-5.
39. *Ibid.*, p. III/3.

may have been averted. Without such an appointment, the UN often has to rely on the military assessments of some powerful countries, diluting the soundness of the assessments with their own interests. With such emphasis at the UN on political matters, military considerations always get a lower priority in mounting peacekeeping operations. Instead of the military, the Security Council formulates the strategic and tactical concepts of peacekeeping operations, but it will be the Security Council through the Secretary General[40].

Decision to Mount Peacekeeping Missions

The decision to mount a peacekeeping mission lies with the Security Council. Before a decision is taken, it holds many consultations with the Secretary General. Unless an enforcement action is required on humanitarian ground, the consents of the rival parties are always sought. The proposal must also enjoy broad support of the international community, and it must be unanimously voted by the Security Council. Member states must also be willing to provide adequate support with troops, equipment, intelligence, etc. After the Security Council takes a decision, it has to propose a mandate, recommend the size of the force, nominate a Force Commander, and explore the availability of the force from the possible troops contributing countries.

From this point onward, and before the final decision is taken, the Secretary General begins to be increasingly involved. He has to determine that the composition of the force, including the Force Commander, and the countries participating in the mission, are all acceptable to the parties in conflict. The Secretary General also has to approve the fund. One other point that has to be taken into consideration is how the force, once deployed, can be extricated if the situation on the ground changes, and if any one

---

40. *Ibid.*

of the countries withdraws her peacekeeping commitment for any reason, and wants to pull out her troops. The question of extricating troops in emergency did come up in Bosnia-Herzegovina in several towns, including Bangladeshi troops at Bihac.

Force Composition

All the members of the UN are obliged according to Article 43 of the Charter to commit part of their military and police force for the maintenance of international peace and security. However, not all the countries are willing, for many reasons, to contribute troops for peacekeeping missions. For example, the Western countries are generally wont to contribute troops in high risk areas as a result of their domestic compulsions[41]. For instance, there have been many lobbies in American polity not to shed 'valuable' American blood to solve Third World problems. However, in matters of force composition, there often is a two-way lobby. The Secretary General lobbies for a right mix of countries and forces, and some aspiring contributors have to lobby for being included in the team. The Secretary General aims to achieve a broad geographical distribution of the troop-contributing countries, and recruit troops from countries that have previous experience, and are sympathetic to UN causes. Military professionalism, discipline and language skill, etc., also play important roles.

Command and Control

The success of any mission depends largely on a sound command and control arrangement. Actual arrangement varies from mission to mission. However, there are some common features that have remained unchanged. For example, the whole arrangement has two segments-one at the UN and the other in the field. Peacekeeping at the UN is looked after by the DPKO and the Field Operations Division (FOD). In the mission area, all the

---

41.   Source: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Army HQs, Bangladesh.

theatre forces come under the command of the Force Commander (FC), who reports directly to the Secretary General. Every mission HQ comprises the office of the Force Commander(FC) and that of the Chief Administrative Officer(CAO)[42]. A Chief of Staff(COS) helps the Force Commander in operational planning, personnel management, and administrative and logistic arrangement. The CAO has another channel of command. He also reports directly to the FOD in matters of finance, administration and logistics. Being in the authority of financial control, the CAO wields more influence over the FC even in matters of tactics, strategy, rules of engagement, the overall tone of the mission, etc[43]. This effectively removes flexibility of the Force Commander and ties his hands behind his back.

At the higher echelon also there is a problem. There are two officers that control peacekeeping activities- the office of the Under-Secretary General (USG) for Special Political Affairs and the office of the Director of Field Operation and External Support Activities. Under this arrangement, the Secretary General is expected to coordinate and harmonize the activities of both the officers for every mission. This many be asking too much from the Secretary General considering so many other UN organizations, Committees and Bodies that he has to head[44]. Considering this difficulty, the whole UN system may be divided into four main departments, each headed by a Deputy Secretary General[45]. Therefore, the Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Affairs can both be headed by a Deputy Secretary General.

---

42. *The Blue Helmets, Op. Cit.*, pp. 406-418.
43. Interviews with Colonels Salim Akhtar, Moin U. Ahmed and Shafi Mehbub.
44. David Ramsbotham, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 16-17.
45. Brian Urquhart, Towards a More *Effective United Nations*, Dag Hammarskjold Foundation for Development Dialogue, 1991:1-2, p. 13, Cited in David Ramsbotham, *Op. Cit.*, p. 17.

VI. Finance : The Burden of Peace

Contribution

Fund for the total expenses of the United Nations is generated from the contributions of the member states. The maximum rate of contribution is 25 percent of the UN budget by any one member. Bangladesh pays the minimum rate, which is .001 percent. This scale of assessment is specified by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the 18 member Committee on Contributions[46] on the basis of economic criteria of the member states. This is reviewed after a few years.

Later, the operation in Cyprus(UNFICYP) was planned to be financed by voluntary contributions from member states, but that ended in disaster as they failed to provide sufficient fund. Since 1973, special account is kept for each peacekeeping mission, separating the peacekeeping fund from the regular fund[47]. Contributions are also made separately. About 58 percent of the peacekeeping fund is contributed by the Permanent Members[48]; and in doing so, they pay about 22 percent higher than their contribution to the regular fund[49]. Other developed countries pay in equal proportion. The USA bears the maximum burden by paying higher than any other country, about 30 percent of the total peacekeeping budget since 1984[50].

The Crisis

Although it appears that the financial arrangement for UN peacekeeping is neatly worked out, in reality it is replete with problems. The main problem of UN's budget constraint arises out

---

46. *Basic Facts About the United Nations*, (New York, DPI, UN, 1992), p. 22.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
48. *Ibid.*
49. Jamil Majid, *Op. Cit.*, p. 14.
50. August R. Norton and Thomas G. Weiss, *Op. Cit.*, p. 214.

of non-payment of their dues by many member states. Some countries are even 8 years behind in payment[51]. Three reasons can be identified for that. Firstly, during the cold war era, the UN budget was, in a way, hostage to superpower rivalry and political manipulation[52]. Each major power wanted to see a controlling interest in its contribution. The major defaulters, at one time or the other, were the USSR and the USA[53]. Since 1987, the Russians began to pay their dues, but that solved only a small problem. Even though a collegial spirit in UN's peacekeeping operations prevailed since 1988, the financial problem continued to dog the UN. As of December 1995, the member states owed the UN $1.9 billion on account of peacekeeping alone[54]. The second reason for the UN's financial crisis is increasing UN commitment in peacekeeping since 1988. Thus, the cost of peacekeeping in 1995 alone was $ 3 billion. Since only one mission has been undertaken in 1996 and a few have been wrapped up in 1995 and 1996, the cost of peacekeeping in 1996 reached around $ 1.5 billion. In spite of the reduction in annual expense, the outstanding debt of the UN on account of peacekeeping was $1.8 billion[55] in June 1996. Increased mission commitment is an increased burden for the Permanent Members. One of the ways the UN makes up the shortfall is by delaying reimbursement to the troop-contributing countries. In the meantime, the troops are just paid a bare Daily Subsistence Allowance(DSA). This delay in payment places a burden on many troops contributing countries and their forces[56].

Seeing the spiralling cost of peacekeeping, many major contributors have become wary of committing to peacekeeping undertakings. There was also a time when the UN was almost on

---

51. UN Peacekeeping and Peacemaking, *Op. Cit.*, p. 18.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
53. August R. Norton and Thomas G. Weiss, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 212-214.
54. Jamil Majid, *Op. Cit.*, p. 15.
55. Special UN report, DPI/1634/Rev-2, March 1996.
56. *Basic Facts About the United Nations, Op. Cit.*, p. 23.

the verge of closing down many on-going missions due to lack of fund. Thus, there have been apprehension as to the future of peacekeeping. This concern has led to many debates within the UN and outside on how to raise fund, reduce UN peacekeeping commitments and cut cost. Some of the ways that cost can be cut are by reducing mismanagement and by nipping the problems in the buds. In most recent peacekeeping missions, mismanagement of fund and logistics has been occurring regularly[57]. Mismanagement occurs not only for the shortage of field staff in most missions, but also that most administrative personnel involved in logistic planning have no clear understanding of the military requirement. One of the ways to reduce cost is to act early, for which the concepts of preventive diplomacy, peace building, peace enforcement, etc., are considered. It is true that, sometimes, too early a UN action may even aggravate the situation, but most often it can help. For example, USA's reluctance to act early in Rwanda, ultimately increased the mission-cost five times according to an estimate[58]. To act early effectively, the UN would, however, need early warning and accurate intelligence information, not to mention the will to act by the major powers. Often it has been seen that the missions drag on; and by the time the missions are closed, the expenses far exceed the initial estimate. To avoid that, some people prefer to include a 'Sunset Clause', or a bench-mark, in the mandate[59]. What this means is that the mandates must specify a clear termination date, or clear objectives of what are to be achieved at the end of the mission. This tactic may, however, help

---

57. Shafiul Islam (Major), et al, "Problems of Peacekeeping by the United Nations", Unpublished Research paper, DSCSC, Mirpur, Dhaka, p. 10, and "Strategic Policy Issues", *Strategic Survey*, Brassey's for the IISS, UK, 1992-93, pp. 36-37.

58. Holly Barkhalter, "US might have Avoided Rwanda Tragedy" *Christian Science Monitor*, 9 August, 1994, cited in Richard Connaught, "Wider Peacekeeping - How Wide of the Mark?", *British Army Review*, No.11, December 1995.

59. August R. Norton and Thomas G. Weiss, *Op. Cit.*, p. 219.

in some cases, but events in many instances cannot be foreseen. Closing a mission at a pre-determined date may not serve the true purpose of maintaining peace. Another way of cutting cost is to use the regional organization like EU, ASEAN, etc., for maintaining regional peace.

Some countries, especially the developed ones, argue that all the problems of the world cannot be solved by the UN alone. They contend that the UN should not be involved in every trouble spot, arguing that places like Western Sahara are of little interest to most of the international community[60]. However, the general opinion upholds the moral responsibility of the UN to be more active in peace and security problems of the world. The moralists point out that when the world per capita arms expenditure is about $150, the per capita cost of the whole UN system is only $2[61]. If the UN is made more effective, which may indeed entail greater cost, it may allow nations to reduce expenditure on arms, not to mention a more peaceful world. If peacekeeping commitments are to increase, then there is no other option but to increase the fund even after cost cutting measures are taken. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, in his *An Agenda for Peace,* put forward the following recommendations[62]:

* To create a $50 millions reserve peacekeeping fund;

* To create a $50 million humanitarian fund.; and

* To raise $ 1 billion from a combination of assessed and voluntary contributions from member states, and commercially from private sector and individuals.

He also suggested that the system of collecting normal contribution from the budget of the foreign ministries of the

60. *Peacekeeping and Peacemaking, Op. Cit.,* p. 17.
61. Jamil Majid, *Op. Cit.,* p. 15.
62. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *Op. Cit.,* pp. 39-42.

member states may be changed, and be processed through the defence budget[63]. Fund can also be raised by a system of levy on exports, or profits of multinational companies. However, the idea of raising fund commercially has attracted severe criticism from the Western developed countries, especially the USA. They argue that if the UN begins to raise money commercially and privately, it may be independent enough to begin to act like a World Government. In turn, that may erode the level of sovereignty of the member states. Besides, it will take away the hegemonic roles played by some countries. The Western world may not yet be ready for that, but it is only a matter of time before such concepts of fund raising begin to be accepted. Another means of raising fund is to ask the developed nations to pay for peacekeeping more than their assessed scale of contribution for regular funds, as is done by the Permanent Members[64]. The whole scale may even be reassessed, considering emergence of many new industrialized countries. For example, Malaysia, South Korea, Saudi Arabia and Singapore can definitely pay more than what they do now. Finally, with the induction of Japan and Germany in the Security Council, they may be willing to pay a higher share than their present contributions[65].

VII. Conclusion

Peacekeeping is a 20th century phenomenon born out of the ravages of two world wars. The basic purpose of creating the United Nations was indeed to maintain peace in the world, but how that is to be achieved was rather vague in the Charter of the UN. Wars continued to dog the world scenario, while a form of peacekeeping did emerge. This was based on the generalized and

---

63. "Strategic Policy Issues", *Strategic Survey*, Brassey's for the IISS, UK, 1992-1993, p. 3.

64. Jamil Majid, *Op. Cit.*, p. 14.

65. *Ibid.*

non-specific language of Chapters VI and VII of the Charter. peacekeeping started with observer missions, which failed to resolve the underlying conflicts. Besides, the basic concept of conflict resolution also took it for granted that conflicts occurred only between states. Conflicts between non-state actors were considered internal affairs of states, in which the UN often did not intervene. Such concepts are still prevailing but changes in the attitudes of people are being noticed. During the Cold War, many of the problems also remained locked within the domain of the rivalry of super powers, who often exercised unilateral actions to extend their influence and preserve their interests. The end of the Cold War, however, gave rise to the concept of collective security replacing unilateralism.

Even before the Cold War ended, it was surmised that if peace is to be maintained, mere observer mission was not sufficient. Frequent disagreement of the major powers, albeit in the Cold War context, kept resolution of many conflicts unaddressed. That prompted the General Assembly to take charge through its Resolution of Uniting for Peace. By this Resolution, the Secretary General began to implement peacekeeping operations himself. However, even in those, the mandates by the Security Council was necessary. The tradition continues still today. There are, however, other reasons for that. If the Security Council managed peacekeeping operations through the Military Staff Committee, the progress of any particular operation could come to a standstill if there is a disagreement among the Permanent Five. This also resulted in reducing the MSC in its significance. In its place, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, headed by an Under-Secretary General, was created to manage the peacekeeping operations. The system, nonetheless, has other weaknesses. Firstly, there is no Military Adviser to the Secretary General who would advise him in formulating military related policies. Additionally, the span of control of the Secretary General being too wide, the

total UN activities may be brought under four Departments, each headed by a Deputy Secretary General. The Military Adviser, in that case, can report to the Deputy Secretary General in charge of peacekeeping.

Traditional peacekeeping that evolved during the Cold War needed consent of the warring parties to keep them apart by maintaining cease-fire and by establishing demilitarized zones, while diplomatic negotiation was pursued to bring about peace. With mixed results, it worked up to a point. The end of the Cold War let loose new sets of problems. The concept of peacekeeping considered that peace could be maintained by dealing with states only. Many a simmering discontents and aspirations of peoples against hegemonic forces gave rise to many ultra-nationalistic and ethno-religious conflicts. To deal with these intra-state conflicts, the UN had to view the basic nature of conflicts and their resolutions differently. It is also seen that by mere discontinuance of fighting, as was achieved in many cases during the Cold War era, the real causes of conflicts were not removed. As a result many countries have either relapsed into renewed fighting, or they may do so any moment. The Middle-East crisis, Indo-Pakistan tension over Kashmir and the situation in Korea are cases in point. Beside territorial and political causes, environment, economic, social, ethnic, and economic causes are also seen as potential sources of war.

With the changing nature of conflicts and geo-politics, the concept of peacekeeping is also evolving. Thus the second generation peacekeeping goes beyond traditional peacekeeping by trying to solve problems in their roots by preventive diplomacy, peace making, and post-conflict reconstruction. Preventing Diplomacy attempts to address those disputes that have potentials to break out into outright conflicts. The method that is used in preventive diplomacy is purely diplomatic negotiations. Peace making process, on the other hand, starts only after a

conflict has broken out into war. The methods of peace making are many. While the process of peace making gets under way, traditional peacekeeping will also have to be implemented to keep the forces apart; but in the meantime, measures are explored for resolving the main disputes. These can be holding a free and fair election as in Namibia and Mozambique, or solving the basic problems of territorial, environmental, legal, or political disputes. In all these attempts, diplomacy will again play important roles. Traditional peacekeeping requires consent of both the parties for UN mediation, but there are cases when such consent may not be available. In such cases, the UN cannot simply sit idle and see events go by, while millions are massacred. The concept of peace enforcement, therefore, has to be built into the concept of peace making for preventing unnecessary losses of life, and preventing one community or country exercise its ruthless domination over others.

Even if peace making is successful, peace may be transitory. Without a sound socio-economic order and infrastructure established, countries can revert to warring modes. Therefore, most UN missions now undertake post-conflict reconstruction for enabling the countries to manage their newly acquired peace, harmony and development on their own. To achieve that, humanitarian assistance is also extended during all those stages of peacekeeping. Great result is also achieved by means of arms control and by using the services of the regional organizations, as was done in the case of Bosnia-Herzegovina by EU and NATO. All these have been possible so far, only because of the collegial spirit of maintaining global peace with the concept of collective security that is reestablished after the end of the Cold War. In spite of those developments, many problems still remain. One of the problems is national will. Major powers still see conflict resolution in the light of their national interest. For example, there was a prolonged period of inaction in both Bosnia-Herzegovina and

Rwanda. In other words, the requirement of unanimity of opinions of the Permanent Five is often the cause of inaction. Secondly, no uniform standard of application of UN forces has yet been evolved. For example, while Iraq and North Korea can be sanctioned, nothing can be done about any conflict in more powerful countries. Therefore, instead of the requirement of unanimity of the Permanent Five, there could be a system of taking action on two-third majority vote in the Security Council. The size of the SC may even be expanded to include more than 10 members.

The most difficult of the problems of the UN is the financial problem. The number of conflicts and the subsequent increase in peacekeeping commitments has increased the burden of paying the bill. Since the Permanent Five have to pay the largest sum for all the missions, they often hesitate to initiate action. Many arguments have been put forward to solve the financial problems - by reducing the existing inefficiencies of the UN, on the one hand, and to explore the possibilities of raising fund, on the other hand. Some even contend that the UN should not over-extend its capabilities by involving itself in too many missions, because, in that case, it would go against the spirit of the Charter. The general consensus holds that the UN should address as many conflicts as possible. On the other hand, it is also true that much can be done to reduce UN's inefficiencies in handling administration and logistics. To do that, the UN will need to be reorganized to provide for clearer chain of command, correct priority in its policy, better training, lesser span of control of the Secretary General, and adequate personnel to handle the enormous tasks.

Many avenues should be explored to raise fund for UN peacekeeping; and indeed, much can be done. One of the ways is to ask the newly industrialized countries like South Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, etc., and the other rich countries like Saudi Arabia, Brunei, etc., to pay more for peacekeeping. The newest

idea floated by Boutros Boutros-Ghali was to raise money in a combination of assessed contribution, voluntary contribution and from commercial organizations. Although this idea was rebutted by USA, it is generally believed that the idea is sound, feasible and in keeping with the evolutionary nature of the UN itself and of peacekeeping. Lurking behind all these problems is the vagueness of the Charter of the United Nations. The same vagueness may sometimes serve the national interests of some countries. However, if the UN system is to be made more effective, the Charter will also have to be made more specific and inclusive of the recent concepts of peacekeeping.