

# The Paradigm Shift--from Traditional to Multidimensional Peacekeeping: Reflections on Achievements, Failures, Challenges, and Prospects in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

Benson, G.H (Associate Prof. /Ph.D.)  
Director for the Centre for Conflict, Human Rights and Peace Studies,  
University of Education, Winneba-Ghana  
ghbenson@yahoo.com

## Abstract

The peacekeeping concept dates back to pre-League of Nations days, starting with mere inter-positioning of military personnel operations to what we have today as multidimensional operations, since the inception of the United Nations (UN). It is an undebatable fact that the conflict management technique of peacekeeping remains one of the most effective tools that the UN has deployed in terms of international conflict management. Undeniably though, its implementation across the globe in the past has come with mixed results—successes, failures, and challenges. This paper evaluates the challenges and prospects of the phenomenon in this new millennium, having, however, analyzed the impact the technique has so far brought to bear on the international conflict management role of the UN in particular and the international community at large. The study is a content analysis of the concept of peacekeeping, using secondary and tertiary sources. Amidst the successes, failures, and challenges, the potency of peacekeeping as a global conflict management tool in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century is without a doubt. Nonetheless, what we need is efficient and effective reforms of the concept under the leadership of the United Nations system.

**DOI:** 10.7176/RHSS/13-4-04

**Publication date:** February 28<sup>th</sup> 2023

## Part 1: Introduction

It was once said that “*the United Nations might well claim that ‘I struggle therefore I live’; even if its state of crisis may appear to have become endemic*” (Mitrany, 1971:66). More than any other time in human history, our world is plunged neck-deep in violent conflicts of varied degrees, transcending national boundaries and all tongues (Benson, 2015). In that effort to fulfill its constitutional mandate of securing and maintaining international peace and security, the United Nations (UN) has adopted many strategies to resolve and manage the endemic conflicts that confront humanity. These UN conflict control strategies range from military enforcement actions to soft engagements such as the use of good offices and diplomacy, conflict resolution and transformation, mediation, negotiation, peacebuilding, peacekeeping, security council sanctions, and in extreme cases involving the use of war (UN, 2011).

Of these, peacekeeping remains one of the best international conflict management tools available to the UN and the international community in the last eight decades. As observed by Kennedy (2006, pp 77), ‘*out of all these images and ideas about the United Nations, international peacekeeping is perhaps one of the greatest testimonies to human progress in the conflict resolution process*. From the onset, peacekeeping as a conflict management technique was established as a pragmatic tool by the UN to deal with intractable and complex situations in spite of the fact that it was not originally crafted within the Charter. However, for the exigencies of the time and for the relevance of the peacekeeping strategy, the concept was given legal backing by the world body as coming under Chapter Six--and-a-half of the UN Charter as described by Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld (Meisler, 1995).

For all intent and purposes, the technique was originally designed by the UN to keep the peace in troubled spots through the inter-positioning of peacekeepers between combatants; the first of its kind was established during the 1948 Suez Canal crisis between Egypt and Lebanon (Bellamy and Williams, 2010). Since then, about 80 international peacekeeping operations have been undertaken under the auspices and direction of the UN across the five regional groupings--Africa, Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and America. With time, however, the phenomenon came to cover wider and more extensive functions, as motivated by the changing dynamics of international conflicts and the dynamism of the strategy in question (Benson, 2015).

The paradigm shift manifests in different ways and scopes. First, different types of peacekeeping operations have come to include conflict prevention, peacemaking, peace enforcement, and peacebuilding (Woodhouse & Ramsbotham, 2012). Second, the operations have become multifunctional that go beyond the traditional peacekeeping tasks of observation and interposition to also include complex operations such as election monitoring, humanitarian activities, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), and policing, *inter alai*. While traditional peacekeeping focuses on the prevention of violence, multidimensional missions focus on

building a more durable peace. Third, currently, peacekeeping involves not only the military but also civilians and police forces. Lastly, many non-UN actors such as states, governmental regional organizations, private individuals, and private companies, come to play key roles in international peacekeeping, though under the direction and supervision of the UN.

Undoubtedly, the UN together with these other non-UN actors has achieved feats in the field of conflict resolution and international conflict management using the peacekeeping technique. The Liberian case comes to mind as we reflect on the successful lessons of UNMIL (Benson, 2021). Be that as it may, a number of peacekeeping operations across the globe have met with failures amidst several challenges such as the Rwandan operations. Notwithstanding the failures and challenges, the peacekeeping strategy remains a reliable international conflict management instrument going forward in the new millennium (Benson, 2021). To that extent, the relevance of multidimensional peacekeeping operations as an effective international conflict management strategy today has been called to question given the spate of failures and challenges., perhaps explaining why Fortna (2008b) posed the question, ‘Does peacekeeping work’?

This paper investigates the challenges and prospects of the peacekeeping phenomenon in at least the next three decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Two major research questions underpin this study:

- (a) What factors account for the successes, failures, and challenges of past and present peacekeeping operations and how can the system be enhanced further, going forward in the future?
- (b) Are multidimensional peacekeeping operations relevant in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and what prospects and challenges await UN peacekeeping Missions across the globe?

## **Part 2: The Evolving Concept and Dynamics of International Peacekeeping Origins of Peace Operations**

In spite of the fact that the phenomenon of international peacekeeping is without historical depth within the context of the collective security architecture, its usage traces to the League of Nations when an international force of 3,300 British, Italian, Dutch, and Swedish troops were deployed in Saar in the early 1930s (James, 1990). Further, between 1920 and 1922, the international organization had undertaken peace operations within the plebiscites of Schleswig, Allenstein, and Marienwerder, the Klagenfurt Basin, Upper Silesia, and Sopron; where commissioners comprising civilians, police, and soldiers from neutral states numbering up to 3,000 troops, were deployed to bring peace to the troubled areas (MacQueen, 2006). Earlier, some forms of peace operations (even if remote) dating back to the Sixth and Seventh Century, were deployed to protect imperiled Christians in the Balkans and the Middle East, as well protect slaves from the hands of wicked leaders (Clark, 2005; Finnemore, 2003). For example in 1860, some form of peace operations were undertaken by France in Ottoman Syria to liberate the Maronite Christians. Bass (2008) also notes that in 1898, the United States intervened in Cuba after about 100,000 civilians lost their lives due to harsh Spanish policies using peace operations; whilst according to Booth & Wheeler (2008) the Concert of Europe in particular, was established as a catalyst for collective peace operations to protect the *status quo*.

White (1995) avers that the emergence and development of the peacekeeping function is one of the greatest achievements of the United Nations in its quest to maintain international peace and security. Rubinstein (2008) notes that peacekeeping as a concept, was developed under the United Nations system, taking place in several stages yet under two general patterns-- Observer missions that involved inter-positioning of soldiers between combatants and Peacekeeping missions that involve other functions such as humanitarian assistance, the protection of civilian populations and the training and reestablishment of national military. UN peacekeeping started with the authorization of UNSCOB (1947-51) and UNTSO (1948 until date) operations during the Cold War era. Between 1948 and 2023, the UN has undertaken about 73 peacekeeping operations across the world of which the majority are within the African Region, explaining why Adebajo (2011) referred to Africa as the theatre of UN peacekeeping missions. Currently, there are 12 UN peacekeeping missions across the globe represented as follows:

### **(a) Africa**

- i. United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara located within Morocco and the Sahrawi Republic following the Western Sahara conflict (MINURSO-1991).
- ii. United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo following the Kivu conflict (MONUSCO-2010).
- iii. United Nations Interim Security Force for Abyei located within Sudan following the Abyei conflict (UNISFA-2011).
- iv. United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan following the Sudanese Civil War (UNMISS-2011).
- v. Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali following the Northern Mali conflict (MINUSMA-2013.)
- vi. United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African

Republic following the Central African Republic Civil War (MINUSCA-2014).

**(b) Asia**

- i. United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan located within India and Pakistan following the Kashmir conflict (UNMOGIP-1949).

**(c) Europe**

- i. United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus following the Cyprus dispute (UNFICYP-1964).
- ii. United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo following the Kosovo War (UNMIK-1999).

**(d) Middle East**

- i. United Nations Truce Supervision Organization located within the Middle East following various conflicts and interventions (UNTSO-1948).
- ii. United Nations Disengagement Observer Force located within Syria, Israel, and Lebanon following the Yom Kippur War (UNDOF-1974).
- iii. United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon following the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the Israeli-Lebanon conflict (UNFIL-1978).

**Source: UN Information Department, 2023.**

### **Definitions and Characteristics of Peacekeeping**

Peacekeeping is a broad term and like the word 'power' its definition is variedly given within scholarship and general practice, reflective of the circumstances and intentions of the definer (Aksu, 2003; Bellamy & Williams, 2010; Diehl, 2008). To that extent, every military adventure tends to be labeled as peacekeeping in order to legitimize those actions. For instance, President George W. Bush did refer to US forces in Iraq as peacekeepers; whilst the Russian government recognized its counter-insurgency wars in Chechnya as peacekeeping operations (Finnemore, 2003; MacQueen, 2006). That notwithstanding, a few definitions are worthy of note.

According to Goulding (1993), a one-time Under-Secretary-General of the UN, peacekeeping operations are field operations established by the UN, usually with the consent of the parties with the aim of controlling and resolving conflicts between conflicting parties, under UN command using force to the minimum extent necessary and at the collective expense of member-states. This definition though elaborative excludes similar peace operations undertaken by non-UN actors. Second, Rubinstein (2008) explains that peacekeeping involves the prevention, containment, moderation, and termination of hostilities between or within states through the medium of third-party intervention, organized and directed internationally using the multinational military, police, and civilian personnel to restore and maintain peace. Third, Fetherston (1995) asserts that peacekeeping is a peaceful third-party intervention, which operates with the consent of the parties to the dispute. One that operates under a particular set of principles established in 1956 namely, the consent of the parties to the dispute, impartiality of the third parties, and non-use of force except in self-defense. Fourth, the International Peace Academy (1984) on its part defined peacekeeping as *'The prevention, containment, moderation, and termination of hostilities between or within states, through the medium of a peaceful third party intervention organized and directed internally, using multinational forces of soldiers, police and civilians to restore and maintain peace'*. Fifth, The US Department of Defense in a joint publication in 2007 defines peacekeeping as *'military operations undertaken with the consent of all major parties to a dispute, designed to monitor and facilitate implementation of an agreement (cease-fire, truce, or other such agreement) and support diplomatic efforts to reach a long-term political settlement'*.

Clearly, each one of the definitions above fails to capture the whole gamut of the ever-evolving peacekeeping concept that has come to include several non-UN actors as well as multidimensional peacekeeping functions. Nonetheless, the definition given by Bellamy and Williams (2010) appears in the circumstances to be more encompassing. According to them, peacekeeping operations, involve the expeditionary use of uniformed personnel (police and/or military) with or without UN authorization, with a mandate or program to do the following:

- (1) assist in the prevention of armed conflict by supporting a peace process,
- (2) serve as an instrument to observe or assist in the implementation of ceasefires or peace agreements, or
- (3) enforce ceasefires, peace agreements, or the will of the UN Security Council in order to build stable peace.

From whatever viewpoint, peacekeeping involves the deployment of a neutral force (military, police, and/or civilian personnel) in the field of hostilities by the United Nations, regional intergovernmental bodies, individual states, private individuals, or companies, with the aim of paving the way for a pacific resolution of conflicts that ensure the maintenance and restoration of international peace and security.

Each peacekeeping operation is unique in a sense and to that extent, an attempt to identify operations based

on a few restrictive characteristics may appear inaccurate and inappropriate. However, typical peacekeeping operations share certain basic characteristics thus: Peacekeeping operations are inherently reactive to international conflict (Claude, 1971); the authorization of peacekeeping missions is never open-ended (Diehl, 2008); and peacekeeping operations remain distinctly ad hoc, voluntary, and under the command of the UN.

### **Legal/Conceptual Principles of Peacekeeping Underlining Peacekeeping**

Four main legal or conceptual principles guide the creation and operations of peacekeeping missions namely; consent, neutrality, non-use of force, and voluntarism. These principles were affirmed in 1956 following the creation of an Emergency Force in the Middle East in the wake of the Suez crisis (Bellamy & Williams, 2010). The International Court of Justice (ICJ) further affirmed the legal principles of peacekeeping in the Expenses case. In that case, the ICJ stated that the UN Force (UNEF I) could enter the Egyptian territory to maintain order only upon the expressed consent of the Egyptian government; in compliance with UN General Assembly 2 November 1956 resolution (See I.C.J. Rep. 1962, 170 and 171). The peacekeeping Force should have no rights other than those necessary for the execution of its functions in cooperation with local authorities and the consent of the parties.

Second, Rubinstein (2008) asserts that for there to be an effective peacekeeping operation, third-party interveners (actors and peacekeepers) must show neutrality and impartiality throughout the processes. Going by this principle, peacekeepers are expected to conduct their activities in an impartial manner; reporting their field observations to the international community accurately and performing their functions even-handedly.

Third, the practice where peacekeepers are mostly slightly armed or made to operate without arms is informed by the 'non-use of force' principle. Peacekeepers within this context can only resort to the use of force for reasons of self-defense. To that extent, the use of force by any particular UN peace operation is guided in the broadest sense by its mandate as determined by the Security Council (Findlay, 2002).

Lastly, contributions towards peacekeeping operations in respect of personnel are on a voluntary basis, even though financial contributions by all member-states are mandatory. Hence, member-states are not under any compulsion to contribute personnel towards peacekeeping, explaining why a few member-states are involved in the exercise. It is only in recent practice that the permanent members of the UN Security Council (P-5) and other major powers are contributing personnel for peacekeeping purposes.

### **Functions of peacekeeping**

The four main types of UN peace operations that are in practice involve conflict prevention, peacemaking, peace enforcement, and peacebuilding. Owing to this, current peacekeeping operations that are multidimensional perform several functions, unlike in the past when peacekeepers only played the traditional role of observation. These functions include but are not limited to the following: Observation, buffer, policing for the maintenance of the law, capacity building, humanitarian assistance, peacebuilding, Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR), election monitoring, and economic and financial support for victims of conflict and local populations.

- i. Observation tasks involve the detection of violations of ceasefires on the part of disputants by peacekeepers, the creation of mechanisms to handle alleged violations and disputes over the interpretations of agreements, and the supervision of troop withdrawals (Diehl, 2008).
- ii. Peacekeepers serve as buffers as they are interposed between belligerent forces, preventing the conflicting parties from coming into direct contact, and thereby circumventing isolated hostile incidents or accidents that could escalate to full-scale war (Diehl, 2008; Mays, 2011).
- iii. Peacekeepers perform such police tasks as patrolling unsafe areas within conflict zones, and deterring crime and other hostile activities. With police personnel involved in peacekeeping activities, the facilitation and implementation of complex peace agreements, human rights promotion, and the maintenance of law and order in troubled spots, have come to be enhanced hugely (Mays, 2011; O'Neil, 2008).
- iv. Peacekeeping activities have come to include capacity building of the local population, police, administrative personnel, judicial personnel, and military personnel, amongst others; aimed at improving the skills of such personnel in their areas of operations through training programs and seminars.
- v. The humanitarian imperative remains a key component of the UN's service to humanity; hence, international peacekeeping has come to include humanitarian assistance where human suffering is averted in the wake of armed conflict and natural disasters. This assistance is mostly provided through many UN agencies notably; the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR).
- vi. There have been significant increases in the involvement of international and regional organizations,

- national governments, and non-governmental organizations in complex peacebuilding operations; aimed at stabilizing countries just emerging from conflicts (Paris & Sisk, 2009). Over the years, peacebuilding functions have come to include everything from preventive diplomacy and humanitarian aid to different types of civilian assistance, military operations, development activities, and post-conflict reconstruction (Barnett et al, 2007; Call, 2006; Lund, 2003). Other functions include training support for security personnel, election monitoring, promotion and protection of human rights, reformation, and strengthening of governmental institutions (Boutros-Ghali, 1992).
- vii. Peacekeeping has come to involve such activities as Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration (DDR), consisting of the collection of small arms, ammunition, and explosives from combatants; discharge of active combatants from armed forces and groups; and the provision of sustainable employment to ex-combatants.
  - viii. In the past, peacekeepers have successfully supervised and monitored electoral processes in Iraq (2005 and 2010), Liberia (2005 and 2011), Haiti (2006 and 2010), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (2006), Cote d'Ivoire (2010), Timor-Leste (2001 and 2002), *inter alia* (Sisk, 2009; UN, 2011).
  - ix. Peacekeeping missions through non-governmental organizations have come to provide support for victims of violent conflicts as well as vulnerable local populations, in terms of economic, financial, educational support, and skills training in the wake of conflicts so they can re-establish businesses and sustain their livelihoods (Mays, 2011).

### **Selected Theories and Concepts Underlining Peacekeeping**

Four theories underpin this study namely; Structural-functional Theory, Case-study Theory, Legal Theory, and Global Culture and Peace Operations Theory. For space constraints, these relevant theories are reviewed, *albeit* in brief.

First, the structural-functional theory as spearheaded by the likes of David Mitrany and Ernest Haas addresses the 'functional' aspects of international organizations under the caveat of collective security (Bellamy & Williams, 2005a). It explains the concept of a given societal phenomenon in terms of observed patterns of behavior in the matter of the maintenance of law and order of societies enraged by conflicts (Fortna, 2008b; Howard 2008). The theory investigates sets of human units (political, social, economic, and legal entities, *inter alia*) that take into account, the diversities of aggregation and articulation of interests (Bellamy & Williams, 2005a; Booth, 2007; Richmond 2003). The framework of the international peacekeeping concept as a conflict regulatory strategy stems from the structural-functional theory that emphasizes the adoption of strategic rules for conflict resolution.

Second, the Case study approach propounded by Richard A. Falk, Lawrence Scheinman, and David Wilkinson, places emphasis on in-depth analysis of issues on case-by-case bases, thereby aiding the researcher to relate his findings to the broader structure of his study. This approach offers significant insights into the field of international conflict management in which, peacekeeping is a formidable tool (Bellamy & Williams, 2010).

Third, the legal theory that is bed-rocked on the 'world government', 'balance of power,' and the 'collective security' models, traces conflicts and wars to evil ideologies which transcend national boundaries. The evil ideologies according to Ethridge and Handelman (2010) often cause the breakdown of international peace and order but can be subverted within the tenets and code of international law. United Nations peacekeeping is premised on this idealist viewpoint.

Lastly, Roland Paris (2003) drawing from the world polity theory asserts that the international normative environment also referred to as 'global culture', consists of both formal and informal social regulations that guide international life and shape peace operations in unique ways. To that end, peacekeeping agencies are predisposed to develop and implement strategies that are in common with global cultural norms since anything else would be counterproductive (Woodhouse & Ramsbotham, 2012). Global culture and peace operations theories within liberalism discourse give a clearer picture of the peacekeeping concept by determining the sorts of activities that are relevant for peace operations (Bellamy & Williams, 2010; Paris, 2004).

### **The legal framework for the establishment of peacekeeping missions**

It remains an intriguing puzzle that the peacekeeping concept even though one of the most effective UN conflict regulatory techniques, did not find expression in the Charter of the United Nations. To this end, many commentators have doubted the legality of peacekeeping, in spite of the fact that the International Court of Justice in the Certain Expenses case may have settled the question about its legality for once (Roberts, 1996). In contrast, Bellamy and Williams (2010) have explained that the development of the peacekeeping concept as a conflict management technique of the UN as long as its usage aids the restoration of global peace and security.

It would appear rather impossible for the UN Charter like any other dynamic constitutional document, to contain details of all the intentions of the organization in the strict sense of the word. Peacekeeping as a concept

may not have found expression in the Charter, nonetheless, it is the implied interpretation of the expressed word as found within the purposes and objectives of the Organization that task the world body and its member-states to maintain international peace and security using every other appropriate means (James, 1987). Specifically, one of the central purposes of the United Nations as set out in Article 1(1) is to maintain international peace and security, and to that end, the Security Council is enjoined to take effective but collective measures that will prevent and remove threats to global peace.

The rationale contained in the wording ‘to take effective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace’ according to Bellamy and Williams (2010), is the legal basis for peacekeeping. Specific measures are outlined in Chapters VI, VII, and VIII of the UN Charter within this context. Further, measures provided for under Articles 40, 41, and 42 are inconclusive, with Article 40 in particular, empowering the Security Council to apply such measures as it deems necessary and desirable in its quest to restore and maintain global peace, including the conflict regulatory tool of peacekeeping. Following these arguments, former UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld asserted that peacekeeping operations are authorized under Chapter Six-and-a-Half – between pacific and enforcement measures (Agyemang-Bioh, 2000; Bellamy & Williams, 2010).

According to Agyemang-Bioh (2000), the mandates, privileges, and immunities of peacekeepers as clearly spelled out within documents that establish missions, define the legal parameters of the peacekeeping doctrine. Such legal documents and directives include the Mandate of the mission; Status of Mission Agreements/Status of Force Agreement; Memorandum of Understanding; Rules of Engagement; the Secretary-Generals Directives; and the Force Commanders’ Directives.

Member-states in accordance with Article 24 of the UN Charter confer on the Security Council, the primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, and agree that the Council acts on their behalf in respect of this task. To that extent and pursuant to Articles 34 and 39, the Security Council plays the lead role regarding all forms of UN peace initiatives, including the creation of all peacekeeping and peace-enforcement missions (Ratner, 1995). However, the General Assembly is given a secondary role in such matters as it can only make recommendations to the Security Council, which alone may decide on the measures that in its opinion are fitting enough to resolve a particular conflict. The Assembly draws its competence from Articles 10 and 11; whilst under Article 99, the Secretary-General is enjoined to bring to the attention of the Security Council any situation that in his/her opinion may threaten international peace and security.

The formation of UN peacekeeping operations takes place in several stages. First, the Security Council (SC) determines the deployment of a mission in the wake of a conflict that in its opinion threatens international peace and security. Second, Secretary-General’s Secretariat deploys a technical field assessment mission to the country or territory where the operation is envisaged, to assess the overall security, political, military, humanitarian, and human rights implications on the ground and submits report to the Security Council through the Secretary-General. Third, the Security Council authorizes the operations through the adoption of a resolution (Erskine, 2000). At this stage, the budget and resource needs of the operation are brought before the General Assembly for perusal and approval. Fourth, the Secretary-General appoints a Head of Mission, usually his Special Representative who directs the operations of the mission in question. The Secretary-General also appoints the peacekeeping operation’s Force Commander and/or Police Commissioner and Senior Civilian Staff; whilst DPKO and DFS recruit other supporting civilian staff (Durch & Blechman, 1992). The fifth stage, which involves the planning stage, is undertaken by DPKO and DFS, *via* the provision of logistics and the setting up of the mission headquarters, amongst others. The sixth stage involves the selection of peacekeepers by contributing countries since the UN has no standing Force of its own, but is answerable to their country commanders. In the seventh stage, military troops, police, and civilian personnel are deployed to the host country. The top ten troop-contributing countries as at 2021 are as follows: Bangladesh (6,394), Rwanda (5,793), Ethiopia (5,589), Nepal (5,381), India (5,331), Pakistan (4,694), Egypt (3,068), Indonesia (2,635), China (2,388), and Ghana (1,936) (UN Information Department, 2023). Lastly, the Secretary-General is mandated to provide periodic reports and briefs to the Security Council, regarding the implementation of the mission mandate. SC reviews the reports and briefs and determines whether to renew or adjust the mission’s mandate as required, or even withdraw the mission.

### **The bureaucratic framework and funding of UN peace operations**

The Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), created in 1992 is directly responsible for the day-to-day running of peacekeeping operations. Hitherto, peace operations were assembled and managed on an *ad hoc* basis. Much as Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld tried to cure this deficiency through the creation of the Office for Special Political Affairs, the office only afforded the UN a limited planning and implementation infrastructure for peacekeeping operations (Bellamy & Williams, 2010).

DPKO was a creature of a major restructuring process of the UN Secretariat, aimed at enhancing the greater institutional capacity of the peacekeeping conflict control mechanism. The reformed UN peacekeeping structure in the words of Akashi (1998:125-136) has ‘*increasingly spread the responsibility widely, separating issues of planning of both the DPKO and the Department of Administration and Management from the Department of*

*Political Affairs(DPA) and the Executive Office of the Secretary-General*. The further creation of the Department of Field Support (DFS) in 2007 under Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon, is a manifestation of the dynamism in the entire UN reform process, especially in the area of peacekeeping.

DPKO is tasked with five main responsibilities to (DPKO, 2006; 2003):

- i. Monitor, analyze, and assess political development globally;
- ii. Identify potential or actual conflicts where the UN can play an important role in their control and resolution;
- iii. Make appropriate recommendations to the Secretary-General in respect of such actual or potential conflict cases;
- iv. Execute the approved diplomatic policy regarding the management of the conflicts; and
- v. Assist the Secretary-General in carrying out political activities decided by him or as mandated under the General Assembly or the Security Council in the areas of preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, arms control, and disarmament (Boutros-Ghali, 1995; UN,2011).

DPKO operates through sub-units that include the Office of Planning and Support for Mission Planning and Logistics, the Field Missions Procurement Section, the Permanently Staffed Situation Room, and the Lessons Learned Unit (UN, 2011). DFS on the other hand was created within the DPKO as a major reform to improve upon the UN's ability to manage and sustain current complex operations across the globe (DPKO, 2006). Under the current arrangement, whilst DPKO is responsible for strategic oversight and operational political guidance, DFS is tasked with the planning, deployment, and maintenance of operations. Some of its specific functions include the administration and management of field personnel, finances, and information/communications technology; working-level resource increment within DFS and DPKO and other units of the UN Secretariat; provision of logistics; and the initiation of new capacities and integrated structures to match the growing complexity of activities within its outfit (Bellamy and Williams, 2010; UN, 2011).

The issue of the funding of peace operations over the years has been very controversial. Following the financial crisis that the UN encountered during the Congolese operations in 1960-1964, a separate budget was set up for peacekeeping purposes. The General Assembly approves the budget, and apportions contributions of individual member-states of the UN based on a special scale of assessment applicable to peacekeeping, and relative to the economic well-being of member-states. However, the five permanent members of the Security Council pay a larger share because of their special status within the UN system (22 percent on top of their regular UN assessments) in particular regarding their role in the maintenance of international peace and security. The US remains the highest contributor to the fund (Durch & Berkman, 2006). This global 'burden sharing' can sometimes be in the form of human resources in lieu of financial resources. (Durch et al., 2003).

The scale is reassessed periodically to determine the most appropriate levels of assessment for three-year cycles. The current scale has ten levels ranging from A being the highest to J which is the lowest. The top ten contributors for the 2020-2021 financial year are as follows: the US (27.89 %), China (15.21%), Japan (8.56%), Germany (6.09%), UK (5.79 %), France (5.61 %), Italy (3.30%), Russian Federation (3.04%), Canada (2.73%), and the Republic of Korea (2.26 %). The remaining 19.52 percent is shared among the 183 member-states. The budget for UN peacekeeping operations for the 2021-2022 fiscal year was 6.3 billion US dollars (UN Information Department, 2023).

### **Part 3: The Paradigm Shift**

International peacekeeping has dominated the conflict management agenda of the United Nations for the past seventh decades, even though just a few missions are currently in operation as compared to the past. A United Nations report in 2012 suggests that of all the numerous UN conflict intervention activities across the globe, peacekeeping operations alone account for over fifty percent. Even though data on the ground does not support the earlier claims, the relevance of the international conflict mechanism in the new millennium is not in doubt. Following several years of practice, UN peacekeeping has continuously exhibited a pattern of paradigm shifts in its operations, composition, and administration.

#### **From Traditional to Multifunctional Peacekeeping**

There has been a paradigm shift from the original traditional inter-positioning of military personnel between combatants for the purposes of observation to the current multifunctional peacekeeping status. As already stated above, peacekeeping operations have come to include a multiplicity and complexity of functions other than the original observation function (Diehl, 2008; Durch, 2006b; Goulding, 1993). United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon (UNOGIL) and United Nations Observing Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG) are classical examples of traditional observer missions. However, current peacekeeping functions extend to the maintenance of law and order, capacity building, humanitarian assistance, peacebuilding, Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR), election monitoring, monitoring of borders, patrolling of buffer zones, facilitation of political resolution of conflicts and financial support for victims of conflict and local populations, *inter alia*.

Additionally, peacekeeping takes on several other complex functions. Wider second-generation peacekeeping operations have come to be deployed in volatile environments within states rather than between states, coming between the pacific and consensual provisions of Chapter VI and the enforcement measures of Chapter VII of the UN Charter, fondly referred to as ‘Chapter six-and-a-half peacekeeping’, as was instituted in the Rwandan and Sierra Leonean operations (O’Shea, 2002). Military personnel deployed in this type of peacekeeping are given tasks beyond that of traditional peacekeeping to include the separation of forces, disarming of belligerents, and monitoring of ceasefires (Berdal, 1993; Doyle et al., 1997; Melvern, 2000). Furthermore, preventive deployments have come to be instituted so as to prevent the emergence of violent conflicts and as well, prevent specific threats to civilian populations (Hampson & Malone, 2002). Former Secretary-General of the UN, Kofi Annan (2005a, pp 106) replicates the importance of preventive diplomacy when he stated that, *‘No task is more fundamental to the United Nations than the prevention and resolution of deadly conflict’*. Also, peace enforcement operations have taken center stage in current peacekeeping where recalcitrant belligerents have refused to cooperate with peacekeepers. Boutros-Ghali (1992, pp 42) emphasized the importance of peace enforcement by peacekeepers in his ‘An Agenda for Peace’. He stated, *[i]t is the essence of the concept of collective security as contained in the Charter that if peaceful means fail, the measures provided in Chapter VII should be used, on the decision of the Security Council, to maintain or restore international peace and security in the face of a ‘threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or an act of aggression’*. The UN invoked Chapter VII provisions in classic cases such as Iraq (1990) and Somalia (1992) in the form of military interventions (Findlay, 2002; Sarooshi, 2000). Moreover, peacekeeping has come to involve transition assistance operations, where military, police, and/or civilian personnel are deployed to assist parties to a conflict in the implementation of political settlements and the attainment of self-sustaining peace, which hitherto were heavily supported by international agencies (Bellamy & Williams, 2010; Caplan, 2005; Stromseth et al., 2006). Examples include the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC, 1991-1993) which directed a comprehensive political settlement involving public security provision, elections supervision, and human rights promotion; and the United Nations Transitional Assistance Group (Namibia) (UNTAG, 1989-1990), that monitored and supervised Namibia’s transition process involving elections, police activities and reform, and the disarmament and demobilization of former fighters. Lastly, peace support operations are multifaceted missions that combine a robust military force with a significant civilian component to verify peace agreements, offer humanitarian assistance, and transform war-torn societies into liberal democratic societies capable of sustaining stable peace (Cousens & Harland, 2006; Wilkinson, 2000). Examples include the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF, 2001) deployed in Afghanistan, following the demise of the Taliban regime, the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR), and the NATO-led Stabilization Force (SFOR) deployed in Bosnia between 1995 and 2004. These forces amongst other things oversaw the drawdown of regular military forces and the disbandment of irregular units and the supervision of the withdrawal of foreign forces (Cousens & Harland, 2006).

### **Composition of Peacekeeping Personnel**

The composition of peacekeepers came to include military personnel, the navy, police officials, and civilians (Hansen, 2002). Hitherto, peacekeeping was restricted to only military personnel. According to Costa (1995), the introduction of police officials into peacekeeping has greatly helped in transforming former government police personnel as well as many rebels into a new national police force in El Salvador, in particular. In the same vein, O’Neil (2008) alludes to the fact that policing in peacekeeping has successfully monitored human rights abuses in Haiti and engaged in the establishment of the rule of law, and fair and transparent judicial systems in Burundi and Afghanistan. Policing missions and operations include four basic types--executive policing, multidimensional policing, traditional policing, and capacity building (Bayley, 2006; Kroeker, 2007; Lin & Law, 2008). The principal role of executive policing is the provision of public security through the building of local capacity and the management of transitions (Patrick, 2006; Perito, 2002). Multidimensional policing includes the establishment and maintenance of public security; reformation, restructuring, and/or the rebuilding of indigenous law enforcement capacities as was seen United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) (Krasner & Pascual, 2005; Smith et al.2007a:19). Traditional policing operations involve the deployment of unarmed police officers charged with the monitoring and the implementation of police reforms and peace agreement as seen in United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) (Lin & Law, 2008; Smith et al., 2007a). Capacity-building policing operations target the development of local police personnel as well as local populations in the area of skills training and the implementation of reforms that create multi-ethnic, gender-sensitive, and democratic governance issues (Celador, 2005; Harris, 2005; Paris, 2002). The European Union Policing Mission (EUPM) in Bosnia-Herzegovina was mainly of this type as it was tasked to reform the Bosnian police into a ‘professional, political and ethnically neutral institution for judicial enforcement (Call, 2006; Hurwitz, 2008; Osland, 2004).

The involvement of civilian personnel in peacekeeping operations across the globe has brought phenomenal



gains in the area of international conflict management (Bull, 2008; Peake & Brown, 2005). Civilian peacekeepers are mainly engaged in peacebuilding activities, capacity-building activities, and humanitarian assistance (Stromseth et al., (2006). Within this context, they address core issues that affect the functioning of society and state and long-term relationships between disputants, underpinning not only the peacekeeping concept but also peacemaking (Call, 2006).

In the past, close to 99 percent of international peacekeeping operations (whether traditional or multifunctional) involved the deployment of land forces. It is only in very rare cases that naval forces are ever interposed between feuding factions that are separated by a body of water such as was the case in the Middle East (Diehl, 2008). Currently, naval forces have taken new roles beyond the interposition of forces between combatants to include escorting neutral ships through dangerous waters under the siege of belligerents, conducting minesweeping operations, verification of arms control treaties, and the verification of compliance with international environmental regulations (Prins, 1991).

### **The involvement of non-UN Actors in Peacekeeping**

International peacekeeping has come to be undertaken by both the UN and non-UN actors, as the UN is by no means the only legitimate organization to undertake peacekeeping operations. Presently several non-UN actors are successfully involved in numerous peacekeeping operations across the globe. These actors include regional international organizations, regional security alliances, individual states, and coalitions of willing and pivotal states. Examples of regional international organizations and regional security alliances that have undertaken peace operations in recent times include the African Union (AU), European Union (EU), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), amongst others. For example between 1999 and 2003, ECOWAS member-states deployed peacekeepers in Liberia during the Liberian Civil War; whilst the AU on its part fielded peacekeeping operations in Chad (1980-1982), Rwanda (1990-1993), and Eritrea and Ethiopia (2000), amongst others (Berman & Sams, 2003). The Organization of American States (OAS) launched a peacekeeping operation in the Dominican Republic in 1965, following civil unrest in that country; whilst NATO sent a mission to Afghanistan (Diehl, 2008).

In many instances, both UN and non-UN actors operate side by side as in the Balkans, Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, Liberia, and Timor-Leste. There are various partnerships in peacekeeping (MacQueen, 2006). Bellamy and Williams (2010) categorize them as follows:

- (i) Partnerships that involve the adoption of the sequential division of labor, where an actor that initially conducted an operation passes the peacekeeping baton to another actor as in the cases of the ECOWAS transfer of operations in Liberia to the UN in 2003 and the transfer of AU's peacekeeping responsibilities to the UN in the Burundian crisis;
- (ii) Partnerships where two or more actors have concurrently deployed missions within one particular conflict area as occurred between UNOMIG and the CIS in the Abkhazia/Georgia operations in 1993. It usually takes the form of linked peacekeeping-observation operations (Jones & Cherif 2004).
- (iii) The third type occurs where 'integrated operations' have been established as multiple institutions pool their resources and strengths under a single operation command as witnessed between the AU and UN in the African Union-United Nations Hybrid operation in Darfur (UNAMID) operations (Jones & Cherif 2004).

Currently, unilateral actors, pivotal states, and coalitions of the willing are venturing into international peacekeeping; notable among them are France, the United States, Australia, and the United Kingdom. Such operations include the French Operation Licorne in Cote d'Ivoire, the US-led UNITAF in Somalia, the Australian-led mission that assisted the UN in East Timor, and France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States collaboration in the Multinational Force I (MNF I) and Multinational Force II (MNF II), operations in Lebanon (Bellamy & Williams, 2010).

Private Security Companies (PSCs) since the 1990s have played significant roles in peace operations across the globe. PSCs, which are not monolithic, are categorized into 'peace and stability industry', 'contingency contractors', or 'battlespace contractors' (Avant (2005). For instance, the Military Professional Resources Incorporated (MPRI) has played an advisory role in the Croatian operations, whilst the Defense Systems Limited (DSL) has provided logistics, intelligence, and other forms of support in the Democratic Republic of Congo and security for UN infrastructure and personnel in Kinshasa. The Pacific Architects and Engineers (PAE) have provided logistical support to peacekeeping operations in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) and Liberia (ECOMOG). Nevertheless, many scholars and practitioners contest the involvement of private companies in peacekeeping processes. Annan (1998a) once said, '*security is such an important matter that, the world may not be ready to privatize peace*'. (Annan 1998a).

Lastly, peacekeeping has come to embrace the essence of culture in the deployment of missions. This follows the incidence of UNEF in 1957 when some troops mistakenly opened fire on a muezzin who was calling

the Muslim faithful to prayer. The troops did not understand Arabic or Islam and had taken the call for prayer as a call for civil disorder (Rubinstein, 2008). Aside from this incident, the work of peacekeepers is hampered greatly when they cannot understand local cultures and as such fail to interpret or respond appropriately to the actions of the people. To these ends, issues of culture have come to be embedded in peacekeeping undertakings where peacekeepers are given lessons on local cultures before the start of operations (Duffey, 2000).

#### **Part 4: United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Achievements, Failures, and Challenges in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

##### **Relevance and Achievements**

Pursuant to its primary task of maintaining international peace and security across the globe, the UN has often adopted several conflict control strategies, a few of which have yielded maximal results while others are woeful failures. International peacekeeping is one of the few approaches through which the UN has proven beyond all reasonable doubts that it is up to its primary task of restoring and maintaining global peace and order in conflict-ridden areas, thereby giving the technique prominence within the international conflict management terrain. Hence, its frequent use by the United Nations and other non-UN actors both in the past and at the turn of the new century does not come as a surprise.

Undoubtedly, the technique of multifunctional peacekeeping as a UN conflict resolution approach has underscored overwhelming achievements, especially in the area of managing intractable intra-state conflicts (Mays, 2011). For these reasons, the UN throughout the last half of the last century and the beginning of this new century, has not relented in its efforts to not only use the technique but also reform the phenomenon in response to the exigencies of the time. By the year 2000 for example, UN peacekeeping had successfully negotiated 172 peaceful settlements, helped in ending the Iran-Iraq War, stopped the Civil Wars in El Salvador and Namibia, and succeeded in spearheading the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan (Barash & Webel, 2002). Tens of war-torn countries including Liberia, Sierra Leone, Yugoslavia, Haiti, and Cambodia, have had peace restoration through peace operations. In record time, the UN has prevented the escalation of hostilities in many areas across the globe, when peacekeepers are deployed in those areas to serve as buffers between combatants.

It is worth noting that, the majority of the over 70 peacekeeping missions deployed in the five regions of the world- Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe, and the Middle East, ended on successful notes in the accomplishment of their Security Council-mandated tasks. Failed states were put back onto the global map once more as a constitutional rule and the rule of law was reinstated in those countries. In that light, democratic elections were successfully organized in countries such as Liberia and El Salvador, restoring good governance. Tattered economies that resulted from years of conflict were revamped through the support of peacekeeping operations (Bellamy & Williams, 2010). Humanitarian services are afforded to refugees and vulnerable local populations through UN agencies and in some instances by a coalition of individual states, non-governmental organizations, and private individuals as in UNAMSIL.

Further, capacity building is extended to local populations and public servants, while many are usually given financial support to restart businesses as seen in the Sierra Leonean case. Additionally, post-conflict restructuring in terms of infrastructural facility provisions is drawn from the multifunctional peacekeeping activities. Moreover, through the peacebuilding function of peacekeeping, long-lasting relationships are restored between combatants. Indeed, the achievements of the UN in the field of international conflict management are phenomenal, and one can go on and on. Mark (2007) argues that peacekeeping has aided the reduction of volatile intra-state and inter-state conflicts in terms of intensity. At the same time, peacekeepers do facilitate peace agreements, significantly reducing the likelihood and lethality of wars (Bellamy & Williams, 2010; Fortna, 2008b).

In conclusion, many peacekeeping missions including ONUCA, ONUSAL, UNTAC, ONUMOZ, UNPROFOR, UNMIS, UNGOMAP, UNIIMOG, and UNOMIL are success stories, where peace operations prevented, slowed down, or stopped genocide and mass killings and resolved conflicts among states (Krain, 2005). Moreover, peace operations have made immense contributions to building stable and democratic societies and promoted human rights in both medium and long-term cases (Carayannis, 2007; Sambanis, 2000). Coming from the back of these marvelous achievements, the answer to the question if peacekeeping works is a clear and resounding yes (Fortna, 2008b).

##### **Challenges and Failures**

The achievements mentioned above notwithstanding, the relevance of peacekeeping within the new millennium has been strongly contested, given foremost, the costly nature of operations that normally take a chunk of the UN budget. Many are they who think that its continuous use amounts to a huge waste of resources in reflection of failed missions, while others have 'plucked holes' in the *modus operandi* of the operations. To that extent, cynics have insisted that international peacekeeping has outlived its usefulness and is no longer relevant in the present circumstances. Bill Clinton at the time of his presidency of the United States adopted a much tougher line on

peace operations, being frustrated by the failure of the peacekeeping mission in Somalia. During September 27, 1993, General Assembly Session, he expressed his dissatisfaction thus:

*“In recent weeks, in the Security Council, our nation has begun asking harder questions about proposals for new peacekeeping missions: is there a real threat to international peace? Does the proposed mission have clear objectives? Can an endpoint be identified for those who will be asked to participate? How much will the mission cost? The United Nations simply cannot become engaged in every one of the world’s conflicts. If the American people are to say yes to UN peacekeeping, the United Nations must know when to say no (Parsons, 1995: 252).”*

Not only has the United States questioned some aspects of peacekeeping but also Belgium, which had expressed skepticism following the murder of ten of its peacekeepers by extremist militia during the Rwandan genocide (Wheeler, 2000). Clearly one of the biggest challenges facing the UN and its peacekeeping activities across the globe today is that many member-states and powerful states at that do not support the continuity of operations. Another piercing challenge is that member-states have both in the past and present exhibited their non-commitment to this course in their failure to make adequate remittances to the yearly peacekeeping budget, making the sponsorship of peacekeeping missions of the world body a difficult one. It, therefore, does not come as a surprise that current UN peacekeeping across the globe have been downsized to only 12 operations, even though there still exist trouble spots that qualify for the institution of peacekeeping operations.

Others while emphasizing the relevance of less costly conflict resolution measures such as mediation, negotiation, conciliation, settlement, conflict resolution, conflict transformation, and the use of diplomacy, have deemphasized the relevance of peacekeeping in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and beyond. The Indian-Pakistani issue is often cited where the use of diplomacy rather than peacekeeping has in large part, resolved the crisis (Mays, 2011). In the case of the Northern Ireland conflict (between protestant and catholic populations), results have shown that the adoption of such techniques as mediation, conciliation, and conflict resolution has paid off pretty well, whereas the application of peacekeeping operations in less volatile situations as was the case in Haiti have yielded fewer results (Bloomfield, 1997a).

Soldiers’ wrongdoings, which involve the rape of women and girls, the routine use of local young and adult women for the manufacture of pornographic films, the spread of deadly diseases including HIV/AIDS, and corrupt practices by peacekeepers, have cast spells on the peacekeeping concept (Martin, 2005; Razack, 2004). Though not against the setting up of peacekeeping operations, Higate and Henry (2009) have lamented the situation where some peacekeepers have commodified the bodies of vulnerable women as part of a barter system, placing them at risk of unwanted pregnancies, STIs, and HIV/AIDS. Such acts have ruined local economies, stimulated heightened levels of prostitution and human trafficking, and caused increases in HIV/AIDS cases.

Furthermore, the *modus operandi* of some peacekeeping operations has come under scrutiny because rather than being persuasive, they have become combative, reminiscent of wartime encounters (Chesterman, 2004). This has led to the failures of such operations as UNAMIR (Rwanda), UNOSOM I and II (Somalia), UNIVEM III (Angola), and IFOR (Bosnia) and their subsequent withdrawals. For example, in 1994, the world body and its peacekeepers infamously stood by as Rwanda burned following the slaughter of close to one million Tutsi and Hutu moderates, far exceeding that of the Nazi Holocaust massacres of World War II (Martin, 2005). The failure of UNAMIR to have stopped or at least limited the massacres at the start of the genocide had almost eroded the confidence the international community had in UN peacekeeping. Consequently, there was a sharp decline in the use of the peacekeeping tool with regard to managing violent conflicts since member-states became reluctant in contributing their quota towards peacekeeping activities across the globe. The UNOSOM operations in Somalia were a fatal failure too. In 1992 alone, about 350,000 Somalis died because of the deadly combination of protracted Civil War and famine, as the peacekeepers haplessly looked on (Clark & Herbst, 1997). A few others recorded classic failures including UNAVEM I and UNAVEM II (Angola) where over 300,000 were killed, and the NATO-led operations in Serbia where gruesome killings in the name of ‘ethnic cleansing’ were ongoing, as the peacekeepers failed to protect Srebrenica and its people from the Bosnian Serb Army (Fortna, 2008b; Honig & Both, 1996). Lastly, the proliferation of peacekeeping actors and the problem of ineffective coordination has hampered peacekeeping operations in significant terms (Abi-Saab 1995).

## Conclusion

The peacekeeping concept has evolved over the years within the collective security system, having proven to be a potent conflict management tool (Kennedy, 2006). The UN, in particular, has transformed the tool over the years into an effective multidimensional conflict management apparatus. Within that context, many intractable conflicts across the globe have seen resolution, using multifunctional and dynamic approaches (Bellamy & Williams, 2010). Further, peace operations have not only prevented and stopped killings of local populations but also made immense contributions to the building of stable and democratic societies, thus reechoing its relevance in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Carayannis, 2007). To that end, this paper affirms Fortna’s (2008b) assertion that peacekeeping works.

That stated, UN peacekeeping is not a perfect model as it is sometimes saddled with infractions and failures as seen in the Rwandan and Serbian cases. Many reasons are attributed to these failures such as the proliferation of peacekeeping actors that sometimes make coordination and supervision of operations ineffective. The unprofessional conduct of peacekeepers has also cast spells on the system, not to mention the shortfalls within the UN system (UN Security Council) itself regarding the setting up of missions (Abi-Saab 1995). Nonetheless, some missions have failed following the numerous challenges that befuddle peacekeeping processes and the effective functioning of missions including foremost, inadequate funding of peace operations and the non-commitment of member-states towards the establishment of an effective system that will manage international conflicts.

Notwithstanding the fact that the peacekeeping retreats of the early 1990s signaled the monumental insignificance of the conflict management technique, their current resurgence since the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup>-century points to their relevance as potent tools for conflict control and management (Adebajo, 2011). The continuous use of UN peacekeeping in the field of international conflict management holds several prospects in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Through its multifunctional operations, stronger societies are built out of savaged situations, intractable conflicts are resolved to their root causes, human rights are protected and promoted, ill-trained local populations are given the necessary skills to enhance their livelihoods, and the core task of the maintenance of global peace and order by the UN is accomplishable through effective peacekeeping.

Yet still, the UN peacekeeping structure needs reforms and enhancement in our efforts to carve a reliable and effective conflict management mechanism in peacekeeping throughout the years. To that end, this paper makes the following recommendations:

- (a) The UN Secretariat be enhanced in a way that will inspire member-states' commitment to providing adequate funding for peace operations;
- (b) The Security Council should move out of its current reactionary posture into one of prevention, where prompt actions and appropriate policies are taken in the wake of situations that threaten global peace and security;
- (c) Inadequacies and unprofessional actions of peacekeepers should be addressed head-on;
- (d) Both the DPKO and DFS should be expanded and technically equipped to handle complex operations and effectively coordinate and supervise multidimensional peace operations across the globe, giving the multiplicity of peacekeeping actors (Bellamy & Williams, 2010);
- (e) The UN should begin to consider raising its own peacekeepers to cut down the cost of operations as well as achieve effectiveness (Barcena, 2007; Pugh, 2008).

## References

- Abi-Saab, G. (1995). 'United Nations Peacekeeping Old and New: An Overview of the Issues. In Warner, D. (ed), *New Dimensions of Peacekeeping*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Adebajo, A. (2011). *UN Peacekeeping in Africa: From the Suez Crisis to the Sudan Conflicts*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Agyemang-Bioh, N.P.E. (2000). *Preparing for the United Nations International Peacekeeping Operations in the Third Millennium*. Imagine Consult.
- Akashi, Y. (1998) 'Managing United Nations Peacekeeping', in W. Biermann and M. Vadset (eds.), *UN Peacekeeping in Trouble*. Ashgate.
- Aksu, E. (2003) *The United Nations, Intra-state Peacekeeping and Normative Change*. Manchester University Press.
- Annan, K. (2005a) *In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All*. UN doc. A/59/2005, 21 March.
- Annan, K. (1998a) Speech at Ditchley Park, UK. UN press release SG/SM/6613, 26 June.
- Avant, D. (2005). *The Market for Force*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barash, D. P., & Webel, C.P. (2002). *Peace and Conflict Studies*. Sage Publications.
- Barnett, M., D. Kim, M. O'Donnell, and L. Sitea (2007) 'Peacebuilding: What's in a Name?' *Global Governance*, (13) 3: 35-58.
- Bass, G. J. (2008). *Freedom's Battle: The Origins of Humanitarian Intervention*. Alfred Knopf.
- Bayley, D. H. (2006) *Changing the Guard: Developing Democratic Police Abroad*. Oxford University Press.
- Bellamy, A. J., & Williams, P.D. with S. Griffin (2010). *Understanding Peacekeeping*. Polity Press.
- Bellamy, A.J., & P.D. Williams, P.D. (eds.) (2005a). *Peace Operations and Global Order*. Frank Cass.
- Benson, G.H. (2021). Peacekeeping Operations in Africa: Liberian Lessons, a Platform for Deepening Future UN Peacekeeping Engagements. *European Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol.2, Issue 1, pp.1-21.
- Benson, G.H. (2015). International Peacekeeping and Conflict Management: The Impact of Current Challenges on Peacekeeping Operations. *The Social Educator*; Vol. 4, Issue 36, pp. 144-167.
- Berdal, M. (1993). *Whither UN Peacekeeping? An Analysis of the Changing Military Requirements of UN*

- Peacekeeping with Proposals for Its Enhancement*. Adelphi Paper. Brassey's for the International Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Berman, E. G., & Sams, K.E. (2003). 'The Peacekeeping Potential of African Regional Organizations', in J. Boulden (ed), *Dealing with Conflict in Africa: The United Nations and Regional Organizations*. Palgrave Macmillan:35-67.
- Bloomfield, D. (1997a). *Peacemaking Strategies in Northern Ireland: Building Complementarity in Conflict Management Theory*. Macmillan.
- Booth, K. (2007). *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge University Press.
- Booth, K., & N. J. Wheeler, N.J. (2008). *The Security Dilemma*. Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Boutros-Ghali, B. (1995a). *Supplement to An Agenda for Peace*. UN doc. A/47/277-S/24111, 3 January.
- Boutros-Ghali, B. (1992) *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking, and Peacekeeping*. UN Department of Public Information.
- Bull, C. (2008) *No Entry without Strategy: Building the Rule of Law under UN Transitional Administration*. UN University Press.
- Call, C. T. (2006). *Constructing Justice and Security after War*. US Institute of Peace.
- Caplan, R. (2005). *International Governance of War-Torn Territories*. Oxford University Press.
- Carayannis, T. (2007). "The Impact of the ICC on the DR Congo (DRC)," Draft Report given at the *International Conference on Building a Future with Peace and Justice*. Nuremberg, June 25-27: 1-2.
- Chesterman, S. (2004). *You, The People: The United Nations, Transitional Administration, and State-Building*. Oxford University Press.
- Clark, I. (2005). *Legitimacy in International Society*. Oxford University Press.
- Clarke, W., & Herbst, J. (1997). *Learning from Somalia: The Lessons of Armed Humanitarian Intervention*. Westview.
- Claude, I.L. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) (1971). *Swords into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization*. Random House.
- Celador, G. C. (2005). Police Reform: Peacebuilding through "Democratic Policing?" *International Peacekeeping*, 12(3): 364-76.
- Costa, G. (1995). The United Nations and the Reform of the Police in El Salvador', *International Peacekeeping*, 2(3): 365-90.
- Cousens, E.M., & Harland, D. (2006). 'Post-Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina'. In Durch, W.J (ed.), *Twenty-First Century Peace Operations*. US Institute of Peace: 49-140.
- Diehl, P.F. (2008) *Peace Operations*. Polity.
- Doyle, M. W., Johnstone, I. & Orr, R.C. (eds.) (1997). *Keeping the Peace*. Cambridge University Press.
- DPKO (2006) *Draft Capstone Doctrine for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations-Draft 2*.
- DPKO (2003) *Handbook on United Nations Multidimensional Peacekeeping Operations*. New York: DPKO Best Practices Unit.
- Duffey, T. (2000). 'Cultural Issues in Contemporary Peacekeeping'. In Woodhouse, T. & Ramsbotham, O. (eds.) *Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution*. Frank Cass.
- Durch, W. (2006b) *Twenty-First- Century Peace Operations*. US Institute of Peace.
- Durch, W. J. & Berkman, T.C. (2006). 'Restoring and maintaining Peace: What we know So Far'. In Durch, W.J. (ed), *Twenty-First Century Peace Operations*. US Institute of Peace: 1-48.
- Durch, W.J., & Blechman, B.M. (1992). *Keeping the Peace: The United Nations in the Emerging World Order*. The Henry L. Stimson Centre.
- Durch, W. J., Holt, V.K., Earle, C.R. & Shanahan, M.K. (2003). *The Brahimi Report and the Future of the UN Peace Operations*. Henry L. Stimson Center.
- Erskine, E. (2000). *Peace-keeping Techniques for Africa's Conflict Management*. Afram Publications Ghana Limited.
- Ethridge, M., & Handelman, H. (2010). *Politics in a Changing World: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science*. Wordsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Fetherston, A. (1995). *Towards a Theory of United Nations Peacekeeping*. St. Martin's Press.
- Findlay, T. (2002). *The Use of Force in UN Peace Operations*. Oxford University Press for SIPRI.
- Finnemore, M. (2003). *The Purpose of Intervention*. Cornell University Press.
- Fortna, V.P. (2008b). Does Peacekeeping Work? Shaping Belligerents'' *Choices after civil war*. Princeton University Press.
- Goulding, M. (1993). The Evolution of the United Nations Peacekeeping. *International Affairs*, 69(3):451-64.
- Hampson, F.O. & D. Malone, D. (2002). Improving the UN's Capacity for Conflict Prevention. *International Peacekeeping*, 9(1):77-98.
- Hansen, A.S. (2002) *From Congo to Kosovo: Civilian Police in Peace Operations*. Adelphi Paper no.343. Oxford University Press.

- Higate, P., & M. Henry, M. (2009). *Insecure Spaces: Peacekeeping, power and performance in Haiti, Kosovo and Liberia*. Zed Books.
- Harris, F. (2005). *The Role of capacity-Building in Police Reform*. OSCE.
- Honig, J.W., & Both, N. (1996). *Srebrenica: Record of a War Crime*. London: Penguin.
- Howard, L.M. (2008). *UN Peacekeeping in Civil Wars*. University Press.
- Hurwitz, A. (2008). 'Civil War and the Rule of Law: Toward Security, Development and Human Rights'. In Hurwitz, A. (ed.). *Civil War and the Rule of Law*. Lynne Rienner: 1-20.
- International Court of Justice Report (1962). Articles 170 and 171.
- International Peace Academy (1984). *Peacekeeper's Handbook*. International Peace Academy.
- James, A. (1990). *Peacekeeping in International Politics*. Macmillan with the IISS.
- James, A. (1987). 'United Nations peacekeeping and non-alignment'. In Rajan, M.S, et al., *The Non Aligned and the United Nations* 93-9.
- Jones, B.D., & Cherif, F. (2004). Evolving Models of Peacekeeping: Policy Implications and Responses. UN: Peacekeeping Best Practices Unit External Study, <http://pbpu.unlb.org/pbpu/library/Bruce%20Jones%20paper%20with%20logo.pdf>.31/03/ 12.
- Kennedy, P. (2006). *The Parliament of Man: The Past, Present and the Future of the United Nations*. Vintage Books.
- Krain, M. (2005). International Intervention and the Severity of Genocides and Politicides. *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(2): 363—87.
- Krasner, S. D. & Pascual, C. (2005). Addressing State Failure. *Foreign Affairs*, 84(4): 153-63.
- Kroeker, M. (2007). 'Role of UN Police from Observing to "Coaching", Top Adviser Says', UN News Service, 27 January.
- Lin, T. & P. Law, P. (2008). 'Objectives-based policing Typology', paper presented to the Oceanic Conference on International Studies, 2-4 July.
- Lund, M. (2003). 'What Kind of Peace Is Being Built? Taking Stock of Post-Conflict Peacebuilding and Charting Future Directions.' Paper prepared for the International Development Research Centre, (January).
- MacQueen, N. (2006). *Peacekeeping and the International System*. Routledge.
- Mark, A. (2007). *Global Political Violence: Exploring the post Cold War Decline* (Coping with Crisis Working Paper, New York: International Peace Academy).
- Martin, S. (2005). *Must Boys Be Boys: Ending Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in UN Peacekeeping Missions?* Refugees International.
- Mays, T. M. (2011). *Historical Dictionary of Multinational Peacekeeping*. Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Meisler, S. (1995). *United Nations: The First Fifty Years*. The Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Melvorn, L. (2000). *A People Betrayed: The Role of the West in Rwanda's Genocide*. Zed Books.
- Mitrany, D. (1971). *The UN in Historical Perspective in the Evolving United Nations: A Prospect for peace* (ed.) Twitshell.
- O'Neill, W. G. (2008). 'UN Peacekeeping Operations and the Rule of Law Programs'. In Hurwitz, A. (ed.), *Civil War and the Rule of Law*. Lynne Rienner: 91-113.
- O'Shea, B. (2002). 'The Future of UN Peacekeeping', *Conflict and Terrorism*, 25(2):145-8.
- Osland, K. M. (2004). The EU Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *International Peacekeeping*, 11(3): 544-60.
- Paris, R. (2004). *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*. Cambridge University Press.
- Paris R. (2003). Peacekeeping and the Constraints of Global Culture. *European Journal of International Relations*, 9(3): 441-73.
- Paris, R. (2002). International Peacebuilding and the Mission Civilisatrice. *Review of International Studies*, 28(4):637-56.
- Paris, R. & Sisk, T.D. (2009). Understanding the Contradictions of Postwar Statebuilding. In Paris, R. & Sisk, T.D. (eds), *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations*. Routledge.
- Parsons, A. (1995). *From Cold War to Hot Peace*. Michael Joseph.
- Patrick, S. (2006). Weak States and Global Threats: Fact or Fiction?. *Washington Quarterly*, 29(2): 27-53.
- Peake, G., K. & Brown, S. (2005). Police building: The International Deployment Group in the Solomon Islands', *International Peacekeeping*, 12(4): 520-32.
- Perito, R. (2002). 'National Police Training within an Executive Policing Operation'. In Dwan, R. (ed.), *Executive Policing: Enforcing the Law in Peace Operations*. Oxford University Press for SIPRI: 85-101.
- Prins, G. (1991). The United Nations and Peace-Keeping in the Post-Cold-War World: The case of Naval Power. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 22:135-55.
- Pugh, M. (2008). 'Peace Operations', in P. D. Williams (ed.). *Security Studies: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, pp.407-21.

- Ratner, S. (1995). 'Peacemaking, Peacekeeping, and Peace Enforcement: Conceptual and Legal Underpinnings of the U. N. Role'. In S. S Harrison, S.S. & Nishihara, M. (eds) *UN Peacekeeping: Japanese and American Perspectives*. Carnegie.
- Razack, S. H. (2004). *The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping and the New Imperialism*. Toronto: University Press Richmond. (2003). 'Introduction: NGOs, Peace and Human Security'. In Richmond, O. (ed.), *Mitigating Conflict: The Role of NGOs*. Frank Cass: 1-11.
- Roberts, A. (1996). 'The United Nations: Variants of Collective Security'. In Woods, N. (ed.), *Explaining International Relations Since 1945*. Oxford University Press: 309-36.
- Rubinstein, R.A. (2008). *Peacekeeping Under Fire: Culture and Intervention*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Sambanis, N. (2000). Partition as a Solution to Ethnic War: An Empirical Critique of the Theoretical Literature. *World Politics* 52(4): 437-83.
- Sarooshi, D. (2000). *The United Nations and the Development of Collective Security*. Oxford University Press.
- Sisk, T. D. (2009). 'Pathways of the Political: Electoral Processes after Civil War'. In Paris, R. & Sisk, T.D. (eds), *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations*. Routledge.
- Smith, J. G., Holt, V.K. & Durch, W.J. (2007a). *Enhancing United Nations Capacity to Support Post-Conflict Policing and Rule of Law*. Henry L. Stimson Center.
- Stromseth, J., Wippman, D. & Brooks, R. (2006). *Can Might Make Rights? Building the Rule of Law after Military Interventions*. Cambridge University Press.
- United Nations (2023). *UN Peacekeeping*. UN Information Department.
- United Nations (2011) *Basic Facts about the United Nations*. United Nations Department of Public Information. United Nations Charter > [www.un.org/en/documents/charter/intro.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/intro.shtml)29/03/12.
- Wheeler, N.J. (2000). *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society*. Oxford University Press.
- White, N. D. (1995). *Keeping the peace: The United Nations and the maintenance of international peace and security*. Manchester University Press.
- Wilkinson, P. (2000). Sharpening the Weapons of Peace: Peace Support Operations and Complex Emergencies. *International Peacekeeping*, 7(1): 61-79.
- Woodhouse, T. & Ramsbotham, O. (2012). *Peacekeeping in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Cosmopolitanism and the Globalization of Security* (Cass Series on Peacekeeping). Routledge.