

PAMUN XVI RESEARCH REPORT— Redefining the function of UN intervention forces

Introduction of Topic

Among many other things, one of the primary aspirations of the United Nations is to bring peace and stability throughout the world. Although often considered an ambitious objective, in many instances, the UN has proven its commitment to this goal, by being one of the first and most impactful organizations to reach and bring help to nations in need. In countries ravaged by war, famine and disease, the United Nations carries out several different procedures in order to bring order and stability to the region they are operating in, and efficiently accomplish their goals. Among all the aid, expertise, and overall help provided, the UN is very well known, both for good and bad reasons, regarding its deployment of intervention forces or Peacekeepers in regions in need. The so-called “Blue Helmets” or UN Peacekeeping troops have played a major role in both the establishment of the UN’s image and the completion/incompletion or success and failure of its missions.

As it stands today, the image and overall perception of the UN Peacekeepers, which in turn reflects on the UN itself, is not great. Mainly based on past failures and scandals, the growing cost of its missions, its lack of efficiency, and other issues, the UN intervention forces have been labelled with a poor reputation at a time, where their services are the more necessary than ever. A testament to this is that despite its troubled image and tendency not to succeed, there is a recent growth in demand for UN Peacekeepers. However, there are also other cases in which the UN consciously and intentionally deploys Peacekeeping troops in nations without the ruling government’s consent. Yet, there are 16 impressive, active Peacekeeping missions, some of which have lasted for more than a decade, are not of the immediate concern to the United Nations, but rather and more specifically the function of these forces.

The past challenges and defeats of the UN intervention forces, have not only tarnished their own and the UN’s image, but have also aggravated some of the UN’s member states. Some of these nations, whom have contributed some of their own soldiers to these forces, have grown reluctant to do so again. This raises many questions and concerns about this UN “ritual” or procedure, in such a sensitive time in global affairs. Although the use and employment of armed troops is not the UN’s favored method of resolving issues, it is a method which has been necessary and called upon in the past. Yet the numerous issues revolving around it have raised questions, as to how to make these forces more efficient and perhaps have to redefine their function, as to prevent problems in the future. This report will cover this question, as well as the major issues revolving around the UN Peacekeeping troops, some of the major

players involved, background knowledge on the issue, and others, in the hopes to come to a consensus as to what the UN should do on the topic of its intervention forces.

Definition of Key Terms

UN Armed Forces, UN Intervention Forces, Peacekeepers

All of the terms above, as they are used in the report, are meant to represent the same thing, the UN Peacekeeping Forces. Although there are slight nuances between some of these, unless mentioned, they all globally refer to the UN Peacekeeping Forces (soldiers, policemen, and other personnel).

UN or Organization

Similarly, these both refer to the United Nations. Whenever the word “Organization” is used it refers to the United Nations, as it is similarly done so in the UN Charter.

Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)

Although briefly explained below, the DPKO is the organization that deals with the UN’s Peacekeeping Forces. It monitors, supervises, and manages both its armed forces and its missions. It is essentially a branch of the UN that is entirely dedicated to Peacekeeping.

Background Information

As it currently stands, or how it was intended to stand as it is stated in the UN Charter, the role and function of the UN intervention forces or Peacekeepers is, “to maintain or restore international peace and security”. In the UN Charter, Peacekeepers or as they are referred to in the text “armed forces”, are one of the many tools used by the UN and its member states to try to uphold or restore peace. Other such tools or methods involve the provision of not only armed forces from member states, but also expertise, assistance, and facilities. The UN Peacekeeping forces, under the supervision of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), are sent off to regions of conflict and turmoil to try and accomplish their aforementioned goal. The Peacekeepers themselves are instructed to follow a strict guideline of principles, throughout every mission. Upon setting off onto a new mission, the UN Intervention Forces are required to express complete impartiality on the matter they are dealing with, have the consent of the parties involved, and refrain from the use of force, the only exception to this being in self defense. Although not explicitly stated in the original UN Charter, these are some among the many rules and guidelines the UN Armed Forces must follow during their missions.

The history of the UN Peacekeeping Forces, is one that dates back to the very creation of the Organization. Along the past 71 years, the inner workings and structure of these forces have changed and been amended to great extent. Now although there is still much more to be done, one thing that has not changed since 1945 is the function of these forces. Despite there having been changes to the principles the Peacekeepers must follow, the overall message of maintaining and resorting peace, has not changed. Although vague, the 43rd article in the Charter that addresses the UN Intervention Forces, shows the direction or vision the initial signatories of the document had for these armed forces. While clearly indicating the good intention of both the UN Charter and its signatories, article 43, along with article 42 and 44, and the entire concept of UN Intervention Forces, have proven to not deliver on the intended result of their use. The troubled history of the UN Peacekeepers, and their consequential worsened image, is a testament to what has happened to these armed forces in recent times.

Towards the beginning of both the UN's and its Peacekeeping Efforts' history, the UN Intervention forces were used very differently to the way they are today. In the time period in the Organization's history, prior to the Cold War, the UN Intervention Forces were mainly used for lightly armed operations, seeking to simply monitor and report developments in troubled regions. At the time the majority of the active missions were not significantly reliant on the use of arms, with a few exceptions that did rely more on these, like the UN Peacekeeping Mission involving the "Suez Crisis". Yet at the time, these missions remained relatively small, only gaining in size several years and several missions later. At this point in time, the reputation and efficiency of these forces had reached high levels, and as the years went on demand continued to grow for more Peacekeeping Missions. This was all the more accurate with the coming of the Cold War.

Both during and after the Cold War, the UN Peacekeepers continued to grow in higher demand as the years went along. Standing on both past successes and a good reputation, a growing number of nations wished to resolve their inner issues with the help of these forces. Yet it was at this time that issues started to rise among the Peacekeeping Forces. Originally trained and ordered to handle conflicts between several states, through means of evaluation, monitoring, and others, these forces were now being commanded to go beyond their capabilities, to do things they couldn't and didn't know how to do. The task of Peacekeeping grew much more difficult on both the UN and its forces. Despite this these forces experienced moderate success, which in turn accelerated an already growing demand for their help. This ultimately led to more missions being approved and deployed by the Security Council, like those in Rwanda or Yugoslavia both of which are known for great controversy involving the misconduct of Peacekeepers and the overall failure of the missions, ultimately leading to the downfall of both the efficiency and reputation of the UN and its forces.

Due to many issues, both directly involving and non-involving the Peacekeepers themselves, these missions, some of which are still active today, clearly showed the limits of the UN Intervention Forces, and the negative effects of perhaps over-ambitious, overly complicated, and not premeditated missions. In the years following, leading up to modern times, the UN has desperately tried, and

sometimes succeeded, to bring reform to the entire Peacekeeping concept, culture, and structure, to ultimately improve the image and efficiency of the forces. Yet, the difficulty in passing legislation and reform in the UN still proves to be one, among the many, major obstacles preventing change, ultimately leading to modern times in which the United Nations is faced with a broken or imperfect armed force system, in a time where the necessity and demands for these forces have never been higher.

Major Countries and Organizations Involved

In the Charter of the United Nations, specifically in article 43, it is stated that all UN member states, “in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security”, are to make available, upon request from the Security Council, among many things, Peacekeeping troops. These nations are supposed to put to the disposal of this council, the required facilities, assistance, and most importantly armed forces, as deemed necessary. Countries’ individual contributions to the UN Peacekeeping forces are a key element in the success and well being, seeing as without these the UN Intervention Forces would not exist. Although there may be several reasons as to why a nation would or would not contribute armed forces, the following is a list of the nations that have been recorded for either having donated a higher or lower number of armed forces to the UN, as of the month of April, 2016, along with other miscellaneous nations, and the organization that looks over and manages UN Peacekeeping Operations.

Top Five - Ethiopia, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Rwanda

Out of the 193 UN Member States, all of which are called upon and “forced” to contribute to the UN’s peacekeeping forces, the five nations listed above proved to be the most generous and willing in the act of providing armed forces. The nations above are listed in order of highest to lowest with Ethiopia providing the highest amount of personnel, nearly 8,300 people. They are then followed by India (7,700), Pakistan (7,300), Bangladesh (7,050), and Rwanda (6,100). While looking at the list, made by the UN, which identifies its member states and ranks them based on their contributions, it is important to remember the reasons or motives behind the larger number of armed forces provided by these nations. Firstly, although it may not be applicable to these nations, many UN member states benefit from economic return by providing to the UN Peacekeepers. Following this there has been a trend identified in the list and even among these nations that, not to undermine the valor or “honor” in their contributions, many of these nations experience issues of their own requiring the assistance of UN Peacekeepers. One very well known example is the ongoing conflict in Rwanda, as mentioned above, in which Peacekeepers were called upon to provide help. That specific mission is still active today, and may be one of the contributing reasons why Rwanda finds itself among the Top 5 contributing nations.

Bottom Five - Latvia, Jamaica, FYR Macedonia, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique

The following list of nations is that of the countries that have supplied the lowest amount of armed forces to the UN. There may be several factors at play that would justify these countries’ decision to

supply the lowest amount of armed forces among their fellow UN members, for example the size, population, political, economic, and military power, or simply their reluctance to do so. Regardless, as it was recorded by the UN, in April of 2016, all of these nations were tied for providing one male personnel. Although providing a very small amount of aid, compared to other nations, it must be acknowledged, that despite this, they are still fulfilling the requirement that is mentioned in the UN Charter, that is that every member state must make available and provide aid, if deemed necessary, which in this case these nations have.

Miscellaneous - P5 & Other Major Players

P5 Nations

Interestingly enough the P5 nations have supplied a mixed amount of armed forces, varying between each nation. It is first and foremost important and obvious to realize that all five nations neither appear at the very top or the bottom of the list of the number of provided armed forces. Yet some nations have shown more generosity than others on this matter. Out of the five permanent members of the Security Council, China put at the disposal of the committee the highest number of personnel ranging near 3,100 people, putting them in ninth place overall. Following this the gaps between the P5 nations start to increase largely. The second closest permanent member is France with its approximate 900 provided personnel. Then by providing nearly 290 armed forces, the United Kingdom comes next, placing itself near the middle of the list. Finally tied for last out of the five nations are the United States and Russia, having both individually provided 74 and 91 members to the UN Armed forces. Altogether the P5 nations have provided slightly more than 4,400 armed forces. This has created some controversy, considering the size and militaristic power of these nations. That being said, the US, for example, has been known to be a large contributor the UN Peacekeeping budget, while providing few actual armed forces. Some of these nations have also justified their comparatively minimal amount of provided aid, by stating objection to the Peacekeeping missions their forces would be taking part in. That being said, China has taken a different approach to this matter and has even stated that in the future it wishes to continue to grow its number of personnel to an even greater amount, nearing 8,000 people.

Other Major Players

Similarly, to the aforementioned nations, some of the other major global UN members have also provided mixed and varied amounts of armed personnel. Countries like South Africa, Italy, and Brazil find themselves among the Top 25 contributing member states, each having provided around 1,600, 1,310, and 1,300 armed forces to the UN. Further down the list are found nations like, Germany (300 provided armed forces), Japan (270), or even further down Canada with 80 troops. Finally, further towards the lower ends of the list are found nations like Australia (44 armed forces), DR Congo (20 armed forces), and finally New Zealand (11 armed forces). Once

again the reasons for these contribution might be varied and specific to the individual country, but overall many of the lesser developed nations have called out and noticed a trend, in which many of its fellow more developed member states are contributing less aid than they are and could.

Department of Peacekeeping Operations

Created in 1992 by Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), is a branch of the United Nations which focuses on the Organization's Peacekeeping Operations. The DPKO is in charge of the supervision, management, and preparation of UN Peacekeeping Missions. It has played a key role, in maintaining Peacekeeping Operations, and has often been the target for reform on the matter of UN Peacekeepers, as most notably expressed in the 2007 report A/61/858, provided by the Secretary General at the time.

Timeline of Events

Date	Description of event
June 26 th , 1945	United Nations Conference on International Organization
1947 - 1991	Cold War
November 1956 - June 1967	First United Nations Emergency Force (Suez Crisis)
February 1992 - March 1995	United Nations Protection Force in Yugoslavia
October 1993 - March 1996	United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda
August 21 st , 2000	Proposal of Brahimi Report
March 24 th , 2005	Proposal of Zeid Report
April 13 th , 2007	Proposal of A/61/858 Report
2008	Proposal of Capstone Doctrine
March 7 th , 2008	Adoption of Resolution A/RES/62/214

Relevant UN Treaties and Events

- The UN Charter (signed in San Francisco in 1945)

- Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects “Brahimi Report”, August 21st, 2000, **(A/55/305–S/2000/809)**
- “Zeid Report”, March 24th, 2005, Comprehensive report on strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to manage and sustain peace operations, April 13th, 2007, **(A/61/858)**
- Capstone Doctrine, 2008
- United Nations Comprehensive Strategy on Assistance and Support to Victims of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by United Nations Staff and Related Personnel, March 7th, 2008, **(A/RES/62/214)**

Main Issues

The following is a list of some of the major issues or flaws that still remain among the UN’s Peacekeeping forces.

Inability to Meet Demand

In a time of great conflict and tension, throughout the world, Peacekeeping forces have recently experienced an increasingly large demand for their services. A growing number of nations have called upon the UN to help them in their various conflicts. Yet the UN has had a hard time keeping up with demand. The process of recruiting, training, and then deploying UN Intervention Forces, is one that requires both time and precision. In the face of new threats and need the UN has recently had to fast track this process, ultimately leading to an increase of nearly 60,000 armed forces, compared to more than a decade ago. This being said, in order to correctly and successfully fulfill its Peacekeeping missions, the UN has on numerous occasions called for an increase in both member state donation/cooperation, as well as an increase in funds. The UN has tried to meet the needs of the many nations requiring its Peacekeeping services, but has had a difficult time in doing so, considering its lacking resources.

Harder Missions, Over- Ambition, & Outdated Institution

Another issue faced by the United Nations Intervention Forces, is the increasing difficulty of its missions. At its origin, UN Peacekeeping Forces were primarily required to monitor inter-state conflicts. Yet, these forces have increasingly been ordered to handle intra-state conflicts, something the UN has been ineffective in properly training them for. In the past, and even still today, the UN Armed Forces, have been asked to take on tasks within conflict torn nations, only with the help of minimal resources, often facing against uncooperative ruling parties, asked to fulfill over-ambitious and unrealistic tasks. The UN has very often proved to be over-ambitious with its Peacekeeping Missions, which has put a strain

on its armed forces and consequently led to the inevitable failure of its missions. It makes sense, for these forces to be asked to handle modern conflicts, yet its inability to do so proves, among other things, that the UN's Intervention Forces are an outdated institution. Having failed in the past in dealing with modern issues like terrorism for example, the UN Peacekeepers do not have, among other things, the proper training and guidelines to follow to tackle these issues. The inefficiency of these forces, can partly be blamed on its missions. They have recently grown much more difficult and sophisticated, the UN has been over-ambitious in deploying them, and the Peacekeepers do not possess the modern tools and guidelines to keep up with them.

After Peacekeeping & Extended Missions

The final issue to still hinder the UN Peacekeeping Forces' ability to successfully complete its missions, is the state of the nation they are working in, if they were to leave. Although there are several missions in which the Peacekeepers have generated little to no progress, and thusly do not play a big role in the conflict they are addressing, there are missions in which the opposite is true. In some nations both in the past, and currently active these forces have proved to be a major contributor to the well being of the nation. However, when or if these forces were to leave, the country in which they are operating sometimes does not have the means to maintain the progress that was accomplished. Although it is among the duties of these forces to maintain stability in a region for the future, this is not always the case. This has caused for many missions to continue for much longer periods of time, than they were supposed to, leaving nations in constant reliance on the UN and its Peacekeepers, which has proven to be not only costly and resource demanding for the UN, but also detrimental to the nation at hand and their independent well being.

Previous Attempts to solve the Issue

The concept of UN Peacekeeping Troops, has been one that has existed and been active ever since the creation of the Organization. Although gaining more traction slightly further in the United Nations' history, Peacekeeping troops have very often been a topic of discussion and has been at the origin of much reform to the UN. There have been many instances in which reform was brought to the UN Peacekeeping troops, whether it be with the passing of the "Capstone Doctrine" in 2008 which emphasized and clarified the guidelines that were to be followed by Peacekeepers, "Zeid Report" with the intention of restructuring the UN disciplinary policy for its Peacekeepers, or even the General Assembly Resolution A/RES/62/214 which aimed to help the victims of sexual abuse caused by either UN Staff or Peacekeepers. Yet, the list does not stop there. In 2000, the Secretary General in office called for the creation of a panel to highlight the faults of the UN Peacekeepers, to be followed with concrete solutions to these issues, all in a report, which is now known as the "Brahimi Report". This called for among other things increased spending and significant change within the Peacekeeping

institution. Adding to this, structural reform was also proposed for the UN Peacekeeping, in 2007 by Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon through his A/61/858 Report. In this he called for change among the DPKO, more specifically by increasing its resources and capabilities, while also breaking the department into two, nowadays four, sections in order to individualize its tasks. Other than the resolutions and reports mentioned above there have been many other attempts to bring reform to the UN Peacekeepers, focusing on many different issues they face. Whether they be disciplinary, structural, strategic, or other issues, much has been done to at least try to bring reform. It still may be too early to tell whether or not the reform attempts that have passed and been approved, as opposed to those that haven't or only been suggested, will bear any fruit. It is important to recognize the efforts of both the UN and its member's while still remembering that there is much more that can and should be done.

Possible Solutions

As it has been shown and proven numerous times in the past, bringing change to the United Nations is a very arduous and difficult task. Considering the fact that the Organization itself, is made up of 193 different nations, all representing different opinions and following separate agendas, reaching agreement seems nearly impossible. The subject of UN Peacekeeping, in the past, has proven to be an exception to this general theme in the UN. As stated above, a considerable amount of reform has been not only debated, but also passed. While there has been much progress in the past to improve the UN's Peacekeeping operations, there is still much work to be done. There are several solutions that could be proposed and even implemented, which could help improve the efficiency of the UN's Intervention Forces. The following is a small and basic list of these potential solutions:

- Adapt forces to the modern world (promoting use of modern technology or creation of new guidelines on issues facing our time)
- Increase national involvement in forces (providing more troops and aid, better training troops to match the needs of the UN, or even promoting dialogue between the forces and parties involved in the conflict)
- Vow to deploy simpler and more attainable missions
- Calling upon aid from member states or even creating a subsidiary organ of the UN Peacekeeping Forces, to ensure and promote sustainability and development of regions previously host to Peacekeeping missions.

Bibliography

Kirk, Ashley. "UN Peacekeepers: How Many Personnel Does Each Country Contribute?" The Telegraph. Telegraph Media Group, 29 Sept. 2015. Web. 17 July 2016.

"Troop and Police Contributors. United Nations Peacekeeping." UN News Center. UN, Apr. 2016. Web. 17 July 2016.

"Reform of Peacekeeping. United Nations Peacekeeping." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 18 July 2016.

Wallström, Margot. "How UN Peacekeeping Operations Can Become More Effective." Regeringskansliet. Government Offices of Sweden, 27 Jan. 2015. Web. 19 July 2016.

"Peacekeeping Fact Sheet. United Nations Peacekeeping." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 18 July 2016.

Wikipedia Editors. "United Nations Peacekeeping." Wikipedia. Wikimedia Foundation, n.d. Web. 18 July 2016.

"Principles of UN Peacekeeping. United Nations Peacekeeping." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 18 July 2016.

"Current Issues Surrounding UN Peace-keeping Operations And Japanese Perspective." MOFA: Current Issues Surrounding UN Peace-keeping Operations and Japanese Perspective. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Jan. 1997. Web. 19 July 2016.

"History of Peacekeeping - Post Cold-War Surge. United Nations Peacekeeping." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 19 July 2016.

"History of Peacekeeping - the Early Years. United Nations Peacekeeping." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 19 July 2016.

Ki-Moon, Ban. "Secretary-General Highlights Three Major Challenges Facing Peacekeeping." United Nations Multimedia, Radio, Photo and Television. UN, 19 June 2013. Web. 20 July 2016.

"FIRST UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE (UNEF I)." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 19 July 2016.

"UNPROFOR." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 19 July 2016.

"UNAMIR." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 19 July 2016.

Rice, Susan E. "Confronting New Challenges Facing United Nations Peacekeeping Operations." U.S. Department of State. U.S. Department of State, 29 July 2009. Web. 19 July 2016.

"Peacekeeping Fact Sheet. United Nations Peacekeeping." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 20 July 2016.