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The previous two decades have brought to light many issues with the role of the United Nations in peacekeeping. The disasters in Rwanda, Kosovo, Somalia, and now the Sudan, give credence to the idea that something is a serious fundamental flaw in the United Nation's approach to making the world a more peaceful place. The use of violence, or the threat of violence, cannot be used to bring about lasting peace.

Evidence of this fundamental flaw is seen throughout the UN's history, but perhaps nowhere as glaring as the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. That peace enforcement operation ran just as the framers of the UN Charter intended it to. Iraq invaded Kuwait; the Security Council met; sanctions were imposed; a decision was made that an international coalition would have to force Iraq from Kuwait. This goes hand in hand with the prescribed responses to threats to
international peace and security as outlined in the Charter. Despite this seeming “success”, Iraq is today immersed in war and violence.

The UN has broadened its definition of what peace is, but they have not changed their peacekeeping tactics enough. As long as they rely on force to achieve peace, the inevitable result will be more violence.

There are areas where the UN has tried to address the roots of conflict and expand its view of peacekeeping, for example, development. However, their approach to development is similarly flawed as it encourages development that will be beneficial to the developed world, not the developing countries. The UN should be advocating sustainable development and not pushing a capitalist agenda.

Only through the use of nonviolence can the UN hope to achieve its goal of peace. The reliance on coercion will only lead to resentment. If the UN continues to use violent means to attempt to achieve noble ends, they will send the message that violence is the final arbiter of justice. That lesson will lead to increased need for peacekeeping and the circle will continue.

Nonviolence can, and does, work. It has not been tried on a sufficient enough scale to fully judge its merits in the international peacekeeping arena. Violence rarely works and always leads to more violence. The cycle of violence can be traced throughout history. Given this, the UN must change its approach to peacekeeping to incorporate nonviolence as its dominant theme.
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Chapter 1
THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE GOALS AND VALUES OF THE WORLD COMMUNITY

The United Nations began the decade of the 1990’s with what some claimed was their most successful peacekeeping mission ever. The argument for this claim was that the United Nations and the Security Council responded to Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait as they were designed to. However, the continued violence in Iraq is, in and of itself, enough to refute this particular claim. Add to it the less than inspiring UN performance through the rest of the decade in Somalia, Rwanda, Kosovo and East Timor, and it becomes clear that there is a problem with UN peacekeeping.

The record of UN peacekeeping in both interstate and intrastate conflicts has always been a precarious one, but when the results of what many at the UN considered an operation that worked as it was supposed to turns out so terribly, one has to question the very theory behind, and certainly the methods of, UN peacekeeping. In short, the UN’s approach to peacekeeping is fundamentally flawed.

UN rhetoric is in line with what peacekeeping should be about (i.e. development, sustainability, eradication of poverty) but its actions are contradictory to this rhetoric and damaging to the overall search for a peaceful world. The first major flaw in UN peacekeeping is the UN’s reliance on the threat of military force. This reliance is in direct opposition to the quest for peace. The lesson they are teaching the world is that violence and military force are the ultimate manifestation of power. It is a lesson that has been taught throughout centuries with dreadful consequences, particularly in the 20th century.

1 Cameron R. Hume, The United Nations, Iran, and Iraq: How Peacekeeping Changed (Bloomington 1994) 3.
The UN should not rely so heavily on the use of military force, or the threat of force, as a tool for peacekeeping. Until they stop doing so, the need for their conventional (i.e. threat based) peacekeeping will continue to grow as it has over the last two decades. If the UN intends to truly address the issues behind conflict, the bulk of its resources should be directed with what we do know in mind: violence leads to more violence. Therefore, the use of violence in peacekeeping is in opposition to the fundamental goals of peacekeeping.

To understand the inherent problems with threat-based peacekeeping, one should first understand the goals and values of the UN. Although there is considerable evidence that the creators of the UN intended it to be more than a vehicle towards peace, its primary stated goal is to create peace. While the motivations of many of the major world powers at the time can be called into question, it is my belief that the vast majority of countries and vast majority of people at the UN do indeed, to borrow a phrase from the American military, consider peace to be their profession.

The values of the UN are also openly stated, if open to interpretation at times. Self-determination, human rights, economic sustainability, fairness, equality, these values are genuinely shared by most at the UN regardless of the agenda of the powerful developed states. Nowhere in the UN Charter does it mention balance of power or geopolitical goals and values. It stands to reason that if the UN is to live up to its stated goals and values, it should be representative of the people who are intimately involved in achieving those goals and upholding those values, namely, the people of the world as opposed to their governments.

Once one defines the goals and values one can address what types of power the UN has at its disposal to achieve them. It is clear that threat power is used as the final arbiter, but far from the only, or the strongest, power the UN
could wield. To fully understand the error of the UN's ways in its approach to peacekeeping, it is necessary to discuss the types of peacekeeping currently employed and the pros and cons thereof. Under the title of "Peacekeeping" falls everything from development and humanitarian assistance, to sanctions and full-blown military intervention. To understand how this came about, it will also be necessary to look at the evolution of UN peacekeeping, in particular how it has evolved since the end of the Cold War and what many considered a successful entry into the decade of the 1990's.

To adequately show why the UN should not continue its present course, it is imperative that one tries to understand the roots of conflict. Is violence inevitable? Do humans have a propensity for this behavior? While history may appear to lend some credence to answering yes to these questions, it can alternatively show us both the structural violence within the system we have created and the use of nonviolence as an effective and powerful peacekeeping tool. Much of these two areas are not featured prominently in the history books, but they have a compelling story to tell. Humans do not need to behave violently and structural violence is not inevitable.

Next, how does one define peace? The definition has also evolved over the years from simply the absence of war to more holistic meanings that address the environment and the structural violence within our world system. One cannot reasonably provide a roadmap to peace if there is not a definition of what that is and an awareness of what threats face the creation of peace.

Finally, UN peacekeeping must be evaluated in three broad areas: Prevention, Response, and Post-Conflict. Many of the peacekeeping methods will be common to all three, indeed there needs to be a consistent overall vision that addresses all three in a consistent manner as inextricably linked to each other. From recognizing early warning signs and sustainable development, to
the rights of women and the environment, the UN must address these issues if it
wants to address the roots of conflict.

While many will argue, correctly, that the UN does much of this through its
development and aid agencies, it could be argued that while they are helping
with one hand, with the other hand they are hurting the cause of peace and
ultimately undermining their own peace efforts by using force and the threat of
force to address issues of violent conflict. Many may also contend that such an
approach as the one advocated in this thesis defies the reality of the global
system. Perhaps they are correct, but no approach to peacekeeping will be
realistic unless it acknowledges one basic fact: violence will always lead to more
violence.

As one would expect, the values and goals of the UN are inextricably
linked to each other. However, the actions of the UN are at best mixed in moving
towards achieving these goals. As stated above, the approach is fundamentally
flawed. In order to suggest changes to the approach, it is necessary to
understand the values of the UN and the goals that spring from them. It is
necessary to begin with the broad goals of the UN, work towards the specific
goals as outlined in the Millennium Development Goals, and finally address the
goals of UN peacekeeping.

The values of the UN are peace, human rights, self-determination, rule of
law, protection of the environment, and economic and social well-being. The
goals that derive from these values are, of course, the same. Peace and security
for the world, “to save the world from the scourge of war...”3, a normative

---

definition of human rights, self determination for all peoples and the expectation that they can live under a just system with an equal rule of law, to protect and sustain the environment, and to insure that everyone can live an economically viable life. All of these goals are noble and worthy of the world’s attention. These are things that an organization such as the UN should be working on. However, the approach must be consistent with the goals.

Ultimately, peace is the primary goal of the UN. Everything the UN does should lead towards this goal. The Millennium Development Goals are intended to be the means towards that end. The list of 8 specific goals to achieve by 2015 is far-reaching and ambitious. They are:

1. Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger- Reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day. Reduce by half the proportion of people suffering from hunger.

2. Achieve Universal Primary Education- Ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary schooling.


4. Reduce Child Mortality- Reduce by two thirds the mortality rate of children under five.

5. Improve Maternal Health- Reduce by three quarters the maternal mortality ratio.

6. Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Other Diseases- Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS. Halt and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.

7. Ensure Environmental Sustainability- Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs; reverse loss of environmental resources. Reduce by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water. Achieve significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020.
8. Develop a Global Partnership for Development. Develop further an open trading and financial system that is rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory. Includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction - nationally and internationally. Address the least developed countries’ special needs. This includes tariff and quota free access for their exports; enhanced debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries; cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous official development assistance for countries committed to poverty reduction. Address the special needs of landlocked and small island developing States. Deal comprehensively with developing countries’ debt problems through national and international measures to make debt sustainable in the long term. In cooperation with the developing countries, develop decent and productive work for youth. In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries. In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies - especially information and communications technologies.

These goals are clearly well worth achieving. The problem comes when the UN’s efforts are at cross-purposes. If one can argue that the chief goal of the UN is to promote peace, then one may also be able to assume that the actions of the UN will be primarily towards that end. Therefore, these goals have a larger goal in common: peace. One could argue that the UN sees these goals as the way to peace. Looking at the descriptions of each goal one might conclude, due to the detail, that development is the primary path towards peace. This is important because it shows that the UN understands what needs to be done to create the culture of peace that must exist in order to achieve a sustainable peace. The UN has even made steps in the direction of achieving these goals. Many of the UN agencies are designed specifically to do so. However, one area in particular has not seen its actions fall into line with the rest of the UN’s stated philosophy; that is the area of peacekeeping.

Chapter 2

PEACEKEEPING, POWER, AND REFORM AT THE UN

The authority for UN peacekeeping comes primarily from Chapters VI and VII in the UN charter, which give the Security Council the authority to seek the peaceful settlement of disputes, the use of sanctions, or the use of force. This is balanced against strong wording protecting the sovereignty of individual states. This tension has often paralyzed the United Nations. In order to understand what one is talking about when one says “peacekeeping”, it is time for some definitions as per the UN.

Peace Operations - Peace support operations (includes preventative deployments, peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations, diplomatic activities such as preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace building as well as humanitarian assistance, good offices, fact finding and electoral assistance).

Peacekeeping - Hybrid politico-military activity aimed at conflict control, which involves a UN presence in the field (usually involving military and civilian personnel), with consent of the parties, to implement or monitor the implementation of arrangements relating to the control of conflicts (cease-fires, separation of forces, etc.), and their resolution (partial or comprehensive settlements) and/or to protect the delivery of humanitarian relief. Also referred to as a Chapter VI operation.

Peacemaking - Refers to the use of diplomatic means to persuade parties in conflict to cease hostilities and to negotiate a peaceful settlement of their dispute. Excludes the use of force.

Peace Building - Includes all external efforts to assist countries and regions in their transitions from war to peace, and includes all

---

5 United Nations Charter, Chapter VI, articles 33-38. See Appendix A.
6 ibid, Chapter VII, article 41. See Appendix A.
7 ibid, Chapter VII, articles 42-43. See Appendix A.
activities and programmes designed to support and strengthen these transitions.⁸

Peace Enforcement - (The UN does not specifically define Peace Enforcement on its website, so I will use Roland Paris’ definition from his book, At Wars End.) The threat or use of non-defensive military force to impose, maintain, or restore a cease-fire.⁹

It is apparent that peacekeeping encompasses many different actions that the UN can utilize, from diplomacy to military enforcement. Peacekeeping, as defined above, is what one would consider “traditional peacekeeping”. Both sides consent to the involvement of UN troops and state sovereignty is respected.

Traditional peacekeeping is what was primarily seen during the Cold War. The veto power of the U.S. and the Soviet Union created a stalemate in the Security Council that all but paralyzed the UN and its ability to respond to conflicts. Consent was of primary importance. The fall of the Soviet Union at the beginning of the 1990’s changed things considerably. As mentioned before, many called the handling of the Iraq/Kuwait conflict the first successful mission, progressing as it was designed to, resulting in an international coalition to stop Iraqi aggression. However, the results of that operation have led directly to the current war in Iraq and are evidence that the UN’s designed response to aggression is fundamentally flawed.

A second change that has taken place in the peacekeeping field is the change from interstate to intrastate conflicts as the focus of the UN. While the UN has managed to keep the world powers from directly fighting each other, there have been dozens of wars where the world power fought by proxy in the guise of other less powerful but strategically important sovereign nations.

---

The removal of the consent requirement from the UN peacekeeping lexicon has opened up the UN to intervene in intrastate conflicts. One might expect this as the world becomes more interdependent through trade and communications technology. Intrastate conflicts have profound impact on other countries in terms of the environment and refugees, as well as safety and security.

This new direction in peacekeeping comes with many unwanted consequences. The United States is now the world's sole superpower and has considerable political, economic, and military control over the actions of the United Nations. Because of this, there is significant danger of the UN being seen as a tool of the U.S. in its attempt to control the balance of power and maintain its world hegemony. The damage to the UN's reputation, so vital if it is to achieve what it hopes to achieve, will be substantial if this belief is allowed to continue. Therefore, the UN must not, in any way promote the agenda of the U.S. above its own. In all situations, it must be conscious of not deferring to the U.S. This is particularly important in terms of development. The UN's complicity in liberalizing trade and opening markets through their development programs will betray and therefore erode the trust of developing countries.

The new direction in peacekeeping often referred to as, "complex peacekeeping operations," has led to comparisons between it and colonialism. There are considerable parallels. Both use force to create social and/or political change. Also, the powerful "liberal democracies" see the interventions as being in both their national interest and the interests of the native populations. Control of, or at least unfettered access to, natural resources is another disturbing similarity.¹⁰

The changes in UN peacekeeping are at the heart of the second major systemic flaw in UN peacekeeping; the idea that the method of economic development that will lead to a sustainable economy for developing countries is based on exports and open markets. By focusing on export markets, developing countries cannot produce the things they need to sustain the viability of their state. One would certainly not call for a new nationalism, or isolationist strategies on behalf of the developing states, but rather point out what common sense should make apparent, namely that a country that cannot sustain itself will never be able to compete on the world market with the developed countries of the world. The only market these countries will be able to compete in is cheap labor which, given the realities of the motivations of most multinational corporations, is not sustainable. A country that offers low wages will necessarily be undercut by other developing nations and the idea of sustainable development under these circumstances is a farce.

Since the West, the United States in particular, is the major beneficiary of open markets, and since open markets necessarily mean stagnated or unsustainable development for indebted developing nations, the UN's complicity in this action enhances the charge of colonialism against the UN. This erosion of the UN's reputation will severely restrict its ability to provide humanitarian aid in developing nations because the citizens of those nations will legitimately question its motivations and trustworthiness.

In Iraq, the UN came under attack at least partly because it was seen as complicit with the United States' oil grab. Add to that the history of the oil for food program and the sanctions of the 1990's, and it is easy to see why the people of Iraq might not be all that thrilled to see the UN at their borders.

In his essay, *Turning Ploughshares Into Swords at the UN*, Colin D. Edwards, refers to the UN as a "puppet" of the U.S. He further states that, "so
subservient has the UN been made to American purposes that only a few of the member governments are addressing this issue in the forceful way they should.\textsuperscript{11}

This is not to say that everything that the UN has done has been negative. They were the first, with their Human Development Report in 1990, to define development as including more than just the GDP of a country by adding adult literacy and life expectancy to create the Human Development Index (HDI).\textsuperscript{12} This was a significant step in the right direction and should be commended. However, put this up against the other recent developments in the UN's actions, and there is little cause for celebration.

While the problems associated with the types of economic development the UN encourages will be discussed in more detail when development as a way of peacekeeping is discussed, it is important to state at this point that this approach to development is at least partly to blame for the severe increase in UN peacekeeping operations, which will continue to grow in the future if the same policies are continued.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Types of Power Available to the UN}

Referencing, Kenneth Boulding's, \textit{The Three Faces of Power}, Michael Nagler, discusses the three types of power as (1) Threat power (2) Exchange power and (3) Integrative power.\textsuperscript{14} Both threat and exchange power pit one side against the other; threat power in a necessarily antagonistic way, and exchange

\textsuperscript{11} Colin D. Edwards, \textit{Turning Ploughshares Into Swords at the UN, War After War} (San Francisco, 1992) 161.
\textsuperscript{13} www.un.org
\textsuperscript{14} Michael N. Nagler, \textit{Is There No Other Way? The Search for a Nonviolent Future} (Hawaii, 2001) 44.
power in a competitive way. Only integrative power, the power to bring people together, is non-confrontational. To understand how powerful integrative power is we need to understand which human needs are most important. In *Human Nature-Revisited*, biologist, Mary Clark, lists the top three as (1) bonding, (2) autonomy, and (3) meaning.\(^\text{15}\) These needs can help us to more fully understand the nature of conflict. For now it is just important to understand that there is a type of power that is constructive and not inherently divisive.

Threat power is the power most often used by the UN in peacekeeping operations. It is also presented as the ultimate type of power as it is used as a last resort, theoretically if not in practice. It is presented as the power to be used against resistance on the part of belligerents to conform to international norms. Throughout history, nations have time and again resorted to threat power and the use of violence to get what they want. The UN, like the nations of the world, relies on this threat power as well. Failure to comply may result in economic or military devastation.

The threat to send more weapons into a hostile situation to force compliance seems somewhat illogical. For example, picture two people aiming guns at each other. The situation is understandably tense, even more so if they are already firing those guns. Now add a third person with a gun. Does the situation get more tense or less? Now each of the two belligerents have to keep an eye on the third person, despite their claimed neutrality, because they too are armed and therefore a potential danger. Now, what if, instead of arming the third person, they are sent in without any weapons? The tension does not increase this time. While this is perhaps an oversimplification, the lesson holds true.

\(^{15}\) Nagler, 44.
Adding more potential violence to a tense situation does not reduce the chance of more violence, it increases it.

Now, let us say that this armed person is successful in stopping the fighting by threatening to shoot anyone who does not do what they say. What is the lesson learned by the two belligerents? They learn that having more weapons would be a good thing if they want to get what they want. Ultimately, they learn that violence, or the threat of violence, is the quickest way to achieve their goals. The present day examples of Iran and North Korea bear this out.

We have also recently seen the use of exchange power by the UN. The infamous “Oil for Food” program was a perfect example of this. “You give us some oil, and we’ll give you some medical supplies and food (and money).” How did that turn out? The answer is in the paper every day. That is not to say that exchange power, unlike threat power, cannot be used for good intentions. The exchange of doctors for oil between Cuba and Venezuela is a win/win situation on both sides that was entered into without coercion by either side. The problem with exchange power is that it can deteriorate into a perverse form of threat power; “I will withhold this from you if you don’t give me what I want”.

Integrative power on the other hand connects the two belligerents in a way that increases the chance that they will not want to resort to violence. Give people a real, sustainable community to belong to, allow them the right of self-determination, and basic freedoms and meaning will find them. The power of threats and exchange pale in comparison to integrative power, which addresses real, universal human needs.
Reforms at the UN: Other Proposals and Their Drawbacks

Reform at the United Nations is nothing new. This is not surprising as the UN is an enormous organization that comes with a lot of bureaucracy and a variety of different views on the best practices to be undertaken. Some of these proposals are new, some are old; some are from within the UN, and some come from outside voices.

The most popular proposal revolves around the make-up of the Security Council. The current proposals in this area come from a multitude of sources, but the most relevant are those made by the Secretary General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, that was released in 2004. Their proposals for the Security Council involve two different ideas for adding members to the Council, some permanent, some for shorter terms, etc. While their proposals are both comprehensive and detailed; they lack one key ingredient that must be a part of any reform of the Security Council, namely the veto power of the current five permanent members. Any proposal that does not address the need to revoke the veto is a waste of time and energy. The major stumbling block in the Security Council's ability to act in a given situation is the veto. It can only act in situations where all five permanent members agree, or at least are willing to abstain. This is what paralyzed the Council during the Cold War, and it is what has led to unilateral actions by the United States.

The only reform that will have any significant impact on the running of the Security Council would be one that the five permanent members will never allow, namely eliminating the veto. Therefore, any proposal that calls for expanding

---

16 Report of the Secretary General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change.
17 I do not wish to suggest that the UN could have done anything to stop the U.S.'s invasion of Iraq, but merely want to show that because the Council could not agree, states have decided to circumvent the Council.
the membership on the Security Council without addressing the veto issue is limited.

Proposals that involve changes in peacekeeping also abound. They usually fall into one of several areas or a combination thereof: Improving finances, increasing military capability, quick response capability, early warning systems, and development.

Increasing the financial contributions, or at the very least getting countries, particularly the U.S., to live up to their expected contributions, is usually on everyone’s list. While it is indeed a good idea, it relies on the coercive power of the U.S. and while all efforts should be made in this area, a better idea would be to lower the costs of peacekeeping operations by reducing their reliance on violent methods of peacekeeping.

Michael O’Hanlon, in his book, *Expanding Global Military Capacity for Humanitarian Interventions*, calls for more military capability, as the title suggests. He is not alone. Nearly every report and reform suggestion calls for the UN to possess increased military capabilities. What should be obvious by now is that this proposal ignores the number one law of violence. As, Hannah Arendt, put it, “The practice of violence, like all action, changes the world, but the most probable change is to a more violent world.” One would think that after a century like the 20th, ideas like O’Hanlon’s would be obvious in their flaws.

The quick response reform usually accompanies the increased military capability suggestion. This is a throwback to the original idea that the UN should be allowed to have some sort of standing army. Other than concerns for the

---

18 This is a part of the SG’s High Level Panel, a proposal by the World Peace Foundation, and in a book by Michael O’Hanlon, *Expanding Global Military Capacity for Humanitarian Intervention*, just to name a few from across the spectrum.
20 Nagler, 67.
military aspects of this suggestion, there is also doubt as to whether the U.S. or other world powers would ever allow the UN to have significant military capability outside of the control of the major powers.

Early warning systems on the other hand, are a very effective idea for several reasons. To begin with, many regional groups already have similar systems in place. The UN can simply enhance and support them while acting as a sort of central base of operations. The chance to better the UN relationship with regional groups and grassroots Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) is one the UN should take advantage of. The same things that make the UN a great place to coordinate efforts, its size and convening power, make it unable to act as swiftly and appropriately on the local level, which is where there are excellent opportunities for conflict prevention. The UN will need to rely on the assistance of the groups who in addition to being able to do the things the UN cannot, will have greater and more accurate local knowledge that will help immeasurably in conflict prevention.

In addition to the fact that there are many early warning systems in place, the data that needs to be analyzed to identify potential problem areas is also readily available in most cases. A careful look at data on human rights, economic conditions and ethnic tensions, will go a long way to help the UN take action before the violence starts which is essential in the long run for the creation of a peaceful world system.

Clearly, the UN already realizes that economic development is a key component to the development of peace. Their efforts have been considerable. The suggestion for more development money is a fine idea. Throwing money at a problem is never a waste of time unless that is all that is being done. More money for development would be very useful, but it will be of little help unless the UN stops supporting the creation of more violent peacekeeping missions to fight
violence, and being complicit in the market liberalization plans of the developed world.
Chapter 3
ROOTS OF CONFLICT, ROOTS OF PEACE

Why do humans resort to violence time and time again? What issues are at the roots of all of this conflict? It stands to reason that the best way to address the conflict and reach an acceptable solution is to understand why there is conflict in the first place. Reactionary responses, although at times understandable, do little if anything to address the underlying causes of the problem. One sees this with the United States’ attempt to eradicate the terrorists by killing them as a solution to a problem that is systemic, not specific to individual terrorists. The United States’ approach is doomed to failure and, once the real roots of conflict are seen, doomed to increase terrorism and violence in our world.

Nagler describes war as, “mass insecurity.”\(^\text{21}\) It is the same, although in different degrees of magnitude, as the schoolyard bully. He lashes out because of fear or insecurity. That fear and insecurity lead to anger and the need to blame others. Ervin Straub, in his essay, Genocide and Mass Killing: Their Roots and Prevention, describes the root of conflict as, “intense life problems in a society,” such as, “severe economic problems, great political conflict, rapid and substantial social change and their combinations.”\(^\text{22}\)

Compare this theory with that of, Michael Bhatia, in his book, War and Intervention: Issues for Contemporary Peace Operations, who gives the root of conflict as the struggle for power,\(^\text{23}\) whether that power is political power or

\(^{21}\) Nagler, 222.
economic control of resources. As Bhatia states, this is in the context of the threat of interstate wars. In other words, a suggestion of what makes one state attack another. While this may have been true during the Cold War, the prime issue for UN peacekeeping today is intrastate conflict. Bhatia suggests reasons for the increase in these types of conflict since the Cold War as well. He suggests the following:

1) Prior to collapse (state collapse into hostilities); few of these governments were internally legitimate, with a typically long tradition of tyranny. The authoritarian regimes relied on a wealth of aid to maintain elite patronage networks and a harsh government security apparatus. Democracy was rhetorical rather than real. The population was denied basic services (health, education, and infrastructure), while elites typically siphoned off resources and aid wealth for personal enrichment.

2) The end of Cold War military and financial assistance instigated a breakdown in existing, typically dictatorial, domestic power structure. In a reversal, as illustrated by David Laitin in the post-Soviet successor states, external influence also proved to be a decisive factor in the emergence of ethnic conflict, providing the crucial catalyst toward substantive armed insurgency.

3) Debt relief for governments in transition was subject to International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank loan conditionality, as imposed by structural adjustment and economic liberalization programs to reduce government spending, which typically led to the government focusing its remaining resources on the military. Privatization and free trade proved additionally detrimental in countries without the legal structure to prevent the rise of oligarchs and crime syndicates. Mark Duffield argues that "rather than promoting stability," globalization and market deregulation "has helped illiberal and quasi-feudal forms of political economy to expand."

4) The societal ramifications of these authoritarian systems further contribute to the causes of war, from mass unemployment and environmental decline (deforestation and water shortages) to third world health crisis, which includes the spread of HIV/AIDS and other diseases. For Frances Stewart, conflict is driven by the existence of "horizontal inequalities," namely, "inequality in political,
economic, and/or social conditions among culturally and/or geographically distinct groups."

5) Beyond colonial economic exploitation and even the advent of neo-colonialism, Mahmood Mamdani identifies the "institutional legacy" of colonialism as one source of contemporary conflict.24

Bhatia is quoted at length because it is important to show that the end of the Cold War has brought about a change in thinking concerning the roots of conflict. While there were certainly people discussing the economic state of the world and exploitation of developing countries as the roots of conflict before the end of the Cold War, it has now taken the forefront, at least in rhetoric. Also, it is important to show how closely the UN's own interpretation of the roots of conflict echo those of academia. While there is, of course, debate over the roots of conflict, the case made by the UN, Mary Clark, and others, is gaining in acceptance every day.

The Secretary General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, lists many reasons for the roots of conflict. They state that it is known, "all too well that the biggest security threats we face now, and in the decades ahead, go far beyond States waging aggressive war." They continue to state that the threats include, "poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation; war and violence within States; the spread and possible use of nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons; terrorism; and transnational organized crime."25

They also recognize that the threats are connected and have no national boundaries. They recognize that poverty is, "strongly associated," with civil wars,26 noting that since 1990, the number of people living in extreme poverty

24 Bhatia, 33.
26 ibid, 15.
has increased by more than 100 million people. They note also that countries are falling back into conflict after the peacekeepers leave and then the countries fall off the Security Council’s radar. What does this say about UN peacekeeping efforts? They are not long-term solutions.

Criticism in the report claims that neither the UN nor the International Financial Institutions are set up to treat these threats in an integrated, coherent way. It also indicates that neither is designed to help countries before the outbreak of war, or after in the process of rebuilding. This leads to the question: When is the UN fit to help bring peace? Without adequate military resources, according to traditional thought, it is not the best choice to intervene while a conflict is going on. According to its own High Level Panel, it is not well suited to help either before or after a conflict.

Combine the above with the inadequate results of a peacekeeping mission that went as it was designed, Iraq/Kuwait, and it is clear to see that there is a crisis in UN peacekeeping. While O’Hanlon and others will use this evidence as support for their case to add more military capabilities to the UN peacekeeping operations, it is a flawed argument. UN missions do not fail because there are not enough weapons. Instead, they fail, at least in part, because they rely too heavily on weapons. Similarly, UN development programs do not fail because they do not have enough money, but because the rest of the UN’s actions are not consistent with the development goals.

Returning to the roots of conflict as determined by all of the above cited, it seems that they all lead to Mary Clark’s analysis. Bhatia’s list of post-Cold War causes is similar to that of the High Level panel. Both discuss the specific details

---
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of what is at the heart of Clark’s analysis: lack of belonging, crisis of meaning, and lack of autonomy.

The three are linked. Lack of belonging occurs under repressive governments in which the people have no power (i.e. lack of autonomy). Crisis of meaning comes from lack of hope experienced by people who lack basic rights and justice. Push people far enough and they will push back.

The UN, although not in control of the IMF, the World Bank, or the WTO, is complicit in the goals of these institutions by pushing for both market liberalization and a focus on exports, as stated in the Millennium Development Goals. This complicity is in direct contrast to the stated goal of creating sustainable economies in developing nations. The reliance on exports in one, or at best, a few products, limits the sustainability of the economy because the resources of the country flow out of the country creating an unhealthy reliance on a particular commodity. If demand for that commodity slows, the country is in danger of economic ruin that could, depending on the country, have global consequences. The only competitive advantage left to these countries is cheap labor, which simply moves to the next country when wages begin to creep up. Capital is more flexible in its ability to move across borders than is labor. When that capital leaves, there is no sustainable economy left. No investment advisor in the world, that truly had the interests of their client in mind, would suggest that a client focus all of their assets in one area. Yet, the UN encourages the dependence on exports, as opposed to building self-sustaining infrastructure-based industries that reduce the country’s reliance on the developed countries of the world.

If the UN wants to address the roots of conflict, which it should if it wants to create a culture of peace, it must not simply forward the agenda of the developed nations. The UN should strongly criticize the policies of the IMF,
World Bank, and WTO and act as an advocate for true development based on sustainability.

If war is indeed "mass insecurity" as Nagler claims, the UN must also stop using the threat of force to implement change. Threats do not in any way add to feelings of security, rather they add to feelings of insecurity. If the roots of conflict are a lack of belonging, lack of autonomy, and a crisis in meaning, are military solutions doing anything to address these issues?

Does a military intervention add to someone's feeling of belonging? It is difficult to see how. The destruction of their community will instead make them feel even less connected to the world community than they were before the addition of more violence. The death of a loved one will make them feel less connected to humanity.

Does military intervention add to a person's feelings of autonomy? On the contrary, the feeling that they are not in control will become intensified. The only way to regain some degree of control would be to take part in the violence. At least that is what they are being taught by those trying to gain control through military force. An occupying power, no matter how well intentioned, will in no way add to their feelings of autonomy.

Does military intervention solve an individual's crisis of meaning? In reality, there will be an increased crisis of meaning, combined with the above two factors, which will inevitably create the potential that the person will seek this meaning elsewhere. They may find some meaning in a terrorist organization, or a revolutionary group, which will continue the violent cycle.

There is also the issue of economic insecurity. Does the UN's support of market liberalization and exports do anything to address that insecurity? In developing countries, people are forced to go through the humiliating process of picking through garbage dumps to get pieces of plastic or metal that they can sell
in order to survive. Does the export of resources provide a long-term solution for this situation?

The UN does some good things in the area of development, but by undermining that development at the same time, it continues the race to the bottom. The Millennium Development Goals will be a mere memory by 2015 at its current pace. It is time for the UN to focus a majority of its efforts on confronting the true roots of conflict, not merely the results of them.

The support of many people for violence against others is also an issue. Our society minimalizes the impact of violence by desensitizing us to its effects. Movies, television, shock radio, toys, guns, even SUVs suggest the virtues of violence as a means to an end. This structural violence is at the heart of our violent society, which sets the standards for the rest of the world.31

Structural violence hides behind the scenes and influences us in covert ways. The following chart displays the differences between the types of violence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Violence</th>
<th>Structural Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kills people directly</td>
<td>Kills people indirectly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kills quickly</td>
<td>Kills slowly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic harm</td>
<td>Somatic deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic</td>
<td>Commonplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Impersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute insult to well-being</td>
<td>Chronic insult to well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-Action-Object observable</td>
<td>Subject-Action-Object unobservable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentional and immoral</td>
<td>Unintentional and amoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodes may be prevented</td>
<td>Inertia may be mitigated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While one can debate the specifics of the above definition, particularly the intentionality of structural violence, the key point to be taken is that structural violence is commonplace and many people seem to be apathetic towards it.

The UN does its best to try to stop direct violence, but until it addresses the structural violence in a meaningful way, the incidence of direct violence will continue to rise. Combine this with the fact that somebody somewhere is profiting from the system and its structural violence (and will fight for it), and one begins to see the problems facing the UN. Despite the daunting depth and breadth of these problems, the UN must continue forward in a consistent way. The UN clearly recognizes the systemic violence and wishes to address it, but its methods lack clarity and a common direction. The UN is simultaneously fighting the violence and contributing to it, on both the direct and structural level.

This stresses even more the need for the UN, and others who wish to create a culture of peace, to have a coherent, consistent approach to addressing the structural violence that the system is built on.

**Types of Peace: Where Should the UN Be Going?**

In their essay, Creating Global-Local Cultures of Peace, Linda Groff and Paul Smoker define six types of peace. They are listed in what they say is an evolutionary order ranging from peace as the absence of war (negative peace) to Holistic Inner-Outer peace (positive peace).

---

Peace as the Absence of War

This self-defining type of peace is still prevalent among the general population and among world leaders. While still a worthy goal, current world conditions suggest that it is not nearly enough. It is necessary, however, for the other types of peace to flourish and take root. To someone on the receiving end of bombardment, this type of peace would be a welcome one. However, creation of a lasting peace, which this is not, takes far more than simply the absence of war.

The UN has had some success in this area. Its presence has prevented hostilities in many different conflicts and continues to do so today. Once the UN leaves, as the High Level Panel noted, the likelihood of returning to hostilities is high. Ultimately, this theory does not adequately address the intrastate problems that have become so prominent in the 1990’s and beyond.

Peace as a Balance of Forces in the International System

The idea that war breaks out when there is a disruption to the balance of political, social, cultural and technological factors was first proposed by Quincy Wright in 1941.\(^{34}\) His theory assumed that a change in one factor must be counteracted by changes in the other factors. For example, a major change, such as the introduction of nuclear weapons, results in a change in other factors within the system.

\(^{34}\) ibid, 3.
This theory closely relates to the idea that increased economic interdependence will promote peace. While there are serious questions as to the accuracy of this belief, what is clear is that economic globalization has only intensified the civil problems within states.

**Peace as No Structural Violence**

Johann Galtung picked up on both the absence of war and balance of power theories and developed a third position that required the absence of both war and structural violence. Galtung described structural violence as violence caused by the way our social, economic, and political structures are organized. If someone dies for lack of medicine and the very medicine they needed is available somewhere else, that is structural violence. An alternate organization of the resources could have prevented that death.

While there have been advances in humanitarian aid to address some of the problems created by structural violence, little seems to have been done to address the structural violence itself. As stated earlier, humanitarian aid is a good thing, but it is only a band-aid, and will ultimately fail without a change in the current structure, a structure that is supported by the UN.

**Feminist Peace**

Feminist peace theories emerged in the 1970's and brought the ideas of structural violence and negative peace down to an individual basis. These theories included violence against all people. It argued that all violence against the individual must be eradicated to create a peaceful planet.
It also addresses the hierarchical relationship between human beings and calls for its elimination. The human rights of individuals, particularly women, must be addressed in order to create any level of peace beyond the absence of war. As the first head of the World Health Organization’s Programme on AIDS, Dr. Jonathan Mann, was quoted as stating in the Los Angeles Times, “even if all the envisaged educational and control programs were implemented in developing countries, they would fail to halt the impending catastrophe because they do not take into account human rights issues, especially the rights of women.”

**Holistic Gaia Peace**

Holistic peace theories emerged in the 1990’s as a way of taking violence against the environment into account, viewing humans as one of many creatures inhabiting the planet and addressing the interrelationship between all things. It was an important step in realizing the connection humans have with their environment, emphasizing the fact that it is not, as has been the typical approach in Western civilizations, simply a resource to exploit.

Environmental concerns have much to do with the economic devastation in much of the developing world. The constant and ever increasing over consumption of resources by the developed countries has devastated environments and robbed indigenous people of adequate environmental resources for survival.

---
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Holistic Inner-Outer Peace

The final type of peace as seen by Groff and Smoker involves a necessary spiritual component. It is the idea that outer peace must be based on inner peace or it will not have the necessary foundation. It is critical to understand that what this spiritual inner peace may entail is different for everyone. It is not, specifically, a particular religion, but rather a realization that inner peace, which could be defined as 'meaning' is important for creating cultures of peace that have sustainable foundations. It is in keeping with UNESCO's definition of a culture of peace as; "one that cannot be imposed upon anyone, but must develop out of the culture."36

These six types of peace could have profound implications for the UN. The UN must update its definition of peace and its actions. It recognizes that peace is more than the absence of war, but its actions are not entirely consistent with this realization.

The Threats to Peace

The Secretary General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change lists the following as the major threats facing the international community, and thus, the United Nations in the 21st century:

1) Economic and social threats, including poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation

2) Inter-state conflict

36 ibid., 1.
3) Internal conflict, including civil war, genocide and other large-scale atrocities

4) Nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons

5) Terrorism

6) Transnational organized crime

**Economic and Social Threats**

Economic and social threats are in all likelihood, the major cause of conflict in the world today. The lack of development opportunities for developing nations and their people rob them of any sense of belonging to anything, of any sense of control over their own lives, and of any sense of meaning. This is quite devastating alone, without mentioning the economic and social hardships that come with this lack of opportunities.

The amount of poverty worldwide is enormous and growing. It is estimated that there are nearly three billion people living on less than two dollars a day. Even taking into account the different levels of purchasing power a dollar has in other parts of the world, this is not nearly sufficient. The problem is compounded by several factors, all related to the International Financial Institutions, the IMF and the World Bank.

First is the fact that the World Bank and IMF insist on Structural Adjustment Programs that require the developing country that wants to receive assistance to make certain changes. A typical program would include making paying the service on their debt a priority. From a purely fiscal standpoint this

---
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might, on the surface appear to be sound advice. But the results are devastating and lead to a vicious circle of debt and destruction.

The focus on debt service payments requires the already financially troubled country to go further into debt to pay its loans. The further the country falls into debt, the more austere become the requirements imposed by the IMF and World Bank. They require cuts to already inadequate social programs (although not military spending) in favor of paying debt service fees. The spiral begins to spin, but is far from done.

The next requirement would be to open markets to foreign investment and ownership. In other words, all the value in the country either in resources or capital flees, most likely to a developed country. It is also encouraged to focus on exporting those products that it has a “competitive advantage” in. This is invariably cheap labor. This focus on exports, as supported by the UN, also causes capital flight while leaving only cheap labor as a possible resource. The cheap labor lasts for a while until wages begin to rise and then the capital flees to a neighboring developing country and the original country is left with nothing. The spiral hits bottom. Currencies are devalued. Conflict ensues.

As we have already seen, the UN’s approach to this problem is lacking any realistic vision for the outcome of its policies. The UN’s focus is on the idea that interdependent countries do not go to war with each other. While there may be some evidence that democracies do not go to war with each other, this has not prevented them from attacking others. In addition, this idea does not address violence of structural level power relationships.

The spread of infectious diseases, particularly HIV/AIDS, in developing countries has been almost as devastating as poverty. In addition to making any type of tourism almost impossible, infectious diseases also create an atmosphere of fear and mistrust which ultimately leads to conflict. The huge number of
deaths devastates the local community’s economy and its social framework, which leads back to a lack of belonging, autonomy, and meaning. The UN’s approach to this has been better, but its reputation and any trust it has been given in local communities is strained by its development actions. If the UN wants to address these issues of disease, it must have the trust of the people it is trying to help.

Environmental issues are just as important. Destruction of local ecologies in the search for resources to export is particularly devastating to local economies. Local farmers lose valuable land, water sources are polluted and then clean water is privatized, again harming the local economy. The Earth Charter is an excellent way for the UN to combat this environmental devastation.

The Earth Charter lists four main principles:

1) Respect and care for the community of life;
2) Ecological integrity;
3) Social and economic justice; and
4) Democracy, nonviolence, and peace.³⁹

As one can see, the Earth Charter encompasses far more than just the environment. It recognizes the links between all of these issues and peace. It is interesting to note that the Earth Charter grew out of the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development.

**Inter-State Conflict**

Inter-state conflict is still an important area of concern for the UN. Most peacekeeping missions tend to be intra-state related, but a quick look around the

---
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globe suggests that the threat of inter-state conflict is still very much alive. As we speak, Israel is occupying Palestine, the U.S. is occupying Iraq and Afghanistan, India and Pakistan are in a nuclear standoff, North Korea claims to have nuclear weapons, and the U.S. is threatening Iran, Syria, Cuba, and Venezuela on some level. The threat of interstate conflict is far from being resolved. As stated earlier, the UN’s approaches to both interstate and intrastate conflict is flawed, and must become primarily based in nonviolence. As the area where the UN has possibly had the greatest impact in preventing conflict, the UN could learn from its past successes and failures here.

**Intra-State Conflict**

The roots of intrastate conflict are so varied and deep rooted that the issues are often clouded. The major reason for the UN’s inability to reduce the threat of these situations, other than its ultimate reliance on threat power, is the fact that the UN is not designed to handle local issues. As an international organization, it has unprecedented convening power and many other attributes that make it the ideal peacekeeping organization, but its size limits its local knowledge.

This is where local NGOs and locally based early warning systems can be invaluable. Regional groups, such as the Organization of African States, can be perfect partners for the UN. They have local knowledge and are aware of local histories. They have the political will to prevent conflicts in their regions, unlike the major western powers that are only motivated when they can profit, or if they stand to lose the ability to profit.

The UN has begun working with these groups and should continue to do so, in addition to addressing the roots of conflict discussed earlier. Cooperation
with local actors will go a long way towards preventing repeats of the peacekeeping disasters of the last decade.

**Nuclear, Radiological and Biological Weapons**

The threat of nuclear, radiological and biological weapons is a very real one. The UN has not been particularly successful in stopping the spread of these weapons, but should not take all of the blame. The UN is only as effective as its member states, in particular the five permanent members of the Security Council, will allow it to be. As long as the United States, Russia, China, France and England are producing and threatening with these weapons, the danger of their use will continue to grow. The UN will be able to do little to prevent it.

The desire of terrorist groups and so called “rogue states” to acquire these weapons is directly related to the fact that the oppressive powers they wish to throw off also have these weapons. The theory behind this desire is that the weapons will act as a deterrent to preemptive attack. Again one comes back to the role of threat power in today’s global political realm. The use of threat power causes those being threatened to seek deterrents that will prevent the actual carrying out of the threats. This reality should be a glaring lesson to the UN as to the ultimate futility of the use or threat of force. It simply causes those who cannot accept the situation the way it is to find a way to mitigate the threat with threats of their own.

This too is an important point. Those struggling against the current political/economic system are given two equally poor choices between obeying those in power or being destroyed. Eventually, that situation will burst. The UN needs to be a model for other methods of confronting violence and changing the system. As long as the UN, the major vehicle for peace in the world, continues to
use and support the use of violence, the results will be more violence. The proliferation of nuclear, radiological and biological weapons is, as stated above, a direct result of the violence in our world.

Terrorism

Terrorism is nothing new in the world. What is new is that the threat is now real to both the haves and the have-nots. In the words of the Secretary General's High Level Panel, "the mutual vulnerability of weak and strong has never been clearer." Of course the Panel comes to an alternate conclusion as to how one should deal with these threats, but everyone can agree that they exist and that the threat is increasingly mutual. This is the new reality for the developed world. Much of the developing world has been living with multiple forms of terror for decades with hardly a glint of recognition from the powerful. September 11, 2001 was a wake up call to the developed world that terrorism is a boomerang, and that the violence of our policies has in turn made us a target for terrorists. The question that remains is: Has the UN realized this?

The UN's approach to terrorism must address the reason why the terrorists are able to recruit people to give up their lives in this way. More than that, it must also address why terrorist groups enjoy widespread support, or at least a kind of understanding, in many parts of the world. Until these issues are dealt with, the UN's, and others', attempts to end terrorism will be met with more acts of terror. The current direction of global economic and political systems is fertile ground for terrorist groups.

---

Returning to the ideas of belonging and meaning discussed by Mary Clark, it is easy to see how they relate to terrorism. People do not, in most cases, give up their lives if they have something to live for. It is a lack of meaning that causes suicide bombers to commit the ultimate act of violence (to both others and themselves). To be sure, they have a purpose and meaning behind their act, but it was the only one that seemed available to them, namely revenge. When people are treated in a subhuman manner, they lose meaning and lose their sense of belonging to the human community. These people are waiting for any sort of meaning to come along to fill that void. The terrorists offer them someone to blame; they offer them a sense of belonging to something greater. Given the alternatives, which are none or horrible, it is clear why people join, or at least support, these groups.

This seems to be similar to the situation in Germany during World War II. Germany was humiliated and devastated by the Treaty of Versailles following the First World War. Hitler came along with a message that he was going to restore their dignity and gave them a group of people to vent their frustrations and sense of powerlessness on. He was going to make Germany great again. He took advantage of the anti-Semitic feeling in the community and fanned the flames with rhetoric and propaganda. Many basically good people did things they would not have imagined doing in other circumstances. This is the appeal of terrorists and their message.

The goal of the UN should be to take away the circumstances that give that message meaning. It should not try to counteract the message with propaganda and fear, but should really address the issues that are causing people to sympathize with these groups. Most terrorists are already living in a world of fear and hopelessness; one cannot hope to change their minds or diminish their numbers by adding more fear and hopelessness. The UN's
approach to terrorism must be to restore hope and remove fear from these communities that are producing and supporting terrorists.

An approach of this type will undoubtedly bring about charges of negotiating with terrorists. This simply spreads more fear and is counterproductive. The UN is fully aware of the conditions that are causing sympathy with these groups. Of course, there will be those who will not change under any circumstances, but they should not be the focus of the UN's attention. The UN, by addressing basic economic issues can erode the support for terrorists, isolating them in their own communities. This approach not only addresses the underlying problems, which the current approach does not do, but also ends the cycle of fear and violence, which is necessary for ending terrorism.

Transnational Organized Crime

The threat of transnational organized crime comes in different forms. It may be drug trafficking, money laundering, or human trafficking. The Secretary General's High Level Panel makes several recommendations as to the forming of commissions and signing of international treaties.41 All of them do little to address the issues. Again the UN should address the underlying cause for the problem. International organized crime exists for one purpose: to make money.

Signing treaties and having commissions set up to discuss the problem is not an effective approach. The UN, again, can only be as effective as it is allowed to be by member states. Too many member states are not complying with international law as it stands. One approach the UN could take is putting

41 Report of the Secretary General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. 52-56.
international pressure on states that are lax in their enforcement. It would be a good start, but as with terrorism, the best approach for the UN would be to address the underlying issues that lead to these problems.

As long as there is a demand for drugs, money laundering, and slaves, there will be people willing to provide these services if there is money to be made. In all reality, the UN can do little to stop people’s desire for drugs. It is a problem much more suited to local actors. Money laundering is an issue of enforcement, and one that the UN is not suited to address. Human trafficking however is one that the UN can effectively address.

Slavery is still a very real problem in the world today. These slave traders take advantage of the same conditions that the terrorists take advantage of. The devastating conditions much of the world’s population live under give slave traders the necessary ammunition to take advantage of people’s hope for a better life. Addressing these conditions will go a long way towards addressing the issue of human trafficking.

The UN can also look at where these people are being taken. Someone is profiting off the work these people perform. By following the money one will eventually find the ultimate source of the problem. Take away their ability to profit and it will reduce much of the world’s traffic in human beings.

All of these threats have common roots. The ever-widening divide between the wealthy minority and the impoverished majority is ultimately the source for much of the threats to peace in the world. The UN, although not solely responsible for this widening gap, has been somewhat complicit in its actions in the area of development. The many good things the UN does are counterbalanced by their role in development that encourages the wealth and power divides to widen.
The UN's use of violence and threats as the ultimate response to problems is also partly responsible for the condition of the world. Its use of the phrase "last resort" when referring to violence only gives credence to the belief that violence is the ultimate power. It is this philosophy that is responsible for much of the world's problems today. The UN was certainly not its originator, but if it wants to reach its stated goal of peace, it needs to be the leader in change towards a more practical and effective method.
Chapter 4

PREVENTION, RESPONSE, AND POST-CONFLICT ACTIONS

The UN's focus should be primarily on conflict prevention. While post conflict issues and prevention issues are obviously very similar, they will be addressed separately for ease of organization. As with medical treatment, where the chances of successfully combating an illness are enhanced with early detection and prevention, the same applies in peacekeeping. The backbone of any UN prevention efforts must be an early warning system. Every report on UN reform seems to agree on this one issue.42

There are already early warning systems in place in many areas of the world. The UN could work with these systems and work to improve them. It is important that the UN find local partners in this endeavor for several reasons.

First, the local partner will have a better sense of the reality of the situation on the ground. This is reminiscent of the situation in Rwanda where a high level delegation went to assess the situation and everything looked fine. The problem was that they didn’t know what to look for or where to look for it. They therefore underestimated the dangerousness of the situation. This is an extremely preventable problem that cannot be allowed to happen again.43

Next, the UN’s structure is built in a way that makes it somewhat immobile and slow to react. The UN's role in the global early warning system can be as a

42 Recommendations for an early warning system of some sort were mentioned by almost every source I read. A few of the more detailed were: “Coping with Internal Conflicts: Teaching the Elephant to Dance” by Kumar Rupesinghe in, The Future of the United Nations System: Potential for the 21st Century; Dana Francis, in Peacekeeping or Peace Enforcement: Conflict Intervention in Africa; “Agent of Change? The United Nations and Development” by Jaques Fomerand, in The United Nations: Confronting the Challenges of a Global Society; Linda Groff and Paul Smoker, in, Creating Global-Local Cultures of Peace; “Genocide and Mass Killing: Their Roots and Prevention” by Ervin Straub, in, Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century; and The Secretary General’s High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change.

clearinghouse for information, and its convening power can be used to gain international support for whatever action is taken. However, care should be taken not to filter information from the field, as happened in Rwanda. The people on the ground were saying "genocide" and, for some reason, the message that got to the Security Council was "ethnic conflict."44

A local, or at least regional, partner would be the natural choice for any action that may be taken, as they have the most political will and the most realistic chance of understanding the true nature of the mounting tensions. The UN has been working with NGOs and regional organizations for some time and should continue to build these relationships.

The beauty of an early warning system is that much of the data that could be used to tip off the international community as to the potential for conflict is already kept. Economic trends, such as those kept by the World Bank and IMF, and social trends, such as those kept by Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, are keys to a successful early warning system. In addition, many of the UN’s own publications report on this data as well. The United Nation’s Development Programme’s annual, Human Development Report, has much information that could be used to identify hot spots. Also the, World Economic and Social Survey, has valuable information. These flagship reports receive far too little attention and their information is far too often ignored or misinterpreted. Many of these reports have challenged the existing conventional wisdom on economic development and growth.45

Once a problem is identified, the UN has many tools at its disposal, ranging from the Good Offices of the Secretary General, to multilateral
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negotiations and development assistance. As Secretary General, Kofi Annan, states, "our best preventative strategy is to support development."\(^{46}\) Annan also mentions the need to build the public health capacities of the developing world and improved management of natural resources.

The Good Offices of the Secretary General is one of the most valuable tools available to the UN. This is simply an invitation from the Secretary General to be the host of discussions between the opposing sides. The process is usually done quietly and without fanfare. This way both sides can present their views before the press and outside governments put their respective spins on the situation. This form of negotiation can go a long way toward building trust, both between the parties and between the UN and the parties. Also, the Secretary General can use the opportunity to assess the situation for her or himself.

The High Level Panel states that,

> In the last 15 years, more civil wars were ended through negotiations than in the previous two centuries in large part because the United Nations provided leadership, opportunities for negotiation, strategic coordination, and the resources needed for implementation.\(^{47}\)

While some may claim that this is due in part to the increase in civil wars, the most relevant lesson to be learned from it is that negotiation can and does work. But, it has a much better chance of working if the tensions are addressed early on.

The recommendations of the Panel in the area of prevention are as follows:

1) A field-oriented dedicated mediation support capacity, comprised of a small team of professionals with relevant direct experience and expertise, available to all United Nations mediators;
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2) Competence on thematic issues that recur in peace negotiations; such as the sequencing of implementation steps, the design of monitoring arrangements and the design of national reconciliation mechanisms;

3) Greater interaction with national mediators, regional organizations and non-governmental organizations involved in conflict resolution;

4) Greater consultation with and involvement in peace processes of important voices from civil society, especially those of women, who are often neglected during negotiations.  

These recommendations seem to stress local knowledge as an important tool to achieve success in peace negotiations.

If there is a problem with negotiations, it is the reliance on threat force as the ultimate solution. The UN loses credibility if it stresses the need for belligerents to refrain from violence while keeping violence as its ultimate device. The negotiating parties do not need another potentially violent actor to be added to the equation. Instead, they need to be able to trust that the UN will be an organization whose involvement will result in justice and a reduction in the overall amount of violence, not as an actor who may, at some point, become one of the belligerents itself.

The UN should follow the advice of the Panel and construct a field-based group of experts. Preferably these will be people who have been involved with successful nonviolent peace processes. For example, those involved with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa immediately come to mind. Their knowledge of the potential pitfalls and how to effectively deal with them will be invaluable to any peace negotiation. Bringing these people into the negotiating room, as opposed to people from developed nations who have
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"interests" in the area, should be preferred. It will lessen the potential suspicion concerning the role of the UN in promoting the developed world’s agenda.

Another important issue is preventative deployment. The Panel highly recommends it to the UN as a method of controlling the potential for conflict. The danger, however, comes from the addition of weapons and potential for increased violence. In addition, the mandate of the armed peacekeepers is often unclear and ill defined. They are forbidden from using their weapons except in defense, when having the weapons is probably one of the reasons they would be attacked in the first place. In the few instances, such as Somalia and Kosovo, where UN troops were allowed to use their weapons as an offensive measure, the results have been disastrous.

While supporting the idea of preventative deployment, one should understand that those who are deployed add very little to the situation if they are carrying weapons. Preventative deployments should be presented in the form of unarmed peacekeepers as well as those with expertise in peace negotiations and/or the local situation. Many will mention the case of Rwanda as a situation where, if the UN had been allowed to be more aggressive in its actions, it could have prevented genocide, and therefore, preventative deployment with armed peacekeepers can be justified. However, the root problem in Rwanda was in the poor assessment of the situation combined with a lack of political will among those who have the weapons. In short, the developed world just did not care enough to act when acting would have helped in prevention.

This brings up another problem with preventative deployment; the UN is totally reliant on those developed nations with weapons to support and organize a deployment. In contrast, unarmed peacekeepers require far less expensive equipment and can achieve the same goals, as the armed peacekeepers. In fact, they could achieve more. Thus, the UN would not have to wait for weapons from
developed nations, and could respond to potential conflicts before they get too far out of control. While the developed world debates, and takes months to deploy the use of force, the situation will inevitably grow steadily worse. The time to address these issues is before they escalate.

**Responding to Conflicts: Nonviolence in Action**

There will undoubtedly be situations where the attempts to prevent a conflict will fail. In those cases, it is more important than ever for the UN to do everything it can to refrain from using violence, even though there will be plenty of parties calling for violence. The UN should be a consistent voice for peaceful intervention. Much as the success of the International Red Cross is reliant on the trust given to it by the international community, the UN must also be trusted to be of any real help in situations of conflict. If it holds the threat of violence over the conflicting parties, it will lose that essential trust.

The major flaw in UN peacekeeping is its reliance on violence and the threat of violence to keep the peace. As Gandhi once said, "as the means, so the end." If those means rely on violence, the results will be predictable. History bears this out time and again. One conflict followed by another, ad nauseum, until the present day.

The responses of the UN can range across the entire spectrum from negotiations to outright war and everything in between. The major focus has been to try to bring the two sides to the negotiating table and restore some semblance of peace. Halting the conflict and beginning negotiations between the two parties are valuable tools, but the UN reserves the right to approve military
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action if a settlement cannot be reached. Robert C. Johansen breaks down the range of UN responses as follows:

- nonviolent to violent actions;
- unarmed forces to heavily armed forces;
- deployment with the consent of all parties, to the consent of one party, to the absence of meaningful consent;
- low-cost to high-cost assignments;
- small sized, single function forces to large, complicated forces;
- forces composed of civilian monitoring experts, to those composed of police personnel, to well armed military forces;
- forces with a modest degree of internationalization to extensive internationalization;
- diffuse command and control exercised by contributing states to centralized control in the hands of the Secretary-General; and
- operations resulting in negative precedents and political learning to positive learning.\(^50\)

With this wide range of possible outcomes and responses, many of which are outside of the control of the UN, it is easy to see why UN peacekeeping can be contradictory at times. Severely limiting the use of military force would simplify peacekeeping and, in many ways, improve it. The usual pattern is of UN peacekeeping is negotiations, sanctions, and force.

Negotiations would be a continuation of the pre-conflict discussions. But negotiations do not always work and the reality is that violence may break out despite the best efforts of negotiators. This is a key time for the UN. How it chooses to respond will set the tone for the intervention and the post-conflict situation. Responding with violence will inevitably lead to more violence in some form, at some time in the future.

Sanctions have, in the past, been seen as a useful tool to force noncompliant states into line. However, the devastation of the Iraqi sanctions and those in Haiti have much of the world community thinking twice about this

blunt and violent approach. All too often, it is the innocent civilians who bear the painful consequences of the sanctions while those in power who are targeted rarely feel their effects. For example, many Iraqis suffered from malnutrition and an increase in diseases due to the sanctions imposed there, while those in power lived more comfortably.51

Still, there are many in the international community, including those on the Secretary General’s High Level Panel, who still see sanctions as a necessary evil. In their words, they are, "a necessary middle ground between war and words..."52 The reality however, is that sanctions are a form of warfare and are in no way necessary. They are in all ways, a choice.

Thus, following the disaster of the most recent sanctions, the new trend is "targeted sanctions" (note the violence of even the language). These are defined as financial, travel, aviation or arms embargoes. The idea that targeted sanctions do not affect the general population as much as complete sanctions is patently false. They still can and do have a devastating effect. Financial restrictions hurt the entire economy of the country. The economy is made up of the people. It is fundamentally impossible to impose financial sanctions on any scale without negatively affecting the general population.

Travel restrictions similarly affect the entire country and cut off potential help from the outside. The country in question begins to feel more and more isolated from the world, forcing it into more and more desperation. Aviation (one assumes the UN means military aviation) and arms embargoes make some sense. However, it seems that someone, somewhere always manages to find a way to sell their weapons to these countries anyway. There is too much profit to
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be made for the developed world to really enforce arms embargoes. Again, if there is no real political will, the UN is fairly powerless to intervene.

Sanctions also have a way of getting more and more severe. In fact, the panel suggests that countries that violate sanctions should have "secondary sanctions" put on them. This seems to defy the logic of targeted sanctions in the first place. The Panel also recommends that humanitarian aid be available for countries under sanctions. The UN needs to be consistent in its actions. It should not impose sanctions with one hand and provide humanitarian assistance with the other. Certainly this is not to suggest that the UN do away with humanitarian assistance, but rather, sanctions.

The main problems with sanctions are that they are themselves extremely violent, they violate UN values such as human rights and equality, and they rarely if ever, work. In many ways, sanctions seem to be worse than military intervention. The civilian population bears the entire impact, while the regime in power bears virtually none. That is not to suggest that the civilian population is not affected by military intervention, but at least military intervention directly affects the regime and not solely the civilians. Sanctions rarely affect the regime in power and always affect the general population. There is a distinct lack of logic behind sanctions. The UN recognizes that there is a threat to peace, but instead of taking definite measures, it tries to pick and choose which areas to target. In short, sanctions are half of an already ineffective effort.

Military intervention is also unacceptable, as again, it is the civilian population that bears the majority of the impact. Power stations, bridges, water facilities, and other infrastructure become targets of full-blown military interventions. Clearly these violent acts lead to further violence down the road.
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They leave the population desperate and without the basic necessities of life. Military interventions also violate the basic principles of the UN because the greatest impact is always on the general population.

The Panel has come up with conditions that must be met before the use of force can be authorized. The problem with them is that they are all very subjective.

1) Seriousness of threat - Is the threatened harm to State or human security of a kind and sufficiently clear and serious to justify prima facie the use of military force? In the case of internal threats, does it involve genocide or other large-scale killing, ethnic cleansing or serious violations of international humanitarian law, actual or imminently apprehended?

2) Proper purpose - Is it clear that the primary purpose of the proposed military action is to halt or avert the threat in question, whatever other purposes or motives may be involved?

3) Last resort - Has every non-military option for meeting the threat in question been explored, with reasonable grounds for believing that other measures will not succeed?

4) Proportional means - Are the scale, duration and intensity of the proposed military action the minimum necessary to meet the threat in question?

5) Balance of consequences - Is there a reasonable chance of the military action being successful in meeting the threat in question, with the consequences of action not likely to be worse than the consequences of inaction?54

As we will see shortly, at the very least, the third condition is never met. The UN and the international community have never really considered unarmed peace teams as a way to end conflict. Because of this, they do not truly treat the
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use of military force as a last resort but rather the thing to do when one has run out of ideas.

The other intervention that involves troops is what would be considered a traditional peacekeeping operation. UN peacekeepers are stationed between two belligerents to keep a peace that has been previously agreed upon. The UN soldiers can only return fire in self-defense, not in defense of civilians. In short, they can do little but stand there. Having guns only adds to the tension in the area and when fighting begins, the UN leaves. The case of Rwanda is a perfect example. When the genocide commenced, the UN began removing troops.

In addition to being handcuffed by the mandate of the mission, these peacekeepers have no way to address the outbreak of more violence. It seems that the same things could be accomplished with unarmed peace teams. There are several ways these types of teams could work so that they would not add tension to the situation, but help to soothe the tensions instead.

The questions are; how would nonviolence work as a method of intervention? What types of actions would truly be the last resort and the ultimate use of power? The answers to these questions require one to look at nonviolence in general before going into details. One must understand the power of nonviolence to understand how it would work, and how it has worked.

In “Peacemaking Through Nonviolence”\textsuperscript{55}, Michael Nagler lists several advantages to nonviolence over violence as a response to conflict. First, is the financial cost. The costs of war are incredibly high and the costs of peacekeeping are also too high when the ultimate tool is threat power, or force. Nonviolent peace forces would require far less funding and equipment. This would allow them to react more quickly as well.
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Second, the nonviolent peace forces would be more politically viable. It would be made up of volunteers, eliminating the need to petition world powers for forces and supplies, which necessitates waiting for them to decide to take action. This increased viability would also reduce response time in the Security Council.

Third, is effectiveness. The only way the UN can affect a situation is through negotiations, which are beneficial, or through force, and then only after getting all five permanent member's approval. In short, the UN has a difficult time compelling nations to do what they want. Nonviolence does not compel, it persuades, insists, and focuses attention, and therefore can be used along side negotiations. Since the UN cannot realistically compel, they should rely on persuasion. Nonviolence turns this inability to compel into a non-issue.\footnote{Nagler, 5.}

In addition to Nagler's points, it is important to note that nonviolent peacekeeping is also more in line with the values and goals of the UN. Violence is unnatural for the UN. It is not designed to be violent and reactionary, and it should take advantage of that and use the power it does have at its disposal.

Let us now look at how one can define nonviolence using the same frames used when defining types of peace: general, balance of power, structural, feminist, Holistic/Gaia, and Holistic /Inner-Outer.

Nonviolence can be seen as any act that helps to prevent war. This is a very limited view of nonviolence despite the inclusion of any act. Included in this category, would be threat power, even the threat of violent force. Therefore, this type of nonviolence is preposterous. One can, if desired, see any action as the "right" thing to do, but not all actions are nonviolent.

The balance of forces that maintain the current power system can be greatly affected by nonviolent action. This relates more to the "power is fragile"
view of Gene Sharp and others.\textsuperscript{57} A system based on peace would also involve a crucial balance of forces to maintain the peace. This does not, however, address the structural violence.

Before Galtung's theory on structural violence, many perceived the current system as a step towards peace. After all, increased interactions between states meant less chance of hostilities. Galtung's assertion that the system was violent itself changed all of this. Our world system, according to Galtung, can be violent or nonviolent. The choice is ours, however none of these theories address, in depth, the micro level of nonviolence. They are primarily concerned with the macro view of world systems and nation states.

Feminist nonviolence, on the other hand, like the feminist definition of peace, brings all relationships into the nonviolent sphere. Community and family relationships also can be violent or nonviolent. However, this feminist view does not ignore the macro level, it simply includes the micro levels as well.

The Holistic, both Gaia and Inner-Outer, like the feminist model, stress "power with" as opposed to "power over". The holistic views extend this out to include all living beings and the environment. Nonviolence, to be complete, must include everything within our sphere. The Inner-Outer model also includes, as with the peace definition, a spiritual side. To be truly nonviolent, one must have inner nonviolence. It must be a way of life, similar to the Gandhian version of nonviolence.\textsuperscript{58}

Therefore, the evolution of nonviolence, like the evolution of the definition of peace, has expanded to become a life choice as opposed to a situational choice. The evolving definition has grown from being a lack of physical violence to being a totality of nonviolence. Similarly, UN peacekeeping must evolve.
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Unfortunately, recent events seem to suggest that peacekeeping is headed in the opposite direction. In order to be effective in creating nonviolence and peace, it must be complete in its acceptance of its principles. Within those principles should be the idea that violence cannot be used to create a culture of peace. A culture of peace is fundamental to world peace. Violence cannot, in any way be a part of a true culture of peace, as violence and peace are entirely mutually exclusive.

The UN General Assembly has identified eight essential elements for a culture of peace. They are: nonviolence, respect for human rights, democracy, tolerance, promotion of development, education for peace, free flow of information, and wider participation of women. Military responses to violence do not fit within these criteria.

In addition, nonviolence works. It is more than an ideal that sounds like a wonderful thing but, in practice, will not work. Many people, at this point, suggest the case of Nazi Germany as one where nonviolence would not have worked. There are several points that should be considered. Hitler was one of many men throughout history that have wreaked havoc. However, these men never acted alone. One way or another, they were able to convince others, usually many, many others, to join in their destructive vision. This relates back to the concept of the crisis of meaning. Why did these people support Hitler’s murderous vision? The short answer is that Hitler gave them meaning, a sense of belonging, which he fostered by dehumanizing people who were different; he made people feel like they were in control again.

Now imagine these people’s reactions when others told them that this new sense of belonging was illegitimate. Add to this that the people saying this were
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holding guns and the results are predictable and violent. On the other hand, there are many stories of spontaneous nonviolence working against the Nazis. The key is that the Nazi soldiers were average people, not socio-paths. A nonviolent approach could, and where used, did have some success. Would it have changed the mind of Hitler? It probably would not have. But the other Germans could have been, and in some cases were, affected. Keep in mind that it is not a passive reaction to the Nazis that is being discussed, but nonviolent resistance.

Non-cooperation, general strikes, and other forms of nonviolent resistance, can go a long way towards changing the situation. Gandhi did not see what he did as passive. It was resistance, but it was nonviolent. The power of this type of resistance is even stronger when used early on. Still, one argument often heard is that once the soldiers roll into town, nonviolent resistance will not work. What, then, explains the "Prague Spring" of 1968? Soviet troops rolled into town and the people of Prague nonviolently refused to cooperate for eight months. The soldiers could do nothing.

The next obvious question is: What happens once the violence starts? Nonviolent accompaniment has saved many lives. There are multiple stories, but perhaps one of the best concerns the Minister of Defense for the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, Ernesto Cardenal, who said that there was no violence when the unarmed peacekeepers were present. His interpreter changed his words to "almost no violence" to which Cardenal then slammed his fist on the table and shouted, "I said absolutely no violence." He would not allow it to be normalized. Neither should the UN.
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Nonviolence is always a powerful force. The above examples are primarily people who had no training in nonviolence and probably were not even aware that they were using the power of nonviolence. They were simply reacting in a manner that felt right and was effective. Imagine the power of nonviolence if practiced by trained people under the auspices of the UN. The potential is limitless. Nonviolence is so powerful precisely because violence is not inevitable. Violence is a choice. It is a learned response to a situation. It is an expected response within a system that derives its power from violence. Whereas a system that derived its power from nonviolence would be more powerful, as compassion and nurturing are inherently human.

In addition, violence never works in the long run, and often does not work in the short run either. Look at two of the most recent UN peacekeeping disasters: Somalia and Bosnia. In both cases, the International community tried to use more violence than normal to change the situation. The results were disastrous. The result, however, was predictable; more violence.

Violence suspends the achievement of what is desired, namely peace, while nonviolence moves towards the ultimate goal. The history of war has demonstrated that it does not work, at least without a huge cost and the creation of more and more structural violence. Nonviolence has not been tried sufficiently. So the choice is between something that moves the world away from peaceful goals and that has been shown empirically not to work, and something that moves the world towards these goals and that has worked many times, albeit on a smaller scale. The better choice seems obvious.

Many also tout the virtues of just war theory. It seems that the theory has two flaws as it might apply to peacekeeping. First, and most obvious is that it too relies on violence as the ultimate weapon. Second, is that the qualifications it sets forth for something to be a just war are not achievable within the current
structural framework. Particularly, the "right intentions" criteria are impossible for an expansionist capitalist system. The current system within which the UN operates could easily be defined as such. The UN's current focus on development by exports is a part of that system. Their intentions cannot be considered "right" as long as that is the case.63

**Post Conflict: What Do We Do Now?**

One of the most important times in a nation's existence is the time after a conflict. The methods of ending the conflict, as stated above, are important, but equally important is the response after the conflict. The differences between "peacemaking" and "peacebuilding" are important to discuss here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peacemaking</th>
<th>Peacebuilding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduces direct violence</td>
<td>Reduces structural violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on nonviolent means</td>
<td>Emphasis on socially just ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily and spatially constrained</td>
<td>Ubiquitous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of violent episodes</td>
<td>Promotion of social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the status quo</td>
<td>Threat to status quo64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peacemaking, as defined above could be defined as what the UN does in its initial response to a violent outbreak. Peacebuilding is what the UN should be doing after a conflict and before conflicts occur. Even if the emphasis is on
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nonviolence, peacemaking will only bring about temporary peace if the underlying causes of violence are not addressed. Peacebuilding does this. It addresses the structural violence and acts to prevent violent outbreaks. Violent outbreaks are common following violent conflicts. While it is easy to see how peacebuilding would be valuable before conflict breaks out, many of the same issues are present after a conflict ends.

As was discussed before; early detection of hot spots is an essential preventative measure. Many of the following issues are relevant for both pre and post conflict situations. They will be discussed in a post conflict context, but they can be applied anywhere as they are general conditions that should be met everywhere. Post conflict states require no broad assessment. The UN should go on the assumption that all of these areas will need to be addressed.

There are several areas to cover: institutions, infrastructure, healthcare, economic, rule of law and justice, democratization or self-determination, reconciliation, political structures, and more. All of these are daunting, but if handled outside of the structural violence of the present system, they become manageable. The UN does great things in these areas already. Most of the discussion will center on the major flaw in post conflict rebuilding, namely, development.

The different issues in post conflict peacebuilding are all very interrelated. For example, infrastructure and institutions are inextricably linked. For the purpose of this discussion, institutions represent the functions of the state, education, etc. Infrastructure will refer to the actual buildings, roads, bridges, communications, etc. Healthcare will be included under institutions, but will also be its own category because of the immediate need for healthcare and medical treatment that invariably follows conflict.
It is difficult, if not impossible to arrange all of these needs in a hierarchy. All are extremely important and most have to be confronted immediately. Infrastructure, which includes electricity, is important to insure that healthcare can operate and to insure that relief supplies can get to where they are needed. The size and scope of the UN makes it unique in its ability to convene the necessary resources for operations following conflicts. No other institution can bring as much to the table in this area.

The rebuilding of infrastructure is important in another respect as well. It can create jobs that will undoubtedly be needed to bolster the local economy. The use of outside contractors and "experts" should be kept to an absolute minimum. If there are locals capable of doing the job, they should do it. There should be no other agenda on the part of the UN.

Electricity and communication are probably the two elements that should be addressed first. They will provide the basic needs for rebuilding other structures. The UN’s role should be one of overall coordination, not dictation. Although it has done so in the past, the UN is not designed to run a state. If it is absolutely necessary for the UN to take on this role, it should involve as many locals as possible.

The many NGOs that operate around the world will be invaluable to the UN in the area of healthcare. Agencies like the Red Cross/Crescent and Medicins Sans Frontiers (Doctors without Borders) have experience in working in post conflict areas and, unlike the UN, are experts in the medical field. The partnerships and working relationships that the UN and these NGOs have built over the years will have to be strengthened. This is particularly important in light of recent operations in which the United States tried to link its invasion of Afghanistan with an aid mission, causing aid workers to lose the trust of the people of Afghanistan and become targets of military resistance forces.
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It is not impossible for the UN to know in advance what types of medical emergencies it will have on its hands in a post conflict environment. It has seen them before and should be prepared to the extent possible. The money it would be saving on military equipment and supplies could be put to this purpose. Since the UN will know for the most part what it will be facing, it should be possible to have an automatic response team, one equipped to deal with those scenarios. This team should not need to be put together for each conflict; it should be a standing division. The UN needs to take advantage of what it does know and this is one of those things it knows well. The UN faces so many situations in which it does not know what to expect; it should take advantage of the fact that in this case, it knows beforehand.

Justice and rule of law are extremely important if a state is going to continue to be viable. While not as urgent as the medical or humanitarian crises, this will go a long way towards creating stability and a sense of belonging and control. If the population feels that they live in a place that is reminiscent of the Wild West, they will not be able to develop and grow. Fear is a major cause of conflict. Rule of law, as decided by the people, will reduce that fear. The UN's role should be one of oversight and coordination.

Political structures and the level of self-determination are obviously related as well. It is important that political structures be stabilized on the local level first. The national level, although important, is secondary here. The focus of the UN is often to get federal governments up and running, but it is the local governments that provide the daily stability and the sense of belonging and safety so necessary to build the country back up. Through participation in the local government, which should be encouraged, it also empowers people to take pride in their community and have a sense of belonging and a sense of control over
the events that shape their lives. These are things that the national government cannot do at the start.

The idea of self-determination needs to be well defined. Some prefer democratization, but that seems to be more of an imposition than true self-determination. Perhaps it is because it is easy to link democracy to liberal democracy, which means automatic open markets and privatization. A true democracy, where people decide what form of government they will have, is what the UN should strive for. This is why local participation is so important. As for types of democracy, there are many: representative, participatory, etc. There should be no rush to hold national elections, as local elections are far more important and stabilizing. Forming a national interim government would be favorable to national elections happening before local governments are in place.

Self-determination is a worthy goal to strive for, if it truly is self-determination. It cannot be the agenda of the UN or the permanent members of the Security Council, or anyone else. Self-determination that is mere rhetoric can be extremely dangerous. If it is not real, it will not hold for long without exploitation, oppression, and eventually violence.

Reconciliation is also another important step in post conflict states. The cessation of violence will be temporary if the underlying issues are not addressed in a public manner. South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission is an example of what the UN should work towards. While the Commission was not perfect, the overall lesson it proved is that reconciliation allows for eventual forgiveness, and with forgiveness comes true rebuilding on a lasting foundation. It is important that the UN does not impose its idea of who should be forgiven and when, this is something that cannot be rushed or manipulated. It is also important to stress that reconciliation does not necessarily mean forgetting or, more importantly, condoning the violence.
Finally, comes the essential role of women. Far too many societies are oppressive to women. It is through education, not force, that the UN will be able to change this. There are religious implications to consider that, even if one thinks they are erroneous, many in the population may embrace. The UN must be careful not to tread on religious traditions that can cause more conflict. That is certainly not to say that the UN should let any argument, religious or otherwise, stand in its way of promoting gender equality. Education and support of nonviolent resistance movements will be the best path towards equality, not imposition.

In addition to equality, it is extremely important to invoke a gender perspective into peacekeeping in general. War and conflict have vast gender impacts. Peace and equality between men and women are linked. It is often the gender gap that is at the base of the structural violence within a system. The UN has, in its rhetoric, recognized this fact and should continue to strive to understand the gender role as it applies to peacekeeping. Any peacekeeping process that does not address the needs and perspectives of women is not going to lead to a lasting peace. A negotiation that leaves one half of the people unrepresented is not a true negotiation. Self-determination that leaves one half of the voices unheard is not real self-determination. Any peace that does not address these issues will be fated to fail, as these issues must be addressed sooner or later. This is comparable to the race issue in the United States. Current race issues are, at least in part, due to the United States' history of slavery. However, they are also due in part to the fact that the United States has never really confronted this issue as a nation. Consequently, race issues continue to trouble the United States. Similarly, gender issues will continue to be
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65 Olsson, I. On October 31, 2000, the Security Council adopted resolution 1325 which addressed this issue specifically.
a serious barrier to peace if not addressed. The sooner they are, the better for all.

The other major flaw in peacekeeping is development. The goal of the UN in development should be clear and without covert agenda. It should solely be the peaceful and sustainable development of the country in question. Common sense then tells us that creating a self-sustaining economy is the primary job. Focusing the economy in too limited an area is bound to backfire, while focusing on exports is allowing the value within the country to leave. This is the self-serving agenda of the developed nations and not the agenda of sustainability for developing countries. Yes, these countries should have access to international trade, but not at the expense of local ownership and local control.

The question then is: How does the UN contribute to the agenda of the developed world? The answer is that by encouraging open market economies as a part of development, in particular export specialization, as does David Ricardo, they are complicit in that agenda. Any knowledgeable investor would say that diversification, not specialization, is the key to creating a good portfolio, or in the case of countries, economies. Diverse economies are sustainable and weather economic changes better. It is destructive and dangerous advice that the UN, the IMF, the World Bank, and the WTO are giving the developing nations.

Post-conflict states are the worst place to implement market liberalization. According to Roland Paris, in *At War's End*, there are three main issues in post-conflict states:

1) Intense societal conflicts.
2) Weak conflict dampeners.
3) Ineffective political institutions.67

---

66 Ricardo was an economic theorist in the early nineteenth century who put forth the ideas of specialization and competitive advantage. His theories are the basis of much of the free trade and globalization ideas today.

Given these three issues, what is the worst thing one could add to this situation? Weapons, of course would be first, but after that, competition for scarce resources would be a close second. This is exactly what market liberalization encourages. And if countries are also encouraged to focus on exports, as in the Millennium Development Goals of the UN, the competition is going to be that much more intense. This is poor planning and poor advice. Without the institutions capable of handling that competition it would be impossible for any country to create a sustainable economy without severe oppression. If one adds to the situation the fact that the country is just coming out of one conflict, and violence is likely to erupt once again. This is simply common sense.

Regardless, the UN still pushes these developing countries to focus their efforts on these areas. It is important to note that the UN does not encompass the IMF and World Bank. These institutions, although under UN auspices, act independently of the UN and were designed to do so. The only thing keeping them in touch with the UN at all is that the association with the UN gives them legitimacy.

However, even without the Bretton Woods institutions, the UN has its own agencies in the mix, some good, some not so good, and as always, at cross purposes. To begin, there is UNIDO (United Nations Industrial Development Organization) which focuses mainly on technical assistance; WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organization) which focuses on intellectual property rights; UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) which is a UN subsidiary that provides mainly technical assistance and experts; UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) which was described by Nigel White as
"concerned now with integrating LDCs (Least Developing Countries) into the rapidly globalizing and liberalizing world economy."\textsuperscript{68}

White goes on to say that this is a far cry from the original role, which was to act as a counter to the Bretton Woods Institutions. Now it works with them to attempt to get the LDCs to survive globalization. This is typical of current responses. Adjust everything to the problem instead of addressing the actual problem.

There are two other concerns with the export specialization approach. The first is the environmental impact. Forests are being decimated, which leads to soil erosion and further problems. Although this is an issue far too large to cover adequately in this thesis, it is worth noting that this, along with resource control, will be one of the two major concerns for UN peacekeeping in the not to distant future. One can already see it with the conflicts over oil, but the resource wars of tomorrow will be over control of, and access to, water. There are already privatization attempts being made. As clean water becomes scarcer, the developed world will want more than its fair share and will do what it has to do to get it. The UN must address the environment and resource control as issues of peacekeeping, and not simply isolated events. The lesson should have been learned with poverty and health. The UN and others ignored the connections for too long. The world cannot afford to do so in these two areas as well.

\textsuperscript{68} White, 286.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

The United Nations has been presented with an opportunity due to the fall of the Soviet Union. It no longer has to worry about two vastly different competing ideologies among the permanent members of the Security Council. This does not mean that it will be smooth sailing ahead; the last fifteen years have proven that. However, with changes in global power structures, inevitably come changes in the international institutions that serve those structures. The United Nations is not immune to those changes.

Unfortunately, the UN has not taken advantage of its opportunities. While it has begun to attempt to understand the complexities involved with confronting conflict, its actions remain stuck in a different time. It is a different world than the one encountered after World War II. The first 45 years of the UN's existence were mired in a Cold War stalemate. The last fifteen have seen a dramatic rise in the number of peacekeeping missions at the UN. While some of this can be attributed to the end of the stalemate, that alone does not do a sufficient job in explaining the increase.

The gap between those who have much, the so-called developed countries, and those who have little or nothing, the developing countries, is growing year after year. Global poverty is destroying communities. The destruction of communities leaves people without a sense of belonging or a sense of purpose. The poor of the world feel powerless against the powers that be. This feeling of powerlessness is not insurmountable, however. They
possess, like all people do, the power of nonviolence.

The United Nations, as a leader towards a just and peaceful world, must help people tap into that power. If it does not, the need for its “peacekeeping” services will continue to rise. The UN has a choice to make; continue down the same path that will inevitably lead to increased global violence, or change tactics and embrace the one power that the developing nations have in equal strength with the developed nations: nonviolent resistance.

If the UN accepts this role, it must embrace nonviolence as the basis for its peacekeeping efforts. The vast majority of its efforts and use of resources should be consistent with its goal of peace and the principles of nonviolence. The UN’s role in preventing conflict will be most important, and this is the area that nonviolence will be most useful. How the UN works toward preventing conflict will set the tone for the settlement of disputes in the future.

The time after a conflict is also vitally important. People who have just survived devastating violence, loss of loved ones, and all of the atrocities of war, will need to be educated about alternative ways of resolving issues. The UN is the only organization with the size and scope to effectively organize this task.

The most difficult question for the UN is how to respond to ongoing violence. While ideally nonviolence should be used, in the form of peace brigades or unarmed peacekeepers, to respond to all conflicts, one can easily imagine a situation where, despite the best efforts of all involved, the UN will need to authorize the use of force. Rwanda, Sudan, and Kosovo come to mind. It could easily be considered an act of violence to stand by doing nothing while a
person is being killed or raped. It is certainly not the intention of this thesis to advocate standing by. Violence must be stopped, as the ultimate goal is to reduce the overall level of violence.

There are a few points that are important in the consideration of this complex issue. First, and most important, is that the use of force should truly be a last resort. If teams of unarmed peacekeepers are sent in and are unable to stop the violence, force may have to be used. But this is only after nonviolence is tried on a significant scale. Second, the use of force should not be glorified in any way. It is, and should be seen as, a failure. Violence is the method of the person who has run out of ideas. It is a failure of human compassion and reason. As Gandhi stated, “Victory attained by violence is tantamount to a defeat, for it is momentary.”

The most important things for the UN are trustworthiness and consistency. The UN must be impartial and fair, to its utmost ability, at all times. No amount of back room dealing should deter it from its mission of peace. If it is perceived as a tool for the developed nations, its effectiveness will be extremely impaired and it will truly become not just irrelevant, but harmful.

A consistent UN will be an effective UN. Humanitarian aid and development programs should not be at cross-purposes as they are now. The values of the UN include fairness and equality. Its efforts in peacekeeping and in creating a culture of peace should be consistent with these values.
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Appendix A

CHAPTERS VI AND VII OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER
CHAPTER VI
PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Article 33

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Article 34

The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 35

1. Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.

2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter.

3. The proceedings of the General Assembly in respect of matters brought to its attention under this Article will be subject to the provisions of Articles 11 and 12.

Article 36

1. The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.
2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.

3. In making recommendations under this Article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court.

Article 37

1. Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

Article 38

Without prejudice to the provisions of Articles 33 to 37, the Security Council may, if all the parties to any dispute so request, make recommendations to the parties with a view to a pacific settlement of the dispute.

CHAPTER VII

ACTION WITH RESPECT TO THREATS TO THE PEACE, BREACHES OF THE PEACE, AND ACTS OF AGGRESSION

Article 39

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.
Article 40

In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided for in Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

Article 41

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Article 42

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

Article 43

1. All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory
states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Article 44

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces.

Article 45

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 46

Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 47

1. There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.
2. The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any Member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the Committee shall be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work.
3. The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. Questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently.
4. The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council
and after consultation with appropriate regional agencies, may establish regional sub-committees.

Article 48

1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.

Article 49

The Members of the United Nations shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

Article 50

If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

Article 51

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.
Appendix B

PARTIAL SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL’S HIGH LEVEL PANEL ON THREATS, CHALLENGES, AND CHANGE
Part Two

Collective security and the challenge of prevention

Poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation

1. All States must recommit themselves to the goals of eradicating poverty, achieving sustained economic growth and promoting sustainable development. (59)

2. The many donor countries which currently fall short of the United Nations 0.7 per cent of gross national product (GNP) for official development assistance (ODA) should establish a timetable for reaching it. (60)

3. World Trade Organization (WTO) members should strive to conclude the Doha development round of multilateral trade negotiations at the latest in 2006. (62)

4. Lender Governments and the international financial institutions should provide highly indebted poor countries with greater debt relief, longer rescheduling and improved access to global markets. (63)

5. Although international resources devoted to meeting the challenge of HIV/AIDS have increased from about $250 million in 1996 to about $2.8 billion in 2002, more than $10 billion annually is needed to stem the pandemic. (64)

6. Leaders of countries affected by HIV/AIDS need to mobilize resources, commit funds and engage civil society and the private sector in disease-control efforts. (65)

7. The Security Council, working closely with UNAIDS, should host a second special session on HIV/AIDS as a threat to international peace and security, to explore the future effects of HIV/AIDS on States and societies, generate research on the problem and identify critical steps towards a long-term strategy for diminishing the threat. (67)

8. International donors, in partnership with national authorities and local civil society organizations, should undertake a major new global initiative to rebuild local and national public health systems throughout the developing world. (68)

9. Members of the World Health Assembly should provide greater resources to the World Health Organization (WHO) Global Outbreak Alert and Response
Network to increase its capacity to cope with potential disease outbreaks. (69)

10. States should provide incentives for the further development of renewable energy sources and begin to phase out environmentally harmful subsidies, especially for fossil fuel use and development. (71)

11. We urge Member States to reflect on the gap between the promise of the Kyoto Protocol and its performance, re-engage on the problem of global warming and begin new negotiations to produce a new long-term strategy for reducing global warming beyond the period covered by the Protocol (2012). (72)
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Conflict between and within States

12. The Security Council should stand ready to use the authority it has under the Rome Statute to refer cases of suspected war crimes and crimes against humanity to the International Criminal Court. (90)

13. The United Nations should work with national authorities, international financial institutions, civil society organizations and the private sector to develop norms governing the management of natural resources for countries emerging from or at risk of conflict. (92)

14. The United Nations should build on the experience of regional organizations in developing frameworks for minority rights and the protection of democratically elected Governments from unconstitutional overthrow. (94)

15. Member States should expedite and conclude negotiations on legally binding agreements on the marking and tracing, as well as the brokering and transfer, of small arms and light weapons. (96)

16. All Member States should report completely and accurately on all elements of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, and the Secretary-General should be asked to report annually to the General Assembly and Security Council on any inadequacies in the reporting. (97)

17. A training and briefing facility should be established for new or potential special representatives of the Secretary-General and other United Nations mediators.
18. The Department of Political Affairs should be given additional resources and should be restructured to provide more consistent and professional mediation support. (102)

19. While the details of such a restructuring should be left to the Secretary-General, it should take into account the need for the United Nations to have:
(a) A field-oriented, dedicated mediation support capacity, comprised of a small team of professionals with relevant direct experience and expertise, available to all United Nations mediators;
(b) Competence on thematic issues that recur in peace negotiations, such as the sequencing of implementation steps, the design of monitoring arrangements, the sequencing of transitional arrangements and the design of national reconciliation mechanisms;
(c) Greater interaction with national mediators, regional organizations and non-governmental organizations involved in conflict resolution;
(d) Greater consultation with and involvement in peace processes of important voices from civil society, especially those of women, who are often neglected during negotiations. (103)

20. National leaders and parties to conflict should make constructive use of the option of preventive deployment of peacekeepers. (104)

21. The nuclear-weapon States must take several steps to restart disarmament:
(a) They must honour their commitments under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to move towards disarmament and be ready to undertake specific measures in fulfillment of those commitments;
(b) They should reaffirm their previous commitments not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. (120)

22. The United States and the Russian Federation, other nuclear-weapon States and States not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons should commit to practical measures to reduce the risk of accidental nuclear war, including, where appropriate, a progressive schedule for de-alerting their strategic nuclear weapons. (121)

23. The Security Council should explicitly pledge to take collective action in response to a nuclear attack or the threat of such attack on a non-nuclear weapon State. (122)
24. Negotiations to resolve regional conflicts should include confidence-building measures and steps towards disarmament. (123)

25. States not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons should pledge a commitment to non-proliferation and disarmament, demonstrating their commitment by ratifying the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and supporting negotiations for a fissile material cut-off treaty, both of which are open to nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States alike. We recommend that peace efforts in the Middle East and South Asia launch nuclear disarmament talks that could lead to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in those regions similar to those established for Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, the South Pacific and South-East Asia. (124)

26. All chemical-weapon States should expedite the scheduled destruction of all existing chemical weapons stockpiles by the agreed target date of 2012. (125)

27. States parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention should without delay return to negotiations for a credible verification protocol, inviting the active participation of the biotechnology industry. (126)

28. The Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) should recognize the Model Additional Protocol as today’s standard for IAEA safeguards, and the Security Council should be prepared to act in cases of serious concern over non-compliance with non-proliferation and safeguards standards. (129)

29. Negotiations should be engaged without delay and carried forward to an early conclusion on an arrangement, based on the existing provisions of Articles III and IX of the IAEA statute, which would enable IAEA to act as a guarantor for the supply of fissile material to civilian nuclear users. (130)

30. While that arrangement is being negotiated, States should, without surrendering the right under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to construct uranium enrichment and reprocessing facilities, voluntarily institute a time-limited moratorium on the construction of any further such facilities, with a commitment to the moratorium matched by a guarantee of the supply of fissile material.
materials by the current suppliers at market rates. (131)

31. All States should be encouraged to join the voluntary Proliferation Security Initiative. (132)

32. A State’s notice of withdrawal from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons should prompt immediate verification of its compliance with the Treaty, if necessary mandated by the Security Council. The IAEA Board of Governors should resolve that, in the event of violations, all assistance provided by IAEA should be withdrawn. (134)

33. The proposed timeline for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative to convert highly enriched uranium reactors and reduce HEU stockpiles should be halved from 10 to five years. (135)

34. States parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention should negotiate a new bio-security protocol to classify dangerous biological agents and establish binding international standards for the export of such agents. (137)

35. The Conference on Disarmament should move without further delay to negotiate a verifiable fissile material cut-off treaty that, on a designated schedule, ends the production of highly enriched uranium for non-weapon as well as weapons purposes. (138)

36. The Directors-General of IAEA and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) should be invited by the Security Council to report to it twice-yearly on the status of safeguards and verification processes, as well as on any serious concerns they have which might fall short of an actual breach of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Chemical Weapons Convention. (140)

37. The Security Council should consult with the WHO Director-General to establish the necessary procedures for working together in the event of a suspicious or overwhelming outbreak of infectious disease. (144)

Terrorism

38. The United Nations, with the Secretary-General taking a leading role, should promote a comprehensive strategy against terrorism, including:
(a) Dissuasion, working to reverse the causes or facilitators of terrorism, including through promoting social and political rights, the rule of law and
democratic reform; working to end occupations and address major political
grievances; combating organized crime; reducing poverty and unemployment;
and
stopping State collapse;
(b) Efforts to counter extremism and intolerance, including through
education and fostering public debate;
(c) Development of better instruments for global counter-terrorism
cooperation, all within a legal framework that is respectful of civil liberties and
human rights, including in the areas of law enforcement; intelligence -sharing,
where
possible; denial and interdiction, when required; and financial controls;
(d) Building State capacity to prevent terrorist recruitment and operations;
(e) Control of dangerous materials and public health defense. (148)

39. Member States that have not yet done so should actively consider signing
and
ratifying all 12 international conventions against terrorism, and should adopt the
eight Special Recommendations on Terrorist Financing issued by the
Organization
for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)-supported Financial Action
Task Force on Money -Laundering and the measures recommended in its
various
best practices papers. (150)

40. The Al-Qaida and Taliban Sanctions Committee should institute a process for
reviewing the cases of individuals and institutions claiming to have been wrongly
placed or retained on its watch lists. (152)

41. The Security Council, after consultation with affected States, should extend
the authority of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate to act as a clearing
house for State -to -State provision of military, police and border control
assistance
for the development of domestic counter-terrorism capacities. (154)

42. To help Member States comply with their counter -terrorism obligations, the
United Nations should establish a capacity -building trust fund under the Counter-
Terrorism Executive Directorate. (155)

43. The Security Council should devise a schedule of predetermined sanctions
for
State non-compliance with the Council’s counter-terrorism resolutions. (156)

44. The General Assembly should rapidly complete negotiations on a
comprehensive convention on terrorism, incorporating a definition of terrorism
with
the following elements:
(a) Recognition, in the preamble, that State use of force against civilians is regulated by the Geneva Conventions and other instruments, and, if of sufficient scale, constitutes a war crime by the persons concerned or a crime against humanity;
(b) Restatement that acts under the 12 preceding anti-terrorism conventions are terrorism, and a declaration that they are a crime under international law; and restatement that terrorism in time of armed conflict is prohibited by the Geneva Conventions and Protocols;
(c) Reference to the definitions contained in the 1999 International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and Security Council resolution 1566 (2004);
(d) Description of terrorism as "any action, in addition to actions already specified by the existing conventions on aspects of terrorism, the Geneva Conventions and Security Council resolution 1566 (2004), that is intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians or non-combatants, when the purpose of such an act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a Government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act".
(163-164)
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Transnational organized crime

45. Member States that have not signed, ratified or resourced the 2000 United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its three Protocols, and the 2003 United Nations Convention against Corruption should do so, and all Member States should support the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in its work in this area. (172)

46. Member States should establish a central authority to facilitate the exchange of evidence among national judicial authorities, mutual legal assistance among prosecutorial authorities and the implementation of extradition requests. (173)

47. A comprehensive international convention on money-laundering that addresses the issues of bank secrecy and the development of financial havens needs to be negotiated, and endorsed by the General Assembly. (174)
48. Member States should sign and ratify the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, and parties to the Protocol should take all necessary steps to effectively implement it. (175)

49. The United Nations should establish a robust capacity-building mechanism for rule-of-law assistance. (177)

The role of sanctions

50. The Security Council must ensure that sanctions are effectively implemented and enforced:
   (a) When the Security Council imposes a sanctions regime — including arms embargoes — it should routinely establish monitoring mechanisms and provide them with the necessary authority and capacity to carry out high-quality, in-depth investigations. Adequate budgetary provisions must be made to implement those mechanisms;
   (b) Security Council sanctions committees should be mandated to develop improved guidelines and reporting procedures to assist States in sanctions implementation, and to improve procedures for maintaining accurate lists of individuals and entities subject to targeted sanctions;
   (c) The Secretary-General should appoint a senior official with sufficient supporting resources to enable the Secretary-General to supply the Security Council with analysis of the best way to target sanctions and to assist in coordinating their implementation. This official would also assist compliance efforts; identify technical assistance needs and coordinate such assistance; and make recommendations on any adjustments necessary to enhance the effectiveness of sanctions;
   (d) Donors should devote more resources to strengthening the legal, administrative, and policing and border-control capacity of Member States to implement sanctions. Capacity-building measures should include efforts to improve air-traffic interdiction in zones of conflict;
   (e) The Security Council should, in instances of verified, chronic violations, impose secondary sanctions against those involved in sanctions-busting;

51. Sanctions committees should improve procedures for providing humanitarian exemptions and routinely conduct assessments of the humanitarian impact of sanctions. The Security Council should continue to strive to mitigate the
52. Where sanctions involve lists of individuals or entities, sanctions committees should establish procedures to review the cases of those claiming to have been incorrectly placed or retained on such lists. (182)

Part Three

Collective security and the use of force

Using force: rules and guidelines

53. Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations should be neither rewritten nor reinterpreted, either to extend its long-established scope (so as to allow preventive measures to non-imminent threats) or to restrict it (so as to allow its application only to actual attacks). (192)

54. The Security Council is fully empowered under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to address the full range of security threats with which States are concerned. The task is not to find alternatives to the Security Council as a source of authority but to make the Council work better than it has. (198)

55. The Panel endorses the emerging norm that there is a collective international responsibility to protect, exercisable by the Security Council authorizing military intervention as a last resort, in the event of genocide and other large-scale killing, ethnic cleansing or serious violations of humanitarian law which sovereign Governments have proved powerless or unwilling to prevent. (203)

56. In considering whether to authorize or endorse the use of military force, the Security Council should always address — whatever other considerations it may take into account — at least the following five basic criteria of legitimacy:

(a) **Seriousness of threat**. Is the threatened harm to State or human security of a kind, and sufficiently clear and serious, to justify prima facie the use of military force? In the case of internal threats, does it involve genocide and other large-scale killing, ethnic cleansing or serious violations of international humanitarian law, actual or imminently apprehended?

(b) **Proper purpose**. Is it clear that the primary purpose of the proposed military action is to halt or avert the threat in question, whatever other purposes or motives may be involved?
(c) *Last resort*. Has every non-military option for meeting the threat in question been explored, with reasonable grounds for believing that other measures will not succeed?

(d) *Proportional means*. Are the scale, duration and intensity of the proposed military action the minimum necessary to meet the threat in question?

(e) *Balance of consequences*. Is there a reasonable chance of the military action being successful in meeting the threat in question, with the consequences of action not likely to be worse than the consequences of inaction? (207)

57. The above guidelines for authorizing the use of force should be embodied in declaratory resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly. (208)

Peace enforcement and peacekeeping capability

58. The developed States should do more to transform their existing force capacities into suitable contingents for peace operations. (216)

59. Member States should strongly support the efforts of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations of the United Nations Secretariat, building on the important work of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (see A/55/305-S/2000/809), to improve its use of strategic deployment stockpiles, standby arrangements, trust funds and other mechanisms in order to meet the tighter deadlines necessary for effective deployment. (218)

60. States with advanced military capacities should establish standby high readiness, self-sufficient battalions at up to brigade level that can reinforce United Nations missions, and should place them at the disposal of the United Nations. (219)

61. The Secretary-General should recommend and the Security Council should authorize troop strengths for peacekeeping missions that are sufficient to deter and repel hostile factions. (222)

62. The United Nations should have a small corps of senior police officers and managers (50-100 personnel) who could undertake mission assessments and organize the start-up of police components of peace operations, and the General Assembly should authorize this capacity. (223)
Post-conflict peacebuilding

63. Special representatives of the Secretary-General should have the authority and guidance to work with relevant parties to establish robust donor-coordinating mechanisms, as well as the resources to perform coordination functions effectively, including ensuring that the sequencing of United Nations assessments and activities is consistent with Government priorities. (226)

64. The Security Council should mandate and the General Assembly should authorize funding for disarmament and demobilization programmes from assessed budgets for United Nations peacekeeping operations. (227)

65. A standing fund for peacebuilding should be established at the level of at least $250 million that can be used to finance the recurrent expenditures of a nascent Government, as well as critical agency programmes in the areas of rehabilitation and reintegration. (228) A/59/565

Protecting civilians

66. All combatants must abide by the Geneva Conventions. All Member States should sign, ratify and act on all treaties relating to the protection of civilians, such as the Genocide Convention, the Geneva Conventions, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and all refugee conventions. (233)


68. The Security Council, United Nations agencies and Member States should fully implement resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security. (238)

69. Member States should support and fully fund the proposed Directorate of Security and accord high priority to assisting the Secretary-General in implementing a new staff security system in 2005. (239)
Appendix C

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL ON
UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Preventive action:

(a) The Panel endorses the recommendations of the Secretary-General with respect to conflict prevention contained in the Millennium Report and in his remarks before the Security Council’s second open meeting on conflict prevention in July 2000, in particular his appeal to "all who are engaged in conflict prevention and development — the United Nations, the Bretton Woods institutions, Governments and civil society organizations — [to] address these challenges in a more integrated fashion";

(b) The Panel supports the Secretary-General’s more frequent use of fact-finding missions to areas of tension, and stresses Member States’ obligations, under Article 2(5) of the Charter, to give "every assistance" to such activities of the United Nations.

2. Peace-building strategy:

(a) A small percentage of a mission’s first-year budget should be made available to the representative or special representative of the Secretary-General leading the mission to fund quick impact projects in its area of operations, with the advice of the United Nations country team’s resident coordinator;

(b) The Panel recommends a doctrinal shift in the use of civilian police, other rule of law elements and human rights experts in complex peace operations to reflect an increased focus on strengthening rule of law institutions and improving respect for human rights in post-conflict environments;
(c) The Panel recommends that the legislative bodies consider bringing demobilization and reintegration programmes into the assessed budgets of complex peace operations for the first phase of an operation in order to facilitate the rapid disassembly of fighting factions and reduce the likelihood of resumed conflict;

(d) The Panel recommends that the Executive Committee on Peace and Security (ECPS) discuss and recommend to the Secretary-General a plan to strengthen the permanent capacity of the United Nations to develop peace-building strategies and to implement programmes in support of those strategies.

3. Peacekeeping doctrine and strategy:

Once deployed, United Nations peacekeepers must be able to carry out their mandates professionally and successfully and be capable of defending themselves, other mission components and the mission's mandate, with robust rules of engagement, against those who renge on their commitments to a peace accord or otherwise seek to undermine it by violence.

4. Clear, credible and achievable mandates:

(a) The Panel recommends that, before the Security Council agrees to implement a ceasefire or peace agreement with a United Nations-led peacekeeping operation, the Council assure itself that the agreement meets threshold conditions, such as consistency with international human rights standards and practicability of specified tasks and timelines;

(b) The Security Council should leave in draft form resolutions authorizing missions with sizeable troop levels until such time as the Secretary-General has firm commitments of troops and other critical mission support elements, including peace-building elements, from Member States;

(c) Security Council resolutions should meet the requirements of peacekeeping operations when they deploy into potentially dangerous situations, especially the need for a clear chain of command and unity of effort;
(d) The Secretariat must tell the Security Council what it needs to know, not what it wants to hear, when formulating or changing mission mandates, and countries that have committed military units to an operation should have access to Secretariat briefings to the Council on matters affecting the safety and security of their personnel, especially those meetings with implications for a mission’s use of force.

5. Information and strategic analysis:

The Secretary-General should establish an entity, referred to here as the ECPS Information and Strategic Analysis Secretariat (EISAS), which would support the information and analysis needs of all members of ECPS; for management purposes, it should be administered by and report jointly to the heads of the Department of Political Affairs (DPA) and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO).

6. Transitional civil administration:

The Panel recommends that the Secretary-General invite a panel of international legal experts, including individuals with experience in United Nations operations that have transitional administration mandates, to evaluate the feasibility and utility of developing an interim criminal code, including any regional adaptations potentially required, for use by such operations pending the re-establishment of local rule of law and local law enforcement capacity.

7. Determining deployment timelines:

The United Nations should define "rapid and effective deployment capacities" as the ability, from an operational perspective, to fully deploy traditional peacekeeping operations within 30 days after the adoption of a Security Council resolution, and within 90 days in the case of complex peacekeeping operations.

8. Mission leadership:

(a) The Secretary-General should systematize the method of selecting mission leaders, beginning with the compilation of a comprehensive list of potential representatives or special representatives of the Secretary-General, force commanders, civilian police commissioners, and their deputies and other heads of substantive and administrative components, within a
fair geographic and gender distribution and with input from Member States;

(b) The entire leadership of a mission should be selected and assembled at Headquarters as early as possible in order to enable their participation in key aspects of the mission planning process, for briefings on the situation in the mission area and to meet and work with their colleagues in mission leadership;

(c) The Secretariat should routinely provide the mission leadership with strategic guidance and plans for anticipating and overcoming challenges to mandate implementation, and whenever possible should formulate such guidance and plans together with the mission leadership.

9. Military personnel:

(a) Member States should be encouraged, where appropriate, to enter into partnerships with one another, within the context of the United Nations Standby Arrangements System (UNSAS), to form several coherent brigade-size forces, with necessary enabling forces, ready for effective deployment within 30 days of the adoption of a Security Council resolution establishing a traditional peacekeeping operation and within 90 days for complex peacekeeping operations;

(b) The Secretary-General should be given the authority to formally canvass Member States participating in UNSAS regarding their willingness to contribute troops to a potential operation, once it appeared likely that a ceasefire accord or agreement envisaging an implementing role for the United Nations, might be reached;

(c) The Secretariat should, as a standard practice, send a team to confirm the preparedness of each potential troop contributor to meet the provisions of the memoranda of understanding on the requisite training and equipment requirements, prior to deployment; those that do not meet the requirements must not deploy;
(d) The Panel recommends that a revolving "on-call list" of about 100 military officers be created in UNSAS to be available on seven days' notice to augment nuclei of DPKO planners with teams trained to create a mission headquarters for a new peacekeeping operation.

10. Civilian police personnel:

(a) Member States are encouraged to each establish a national pool of civilian police officers that would be ready for deployment to United Nations peace operations on short notice, within the context of the United Nations Standby Arrangements System;

(b) Member States are encouraged to enter into regional training partnerships for civilian police in the respective national pools, to promote a common level of preparedness in accordance with guidelines, standard operating procedures and performance standards to be promulgated by the United Nations;

(c) Members States are encouraged to designate a single point of contact within their governmental structures for the provision of civilian police to United Nations peace operations;

(d) The Panel recommends that a revolving on-call list of about 100 police officers and related experts be created in UNSAS to be available on seven days' notice with teams trained to create the civilian police component of a new peacekeeping operation, train incoming personnel and give the component greater coherence at an early date;

(e) The Panel recommends that parallel arrangements to recommendations (a), (b) and (c) above be established for judicial, penal, human rights and other relevant specialists, who with specialist civilian police will make up collegial "rule of law" teams.

11. Civilian specialists:

(a) The Secretariat should establish a central Internet/Intranet-based roster of pre-selected civilian
candidates available to deploy to peace operations on short notice. The field missions should be granted access to and delegated authority to recruit candidates from it, in accordance with guidelines on fair geographic and gender distribution to be promulgated by the Secretariat;

(b) The Field Service category of personnel should be reformed to mirror the recurrent demands faced by all peace operations, especially at the mid- to senior-levels in the administrative and logistics areas;

(c) Conditions of service for externally recruited civilian staff should be revised to enable the United Nations to attract the most highly qualified candidates, and to then offer those who have served with distinction greater career prospects;

(d) DPKO should formulate a comprehensive staffing strategy for peace operations, outlining, among other issues, the use of United Nations Volunteers, standby arrangements for the provision of civilian personnel on 72 hours' notice to facilitate mission start-up, and the divisions of responsibility among the members of the Executive Committee on Peace and Security for implementing that strategy.

12. Rapidly deployable capacity for public information:

Additional resources should be devoted in mission budgets to public information and the associated personnel and information technology required to get an operation's message out and build effective internal communications links.

13. Logistics support and expenditure management:

(a) The Secretariat should prepare a global logistics support strategy to enable rapid and effective mission deployment within the timelines proposed and corresponding to planning assumptions established by the substantive offices of DPKO;

(b) The General Assembly should authorize and approve a one-time expenditure to maintain at least five mission start-up kits in Brindisi, which should include rapidly deployable communications
equipment. These start-up kits should then be routinely replenished with funding from the assessed contributions to the operations that drew on them;

(c) The Secretary-General should be given authority to draw up to US$50 million from the Peacekeeping Reserve Fund, once it became clear that an operation was likely to be established, with the approval of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) but prior to the adoption of a Security Council resolution;

(d) The Secretariat should undertake a review of the entire procurement policies and procedures (with proposals to the General Assembly for amendments to the Financial Rules and Regulations, as required), to facilitate in particular the rapid and full deployment of an operation within the proposed timelines;

(e) The Secretariat should conduct a review of the policies and procedures governing the management of financial resources in the field missions with a view to providing field missions with much greater flexibility in the management of their budgets;

(f) The Secretariat should increase the level of procurement authority delegated to the field missions (from $200,000 to as high as $1 million, depending on mission size and needs) for all goods and services that are available locally and are not covered under systems contracts or standing commercial services contracts.

14. Funding Headquarters support for peacekeeping operations:

(a) The Panel recommends a substantial increase in resources for Headquarters support of peacekeeping operations, and urges the Secretary-General to submit a proposal to the General Assembly outlining his requirements in full;

(b) Headquarters support for peacekeeping should be treated as a core activity of the United Nations, and as such the majority of its resource requirements for this purpose should be funded through the
mechanism of the regular biennial programme budget of the Organization;

(c) Pending the preparation of the next regular budget submission, the Panel recommends that the Secretary-General approach the General Assembly with a request for an emergency supplemental increase to the Support Account to allow immediate recruitment of additional personnel, particularly in DPKO.

15. Integrated mission planning and support:

Integrated Mission Task Forces (IMTFs), with members seconded from throughout the United Nations system, as necessary, should be the standard vehicle for mission-specific planning and support. IMTFs should serve as the first point of contact for all such support, and IMTF leaders should have temporary line authority over seconded personnel, in accordance with agreements between DPKO, DPA and other contributing departments, programmes, funds and agencies.

16. Other structural adjustments in DPKO:

(a) The current Military and Civilian Police Division should be restructured, moving the Civilian Police Unit out of the military reporting chain. Consideration should be given to upgrading the rank and level of the Civilian Police Adviser;

(b) The Military Adviser's Office in DPKO should be restructured to correspond more closely to the way in which the military field headquarters in United Nations peacekeeping operations are structured;

(c) A new unit should be established in DPKO and staffed with the relevant expertise for the provision of advice on criminal law issues that are critical to the effective use of civilian police in the United Nations peace operations;

(d) The Under-Secretary-General for Management should delegate authority and responsibility for peacekeeping-related budgeting and procurement functions to the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations for a two-year trial period;
(e) The Lessons Learned Unit should be substantially enhanced and moved into a revamped DPKO Office of Operations;

(f) Consideration should be given to increasing the number of Assistant Secretaries-General in DPKO from two to three, with one of the three designated as the "Principal Assistant Secretary-General" and functioning as the deputy to the Under-Secretary-General.

17. Operational support for public information:

A unit for operational planning and support of public information in peace operations should be established, either within DPKO or within a new Peace and Security Information Service in the Department of Public Information (DPI) reporting directly to the Under-Secretary-General for Communication and Public Information.

18. Peace-building support in the Department of Political Affairs:

(a) The Panel supports the Secretariat's effort to create a pilot Peace-building Unit within DPA, in cooperation with other integral United Nations elements, and suggests that regular budgetary support for this unit be revisited by the membership if the pilot programme works well. This programme should be evaluated in the context of guidance the Panel has provided in paragraph 46 above, and if considered the best available option for strengthening United Nations peace-building capacity it should be presented to the Secretary-General within the context of the Panel's recommendation contained in paragraph 47 (d) above;

(b) The Panel recommends that regular budget resources for Electoral Assistance Division programmatic expenses be substantially increased to meet the rapidly growing demand for its services, in lieu of voluntary contributions;

(c) To relieve demand on the Field Administration and Logistics Division (FALD) and the executive office of DPA, and to improve support services rendered to smaller political and peace-building field offices, the
Panel recommends that procurement, logistics, staff recruitment and other support services for all such smaller, non-military field missions be provided by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS).

19. Peace operations support in the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights:

The Panel recommends substantially enhancing the field mission planning and preparation capacity of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, with funding partly from the regular budget and partly from peace operations mission budgets.

20. Peace operations and the information age:

(a) Headquarters peace and security departments need a responsibility centre to devise and oversee the implementation of common information technology strategy and training for peace operations, residing in EISAS. Mission counterparts to the responsibility centre should also be appointed to serve in the offices of the special representatives of the Secretary-General in complex peace operations to oversee the implementation of that strategy;

(b) EISAS, in cooperation with the Information Technology Services Division (ITSD), should implement an enhanced peace operations element on the current United Nations Intranet and link it to the missions through a Peace Operations Extranet (POE);

(c) Peace operations could benefit greatly from more extensive use of geographic information systems (GIS) technology, which quickly integrates operational information with electronic maps of the mission area, for applications as diverse as demobilization, civilian policing, voter registration, human rights monitoring and reconstruction;

(d) The IT needs of mission components with unique information technology needs, such as civilian police and human rights, should be anticipated and met more consistently in mission planning and implementation;
(e) The Panel encourages the development of web site co-management by Headquarters and the field missions, in which Headquarters would maintain oversight but individual missions would have staff authorized to produce and post web content that conforms to basic presentational standards and policy.
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