

UNA Southern Counties Region – Conference

The Relevance of the UN in Today's World

Conference

21 – 23 August 2009

Chichester University, Bishop Otter Campus

Why Peace Keeping is not effective - the Alternatives

Speaker: Vijay Mehta

Other speakers include: Sir Richard Jolly, David Wardrop,
Peter Challen, Catherine Ronderas and Selina Brewer

Contact: Southern Counties Region UNA
01483 285 229

Email: vijay@vmpeace.org

Web: www.vmpeace.org

Web: www.actionfourrenewal.org.uk

Contents

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. What drives conflicts – civil, international and future wars**
- 3. How peacekeeping works?**
- 4. Are the three largest peacekeeping operations effective?**
 - MONUC (Democratic Republic of Congo)
 - UNAMID (Darfur – Sudan)
 - IASF (Afghanistan)
- 5. What are the alternatives, policy recommendations, and campaigns to kick-start effective peacekeeping?**
- 6. Way forward**
- 7. Conclusion**

Introduction

Thank you Michael Blackshaw, Greame Panting, Sid, Viv Williams and members of UNA Southern Counties region for inviting me to speak today. It is great to be among an audience knowledgeable and dedicated peace activists and intellectuals as you are who are a driving force behind all change and who keep a check on the excesses of governments and leaders.

A few weeks ago, I was in Belfast to give a talk to a conference on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission for Britain and Ireland. I had the opportunity to meet people who had suffered from violence in the Northern Ireland conflict and had been on hunger strike and gone to prison. I also had the opportunity to see how the Good Friday Agreement and the Northern Ireland Peace Process is working and holding the peace together. The comments from my speech were given prominence in the following day's Irish Times.

I'm going to examine what drives conflict, how peacekeeping works, why three of the today's largest peacekeeping operations are in a mess and what are the alternatives, policy recommendations for successful peacekeeping operations?

Thousands of years of conflicts and wars span over history of world civilisation. Humanity has been subject to religious, tribal, territorial and resource wars bringing endless bloodshed, misery and suffering, without much success in peacekeeping. So today's title why peacekeeping is not effective is timely.

The title alludes that the UN is ineffective at peacekeeping – and is therefore not able to fulfil its vision and mandate for which it was created.

“...to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind.” (Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations)

Former Secretary General Kofi Annan famously called the UN “the only fire brigade in the world that has to acquire a fire engine after the fire has started.” Even when peacekeeping is the most appropriate protection tool, the UN must always overcome significant challenges to deploy and support each new mission.

The UN has failed to stand up to dictators and perpetrators of genocide. Its failure to halt the Rwandan genocide in 1994 to intervene in Srebrenica massacre in 1995 and its recent failure to stop the humanitarian crisis in Sri Lanka are a few examples of its impotency on the major issues of the day. One of its agencies, UN Human Rights Council's obsession with criticising Israel and its failure to halt genocide in Sudan shows that the newly formed human rights council is not working.

The history of the UN peacekeeping is a mixed bag. There have been many successes in Cambodia, Mozambique, Haiti and Timor-Leste including long standing peacekeeping

troops in Kashmir and Cyprus. Other missions are not so successful – Rwanda, Kivu in Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Darfur in Sudan.

2009 has been one of the worst years which the role of UN and the international community has diminished to a low level. The recent conflict in Sri Lanka, escalating war in Afghanistan and Pakistan, the ongoing problems in Middle East, Iran and North Korea are a few examples where the UN and international community have not been able to broker the peace. The unfolding and growing humanitarian crisis in Sri Lanka, Gaza and Swat Valley in Pakistan where 2 million people have become refugees is a fact that is shameful and shocking.

Three of the largest peacekeeping operations in DRC, Darfur (Sudan) and Afghanistan, are not achieving the objective they were set out to do. Let me tell you what Ban-Ki Moon Secretary General of UN recently had to say about peacekeeping. “The United Nations is struggling to keep its peacekeeping missions staffed and supplied as the world endures an unprecedented combination of crises.

We are living through an era like no other. There are multiple crises: a food crisis, fuel crisis, flu crisis and financial crisis

Each is a crisis we have not seen for many years, even generations. But this time they are hitting the world all at once. We have never seen any era when we have been hit by all these multiple crises at the one time," Ban said.

He said UN donor countries were being compelled to cut their support in money, soldiers and other resources at a moment when the world's conflict zones need more support, not less. Peacekeeping has experienced serious setbacks. Today we face mounting difficulties in getting enough troops, the right equipment and adequate logistical support. This supply has not kept pace with demand," he said.

Ban said the UN employed 78,000 military personnel, 11,000 police and 23,000 civil servants in 16 peacekeeping operations and 27 other political missions in the world's trouble spots - but needed much more help to do its job properly in lands wracked by fighting, famine and poverty. He said achieving UN goals would mean building up the capabilities of regional peacekeeping players, including the European Union and the African Union”

Peacekeeping to be effective is combination of several factors which include dialogue and mediation at the pre-conflict stage, enforcement of peace during the war, giving parties breathing space to reach an agreement, and post-conflict reconstruction when the warring parties entered a peace agreement and trying to work things together for a future free of violence.

However, I will argue that the reconciliation in the pre-conflict mode is the most important for not only finding causes and reasons for tensions and hostilities but also for resolving disputes before they become full-blown war. This is the sign of a successful peacekeeping operation. It not only saves millions of lives which are lost

in a nasty war, but also saves billions of dollars (\$7 billion dollars at present spent on peacekeeping) and free much needed valuable resources (food, water, energy, etc) which are increasingly short in supply.

What drives conflicts – civil, international and future wars

Root Cause of War

What drives conflict? I think many causes which include violence (ethnic, religious, racial intolerance), neo-colonialism, lack of democracy, poor governance, role of media in misrepresenting the facts and flaring the hostilities and tensions. Military spending in armed conflicts, involvement of Pentagon and Military Industrial Complex's 'war of aggression,' has a direct vested interest in the perpetuation of such conflicts is a major cause of ongoing wars. Afghanistan and Pakistan is a example of that.

Another danger to world peace and security is the level of poverty and hunger of the one sixth of the world's population, who are under nourished and live in developing countries and are prone to conflicts over resources.

Refugees and internally displaced populations (IDPs) are a increasing source of violence and tension in the communities. According to UNICEF 2006 estimates, more than 1 billion children under the age of 18 are living in areas of conflict or emerging from war. There is a problem of mass displacements caused by conflicts (IDPs) which is linked with problem of population displacement and 'one sided violence' committed by armed forces against civilians.

A major threat to global stability is the food crises in poor countries which causes government collapse turning into a failed state. Global warming is causing a shortage of freshwater, the loss of topsoil and rising temperatures, all of which reduce food production.

The resulting food-price inflation puts severe stress on the governments with fragile economies. Teetering on the edge, these can easily become failed states. Many of their problems stem from the inability to control their populations making them particularly vulnerable to food pressures.

States fail when national governments can no longer provide personal security, food security and basic social services such as education and health care. They often lose control of part or all of their territory. After a point, they can become so dangerous that food relief workers are no longer safe and their programmes are curtailed (for example, Somalia and Afghanistan).

Failing states are an international problem because they are a source of terrorists, drugs, weapons and refugees, threatening political stability everywhere. Somalia is a failed state and has become a base for piracy; Iraq is a hotbed for terrorist training and Afghanistan is at war and is the world's leading supplier of heroin. Following the massive genocide in Rwanda, refugees from that failed state, thousands of armed soldiers

among them, helped to destabilize neighbouring Democratic Republic of Congo. Once states fail, no one assumes responsibility for their debt to outside lenders. If enough states disintegrate, their fall will threaten the stability of global civilisation.

Civil wars

There are some 20 civil conflicts burning around the globe, from Colombia to Iraq to Pakistan. Which raises some questions: How long do most civil wars last? What is a civil war, anyway? And how, finally, are they ended? a civil war is one fought within a society, but there are two kinds. In one, rebels seek to take over a region (as in Sri Lanka); in the other, they aim to control the whole state (like the FARC in Colombia).

Civil wars tend to last if you accept the general definition of a civil war as one fought within internationally recognised borders, then throughout history civil conflicts have tended to outlast international wars by 20 times.

Typically they last for 7 to 15 years on average, while the average for international wars is about six months. On the face of it, such persistence must be a function of deep grievance felt by the warring parties, divided over ideology or religion or the thirst for justice, fighting to the bitter end.

One extreme forerunner of this would be the interminable wars between the Scots and the English, which lasted for more than four centuries. In the more modern category is the Spanish Civil War in the 1930s, fought by right-wing rebels fearful their Spain of church and king was being liquidated by the left.

The true reasons for longevity in civil conflicts are more prosaic, at least in modern times. While they may begin by professing noble sentiments, insurgents sooner or later become self-interested fighting organisations, which want mainly to preserve themselves and the resources they command. For example, that the Tamil Tigers had a revenue base of roughly \$30 million a year.

Another reason civil wars drag on is what economists call the time consistency problem: a government has no credibility in negotiating an end to a civil war because the rebels know that even if they lay down their arms, the state will keep its military. So the fight goes on, as long as neither side can crush the other.

In the recent conflict in Sri Lanka, the rebel leader died in the final battle. The real tipping point had already been reached — when rebel financing from Tamils abroad was squeezed while the government could buy new weapons and expand its army.

Civil wars can be ended by outside intervention, as in the Balkans. Sometimes such intervention may only prolong wars. In Bosnia now there is very little economic development or reconstruction, because actually it's a frozen war.

International and future Wars

Future wars now are mainly guerrilla wars, insurgencies and terrorism. The methods of operating are changing as space technology is co-ordinating the war in Iraq, Afghanistan

and Pakistan with tragic consequences to hundreds of innocent civilians who have been killed by United States unmanned aerial vehicles, or “drones” as they are popularly called. This is becoming the future face of wars. These killing machines are Pentagon’s answer to escalating war costs and difficulty in recruiting.

These drones are directed by military space satellites and flown by U.S. soldiers sitting at computer terminals inside Creech Air Force Base near Las Vegas (Nevada). The Air Force named these drones the “Predator” and the “Reaper.” The pilots watch in “real time” as cameras on the drones send back images from the war zone and in split-second time a button is pressed and missiles are fired. The hit could be the Taliban, it can be a wedding or a funeral as happened recently in South Waziristan. Can there be the slightest doubt that this “hands off” way of killing today is absolutely repugnant, as it kills from a distance with little conscience or public outcry? It is also an attack on a sovereign country, and hence illegal under the UN Charter.

Pentagon has a different view of future wars. They want to develop a new weapon that would allow US to take out a fleeting target in a manner of minutes. They say that conventional armed bombers are "too slow and too intrusive" for many "global strike missions." They are for several years have advocated for a "prompt global strike" weapon, which would be ultra-fast and fitted with a conventional warhead. Congress, due largely to worries that other nations, like Russia, would be unable to quickly determine whether an in-flight warhead was nuclear, has refused to fund the program.

Future wars will be resource wars which will see over population and resource scarcity which will be the direct cause of confrontation, conflicts and wars. The struggle to maintain access to critical resources will spark local and regional conflicts that will evolve into more frequent conventional wars of the next century.

The early decades of the new millennium, wars will be fought not over ideology but over access to dwindling supplies of precious natural commodities. The political divisions of the Cold War, have given way to a global scramble for oil, natural gas, minerals, and water. And as armies throughout the world define resource security as a primary objective, widespread instability is bound to follow, especially in those areas where competition for essential materials overlaps with long-standing territorial and religious disputes. The recent explosive conflict between the United States and Islamic extremism stands revealed as the predictable consequence of consumer nations seeking to protect the vital resources they depend on.

The conflict in Darfur – Sudan is one such example. Today notion of resource wars leads us to think immediately of oil, but water will be fundamental need of some countries and peoples. We need to preserve rain forests, but expanding populations will increasingly create regional shortages of food – especially when nature turns fatal. We are entering the century of not enough and will fight for things we could previously have.

How peacekeeping works?

Peacekeeping institution is not mentioned in the UN's original charter. Dag Hammarskjöld, UN secretary general seized the opportunity of the Suez Crisis created by Britain and France's invasion of Egypt in 1956 to persuade governments to create peacekeeping forces. Since the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s, "Blue Helmet" peace keeping missions have multiplied and UN peacekeepers now serve in flashpoints as far apart as East Timor and Haiti, though chiefly in Africa and the Middle East.

Several regional forces, notably NATO and the African Union, run peacekeeping missions, sometimes alongside the UN as in Kosovo and Afghanistan, sometimes with the UN's blessing only, as in Darfur and Somalia. A mainly US force has policed Egypt's Sinai Peninsula since it made peace with Israel while Russian peacekeepers are deployed in a number of ethnic flashpoints of the ex-USSR, though their impartiality is often questioned.

But with more than 112,000 personnel in the field as start of 2009 extended over 4 continents, with a budget of \$7 billion the UN's Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) is by far the biggest and most recognised brand of peacekeeping today. However, if one includes sixty multilateral peace operations conducted in 2008 including NATO / African Union – record number of personal (187,586) were deployed. It included 166,000 military, 21000 civilians including police and military observers from 137 countries.

Most of the peacekeeping operations have been following former Secretary General Boutros Boutros – Ghali's seminal report, Agenda for Peace which outlines how peace enforcement should work, which should also include peacemaking, peacekeeping and post-conflict reconstruction

A peace keeping operation comes into being when any UN member state, regional group or the UN administration (Secretariat) itself can approach the UN's 15-member Security Council to request a peacekeeping mission. A carefully drafted first resolution has then to be voted through by the Security Council. This first resolution states that the council agrees in principle to the mission and asks the head of the UN secretary general to submit a detailed plan together with a rough cost estimate.

The power of veto enjoyed by the five permanent members - China, France, Russia, the UK and the US - means the mission cannot be approved by a simple majority. If the vote does succeed, and time permits, the secretary general dispatches one or more assessment missions, then reports back to the council with options and recommendations as appropriate. There is then a vote on a second resolution (mandate), approving all or part of the plan and formally authorising the mission.

While the mandate goes through the Security Council, the Secretariat contacts potential contributors of troops, police and equipment. This is necessary as the UN has no armed forces other than those which member-states provide for each specific peacekeeping operation. Once the mandate is passed, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations approaches potential contributors to assess what they can provide.

Factors taken into account are force requirements, readiness and geographic distribution. A core group of developing countries continue to provide most of the Blue Helmets. As of February 2007, the top five troop-contributors were Pakistan, Bangladesh, India, Jordan and Nepal. Blue Helmet missions are meant to "reflect the diversity of countries and cultures in the international community", the DPKO says, but it admits that getting enough boots on the ground from the developed world remains a major concern.

"Countries from the South [ie developing world] should not and must not be expected to shoulder this burden alone," the head of peacekeeping, Jean-Marie Guehenno, has said. The UN pays force-contributing governments, which in turn pay their own troops and police according to their national rank and salary scales.

As for who finances UN operations, the US was the biggest contributor at the last official count (1 January 2006), followed by Japan, Germany, the UK, France, Italy, Canada, Spain, China and the Netherlands. The UN carefully evaluates the capacity of each potential contributing country to provide personnel capable of "meeting the high standards required to serve in UN peacekeeping operations".

Most peacekeeping troops are combat-trained and many find peacekeeping somewhat frustrating as they make little or no use of their military skills, while differences in national military cultures raise questions of quality and shape the ways in which peacekeepers act on the ground. An extensive internal review in 2004, the Zeid Report, highlighted instances of sexual abuse by peacekeepers and prompted a policy of "zero tolerance". Towards the end of his tenure as UN secretary general in December, Kofi Annan told a conference on abuse that the UN was working on a binding treaty on the prosecution of sexual abuse committed by peacekeepers.

Some Blue Helmet deployments have lasted decades, and of the 13 missions set up during the Cold War (ie pre-1988), five remain active. Some UN wags have privately dubbed Cyprus (launched 1964) a "Five-Star Mission", seeing it as a relatively safe posting on a Mediterranean island popular with tourists, and perhaps forgetting the casualties Blue Helmets took there in the early years.

But missions have an end too. Given six months to a year initially, their mandates periodically come up for renewal at the Security Council. If the mandate is considered to have been successfully fulfilled, the mission is closed down. The UN counts among its successes deployments in Mozambique (1992-94) and Cambodia (1991-93). And then there are missions which have their mandate withdrawn after the conflict spirals out of the UN's hands, as in Rwanda in the 1990s.

Are the three largest peacekeeping operations effective?

- MONUC (Democratic Republic of Congo)
- UNAMID (Darfur – Sudan)
- IASF (Afghanistan)

Legitimacy is desirable in principle and fundamental to the ability of multilateral peacekeeping to promote and secure sustainable peace. Any peacekeeping operation should be perceived legitimate otherwise it can seriously undermine its effectiveness. Legitimacy comprises three interlinked and mutually reinforcing elements: political consensus, legality and moral authority.

- Political consensus agreement, or acquiescence, among external actors and the host government that a peace operation is required and appropriate.
- A missions legitimacy is widely seen as determined by political consensus and international legality.
- The conduct of its personnel largely determines the moral authority of a peace operation.

The legality of the European Union (EU) Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX Kosovo) was seen as directly linked to Kosovo's disputed independence. EULEX Kosovo testifies to the centrality of political consensus surrounding an operation's legality and its legitimacy. Conversely, the experience of the EU military operation in Chad and the Central African Republic (EUFOR Tchad/RCA) underscores how the appropriateness and execution of a mandate determine the mandate's legitimacy, and how this can be undermined by political compromise—international or local.

The cases of the UN Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), the African Union (AU) Mission in Somalia and the AU/UN Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) show that the moral authority of an operation is crucial to securing local legitimacy. If an operation is perceived to lack moral authority, this may affect countries' decisions to deploy personnel. Reluctance to provide the reinforcement requested by MONUC at the end of 2008 was probably influenced by the misconduct scandals that have surrounded the mission.

The demand for effective peacekeeping outstrips the availability of human and other resources. In 2008, 23 UN missions fell around 22 800 personnel short of authorised strength. Ensuring that missions enjoy sound political, legal and moral standing should be a priority.

Three of the biggest peacekeeping operations in the world, DRC, Sudan, and Afghanistan are not producing the desired results.

The mandate of the UN Peacekeeping mission in the **Democratic Republic of Congo**, known by the acronym MONUC (United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo), includes 45 discreet tasks and responsibilities, not the least of which is the protection of civilians in the hilly, densely forested, nearly inaccessible provinces of North and South Kivu in the east of the country. Meanwhile, the 3,000 troops and additional equipment that were promised to the mission in December of 2008 have still not been deployed.

MONUC has been facing a “very unique situation” since it was effectively engaged in three military operations at once: alongside the Congolese Armed Forces (FARDC) against the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA); against the militias in Ituri; and against the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR) in the Kivus. The Mission, the largest United Nations peacekeeping operation deployed anywhere in the world, was facing all the challenges faced by any mission, including the use of force and the protection of civilians.

In the DRC, an invisible war has been going around for 12 years where UN peacekeepers (Monuc) are not only producing any results but according to some observers they are actually standing by as the perpetrators massacre people. Over five million dead, hundreds of thousands of women and girls raped and sexually tortured in the most unimaginable ways, 800,000 internally displaced since January 2009 and close to 350,000 forced to flee to neighbouring countries. This violence is fuelled by the world's need for minerals, most recently due to the economic crisis. Congo, the sixth most mineral-rich country in Africa, has become the stage for a regional war fuelled by economic interests – a resource war backed by extraction of minerals.

The UN has not been able to tackle the rebel leader, Laurent Nkunda, and neutralise his troops. In a desperate attempt, they are joining with the enemy militias by offering logistical support. However, this has not yet taken place as war continues as the Western world is hungry for minerals. Only an effort by the international community to support a solution other than military means can bring forward a peaceful solution in a war destroyed country.

The situation in **Darfur, Sudan** is problematic and its challenges are vast and difficult because of the size of the country. UN peacekeeping troops under UNAMID (African Union/United Nations Hybrid operation in Darfur) are charged with supporting the implementation of the Darfur Peace Agreement. The conflict began in 2003, when rebel groups began attacking government targets. In retaliation, the government launched a military and police campaign in Darfur. More than 2 million people fled their homes due to government aircraft bombing villages, after which the Arab Janjaweed militia would ride in on camels and horses to slaughter, rape and steal. Many have claimed that this has been a deliberate attempt to drive black Africans out of Darfur. The government admits mobilising "self-defence militias", but denies links to the Janjaweed and says the problems have been exaggerated.

The chances of peace look bleak. Sudan's rebel Justice and Equality Movement (Jem) signed a declaration of intent in February 2009 to pave the way for broader peace talks with Khartoum. But previous peace efforts have faltered, as the rebels group have splintered. The leader of one Sudan Liberation Army (SLA) faction, Minni Minnawi, has signed a deal with government. He was given a large budget and became a presidential adviser, but the SLA then splintered into a number of factions.

There are efforts to stop the fighting but the results remain mixed owing to the fact that the president, who has been issued with warrants for his arrest for crimes against humanity, is free and remains in power. The Doha meeting where Khartoum and Jem signed an agreement in February 2009 to pave the way for broader peace talks were sponsored by Qatar, the United Nations, the African Union and Arab League. The joint African Union-UN peacekeeping mission, Unamid, took over from January 2008 from an African peace force. But the mission is currently at only 60% of its mandated strength, with just 15,000 of the 26,000 planned troops and police on the ground. Some say even the full force would not be enough to cover the remote area.

The failure of the Darfur Peace Agreement and the fragmentation of rebel movements into small groups, has led the African Union to try to consolidate what had been achieved so far. That had only added to UNAMID's challenge because it had resulted in the loss of command and control even among the groups themselves. Additionally, the groups had become too small and too weak, with the result that they had begun to act in a manner that increased the insecurity now being witnessed in Darfur.

Afghanistan has 51,000 UN/NATO troops under NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). Established by the UN Security Council in December 2001, its stated role is to promote security and development. The country suffers from insurgent attacks, slow political and economic progress. I think the lack of coordination and strategy hampers progress and frustrates the Afghan government and people. There is also a media coverage which continues to give bleak prospects and emphasis on an unwinnable war. The drone attacks by the US into a sovereign country make it harder the job of the peacekeeping troops. It makes Afghanistan a complex place where future political and economic efforts are frustrated and where peace is becoming a distant dream.

Stability, security and prosperity in Afghanistan, Pakistan and neighbouring countries can only be achieved by sustained public and private sectors working on border management, countering terrorism, illicit trafficking, economic and social development.

Increasingly, it is now felt that within the UN, NATO, and by other military and government leaders that there is an increased need to have a dialogue with the moderate elements of the Taliban and Al-Qaeda for a peaceful outcome of the Afghanistan conflict.

The fanatical and violent Islamist outfits know that their dream of creating a strict Islamic state across the Muslim realm is not going to happen as majority of the population in the Muslim world, no matter how anti-west in orientation, has largely refused to rise up to the call of what was advocated as true, un-adulterated Islam.

What are the alternatives, policy recommendations and campaigns to kick-start effective peacekeeping?

These can be described as pre-conflict and post-conflict peacebuilding, faster and better peacekeeping enforcements, adhering to UN charter and International Law, disarmament and non-proliferation, humanitarian intervention, sanctions, prevention of war, activism, education, culture of peace and more robust allocation of funds for peacekeeping. A combination of these will be needed to meet key peacekeeping challenges which are a) demand for increased peacekeeping, b) limited reality of UN reforms c) escalating terrorism, d) increasing violence of civilians and internally displaced persons (IDPs).

- **All peacekeeping operations go through 3 process – pre-conflict, peace enforcement and post-conflict.**

I believe that dealing with pre-conflict successfully is the most important as it saves money (7.1 billion is the cost of peacekeeping today) and human cost as countless casualties happen when the conflict starts).

With a few thousand peacekeepers a conflict which has not fully blown and not turned into a nasty war, can be rescued and brought under control. This can save bloodshed long drawn out war and savings of hundreds of millions in peacekeeping.

In Kosovo the observers of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) did a very effective job in controlling the situation, until they were thrown out by those who had sent them there and the NATO militarists took over, a dispute which has not been resolved till today and is known as a frozen war.

Russians, Serbians, Macedonians, and Montenegrins are all trying to make sense out of the break up of the former Yugoslavia and consequences. It's still an unfinished story in a region with a long history of complicated conflict and deep UN involvement.

In peace enforcement the priority is for warring parties to stop the war immediately and have ceasefire. It should be followed by destruction of military capabilities of combatants, a pre-requisite to political settlements. This gives the parties in dispute a breathing space to sort out their differences and come to some sort of a peace agreement which all parties to the dispute agree to work towards for a peaceful future. The obvious examples are Kashmir and Cyprus where peace has been maintained for over 40 years.

Post-conflict peacekeeping is very important in the sense that according to statistics most of the conflicts reoccur within 5 years of a peace agreement. This is the reason that institutions of government, backed by rule of law and return of normal life, are important to be maintained when the war has ended. The continuity of peace after the violence of Northern Ireland is an example.

Rapid Reaction Force or a civilian peace mission should be formed with trained civilians which can be rapidly deployed to help prevent weak states from collapsing and preventing deadly conflicts. This force will not be prone to delays by the indecisions of Security Council. It will be available for contingency operations in Congo, Darfur and other areas of conflict. The peacekeepers will go through a training program to enhance the peacekeeping capabilities.

The role of army should be changed from warfare to peace operations and conflict resolution should become a priority. As the role of the traditional war fighting is declining the best role for the millions of soldiers (boots on the ground) is to change their traditional role of warfare to peacekeeping. British army has played peacekeeping role in the past in Northern Ireland, Sierra Leone and former Yugoslavia. They had a limited success and became a role model for other armies to copy. This role needs to be extended and done on a larger and organised way.

However, peacekeepers should not be used for the wrong purposes like the African Union force of 4,300, solely being used to protect President Sharif Ahmed of Somalia in his official quarters.

Complying with the UN Charter.

States have signed and agreed under Chapter 7 provisions of the UN Charter, and have accepted not to go to war which in other words, make the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan illegal.

UN and civil society should promote laws which prohibit wars like:

- The general treaty for the Renunciation of War (Kellogg-Briand Pact)
- The Nuremberg charter and principals
- The charter of the United Nations

The main legal principals included in the UN charter are that:

- International disputes must be settle by peaceful means,
- Member States must never threaten or use force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any of a state.
- The only legal use of armed force should occur when a state has been attacked and must defend itself and/or on the authorised resolution of the Security Council to restore international peace and security, provided all peaceful means of settlements have been exhausted

Bringing Security Council reforms for increasing the peacekeeping budget, accelerating preventative measures to concentrate on pre-conflict and post-conflict policing, following the recommendations of the peacebuilding commission.

The UN Security Council should craft the mandates and determine the character of each new UN peacekeeping deployment which is achievable. Where peacekeeping is not appropriate, it is also the Security Council that can authorise the deployment of a non-UN peace enforcement mission.

For UN peacekeeping operations, it is critical that the Security Council recognise the limitations of the tool. In deliberations over the viability of a new UN peacekeeping operation the Security Council must consider:

- a) Whether a situation exists the continuation of which is likely to endanger or constitute a threat to international peace and security;

- b) Whether regional or sub-regional organizations and arrangements exist and are ready and able to assist in resolving the situation;
- c) Whether a cease-fire exists and whether the parties have committed themselves to a peace process intended to reach a political settlement;
- d) Whether a clear political goal exists and whether it can be reflected in the mandate;
- e) Whether a precise mandate for a United Nations operation can be formulated.

If these questions can not be satisfactorily answered, and these conditions fulfilled, then the Security Council must consider whether or not a peace enforcement operation is the more appropriate way forward. All permanent members of the UN Security Council should use their leadership position to ensure that all new peacekeeping operations have clear, achievable mandates, and that they are well resourced to fulfil the tasks that the UN has set for them.

Applying Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine and international law (under ICC) to stop genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. Follow the R2P doctrine to stop conflicts and to get rid of dictators and evil politicians who have perpetrated rapes and murders in their own countries against their own citizens. R2P, which has been agreed by the UN, can be applied for failed states, chronic low-grade conflicts, and ungoverned spaces (Somalia and Rwanda)

R2P and Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide provide a legal and ethical basis for "humanitarian intervention": the intervention by external actors (preferably the international community through the UN) in a state that is unwilling or unable to fight genocide, massive killings and other massive human rights violations being inflicted on its citizens. It should only be used as a last resort and the concept should be widened to include method of conflict resolution other than the use of force, till all peaceful diplomatic means are exhausted.

However, it is a concept difficult to enforce except for the limited success in prosecuting Charles Taylor from Liberia. Recently warrant for arrest were issued against President Bashir of Sudan who has brought untold suffering to millions of his own country men and is still roaming around in different parts of Africa as a free person escaping arrest.

The implementation of R2P up to now has been an abject failure because most powerful countries in the world have done little to provide resources for prevention of atrocities and crimes. Civil society actors should forge broad based alliances to generate public support for positive action. The only way the concept can become successful if sufficient numbers of well trained and equipped peace keeping forces are authorised to take appropriate actions for implementing the doctrine. Civil society actors should forge broad based alliances to generate public support for its implementation and its positive action.

When genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes or crimes against humanity are being committed, it is important that world governments respond with quick, concerted diplomatic action, and, if necessary, that the UN Security Council give swift

authorization for the deployment of a non-UN peace enforcement operation, with or without the consent of the host government. However, the authorisation of non-consensual intervention continues to be politically controversial.

Targeting sanctions have become an established practice in international relations since the end of the Cold War. It can be directed at certain leaders, particular commodities and services. These can be imposed by UN, EU, African countries and WTO. However, its role in peacekeeping is debatable as sanctions imposed on Iran, North Korea, Iraq and Burma are not bringing results. If the neighbouring countries, like China and India, in the region keep trading as in the case of Burma, the affect of sanctions can be negligible. However, economic sanctions have a certain effect as it hurts the economy and can be effective tool for peacekeeping as was the case in the Apartheid era of South Africa.

There are various non-violent ways sanctions can be applied.

1. Treating citizen groups as representatives of society instead of warring parties which marginalises the military
2. By tightening the embargo surveillance with the support of unarmed civilians on all products including arms cargo
3. Make sanctions more effective by better targeting and being more humane

Holding Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRC) to prevent future conflicts like the one in South Africa, Peru, East Timor and Morocco. The tribunals for Rwanda and Yugoslavia are other examples. It brings into open grievances of the warring tribes, nations and religions about the misgivings of different communities. It brings forward the fact that inside all of us, we are essentially the same – human beings, standing up for our Human Rights and civil liberties, pursuing the same goals of peace and happiness. We need TRC's for Burma, Sri-Lanka, Middle-East, Afghanistan to bring open the violations of international law, and the persecution of minorities.

Campaigning to ban US military bases as in Iraq, Afghanistan and other places around the world. American bases in particular now ring the entire globe and represent a huge financial, environmental and human investment. Have they really made anyone safer?

In America Military Industrial Complex (MIC) calls the shots. America is a global bully with 750 bases in 130 countries. In addition there are 1000 bases in US alone. It also deploys half a million solders including spies who work under a dozen or so Carrier Task Forces in all oceans and seas of the world. America is a military juggernaut intent on world domination. It spends approximately \$250 billion annually to maintain troops, equipment, fleets and bases world wide.

Protecting civilians in armed conflict and avoid cover-ups. The sorrow and brutality of war continues to be felt by untold millions of civilians in Gaza, Sri Lanka, Somalia trapped by conflict or forced to flight from their homes to become refugees or Internally Displaced Person (IDP). International community has a duty to this humanitarian catastrophe to respond and protect these helpless millions in a comprehensive and

systematic way. Have an independent verification of the deaths in conflicts instead of the constant military cover-ups and misinformation by governments and the media, for the sake of continuation of war.

Stopping the war propaganda which is used for selling war to populations and should be defended by alternative non-violent demonstrations, material-magazines, records, brochures and the like extolling the virtues of peaceful co-existence and the resolution of conflicts.

We can challenge the war propaganda as the current issue of New Scientist has an article entitled 'The End of War'. It appears that the view that war is an endemic part of the human condition because it is built into human nature is wrong. The consensus is developing among scientists including anthropologists that there is no evidence that war existed for the first two million years of the history of man and his forebears. In fact the fossil evidence would indicate that war did not exist until about 10,000 years ago with the development of agriculture. As farming became more accomplished, surpluses developed and these became the focus of individuals and tribes who saw an opportunity to eat without working. This meant that a warrior class was formed to protect the surpluses and the rest is history – well modern history anyway.

Following the work of the Peacebuilding Commission this will help bridge the gap in co-ordination of peace building activities in countries just a emerging from violent conflicts. It should be corner stone of UN peacekeeping. It helps post conflict recovery, reconstruction, institution building and sustainable development

Reducing the military spending and the influence of the military-industrial complex. This year about \$1.46 trillion dollars has gone into the military coffers. It is obvious that this huge military spending and the method of war and militarism is not bringing any real human security. In fact, the priorities are misplaced as more and more military solutions are put into place instead of addressing the root causes of conflicts. In desperation, military engagement is what drives many people to violent conflict. There is little point in peacekeeping operations if we cannot reduce military spending which is increasingly spent on nuclear and conventional weapons. In fact, it is incredible that bogus wars are started and then used to justify the continued production and development of military hardware. Unless we can stop military industrial complex and ministry of defence budgets, money will be continued to be spent on misadventures.

Governments should spend more funds on prevention of war and changing gun culture in pre conflict and post conflict situations. At present, the difference in money spent on prevention of war is staggering 2000 per cent less than military spending.

The money saved from the dividend of peacekeeping can be deployed for poverty reduction, completion of Millennium Development Goals and offsetting the climate change crisis. The best estimates are that a ten year commitment of around \$76 billion per year, less than 7% of military expenditures, would lead to the MDG's fulfilment.

However, no one in mainstream politics or media talks about the money locked up in rising military budgets. This is the biggest taboo to be broken for any progress to happen.

Its time for mainstream media to bring open the conspiracy that powerful nations and governments in order to establish supremacy, under the pre-text of bringing peace and development in the world, continuously oppress others and bring chaos and conflict upon them. Their promise of help is false, hypocritical and hollow.

Adopting a Culture of Peace and Prevention of Warfare

It's incredible that even in the 21st century, the institution of war is well and alive. Most conflicts today are fought with small arms and light weapons. They are weapons of choice in civil wars and for terrorism, organised crime, and gang warfare. They also facilitate human rights violations including killing and maiming, rape, enforced disappearance, torture and forced recruitment of children by armed groups. States need to control tools of violence, have a program of action to stop sale, manufacture and transfer of small arms and light weapons and work for improving legislation, development of disarmament education and make provision for victims of violence and gun crime. There is a role for civil society to take action in a concerted way against gun violence.

We need a global counter terrorism strategy to work for reducing security threats from nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and proliferation of materials for making bombs. Dismantle some of the war mongering institutions like NATO and Pentagon. NATO is still finding a reason to exist after the cold war. Military, Industrial Complex, mercenaries, Ministry Of Defence and all war departments should be replaced by Ministries of Peace. Governments should stop spending billions on weapons like replacing UK's nuclear weapons system trident, bunker buster bombs, and other expensive projects like hunter killer – submarines and new F35 fighter aircrafts. In the present stage of credit crunch and economic downturn, this is a recipe for disaster and even the senior military figures are questioning the wisdom of producing them.

Campaign for article 9 of the Japanese constitution (which rejects war and militarism) to be discussed and adopted by the UN General Assembly, thereby encouraging member states to move away from war and militarism, towards non-violent conflict prevention and resolution.

Promote education and no-violent ways of ending conflicts build on arms control treaties, nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regimes. Also Protect Human Rights violations and environment from destruction as both lead to maintaining long term peace and security.

One of the solutions to stop wars could be to promote culture of non-violence and non-killing for replacing the gun culture. It will ensure human survival. For achieving this

worldwide campaign for non-violence training is essential. Non-violence is an antidote to a culture of killing that pervades the Earth. The task is challenging but for peace to prevail we have to reverse the trend of killing through hating violence, war, and mass psychological transformation for creating harmony, peace and love.

Building peace must include all parties in the process to build trust and long term commitment for finding lasting solutions. Promote reasons to avoid war like war destroys environment, hinders development and hampers the desire for decent living.

One such example is the ammunitions destroyed in Colombia. As part of the peace process, 18,000 weapons and 2.7 million pieces of ammunition were melted into 25 tons of metal in the city of Sogamoso recently. The metal was transformed into sculptures in memory of victims of paramilitary activities. The guns were handed in through the demobilization process of the paramilitary group United Self-Defence Forces of Colombia (AUC). Most of these guns had been used in the conflicts of El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala and by Colombian guerrillas.

Engaging Multilateral Diplomacy for peace

Multilateral diplomacy at international level is the best way forward in the world. Nations should deal with global problems first, instead of putting their own agenda which is a recipe for disaster. Europe is a prime example that shows the world that political solutions of the wider world are possible without endangering the agenda of the nation states. This is a quantum leap in solving world problems, keeping away the unnecessary violence and wars which are creating untold suffering in the world.

International co-operation and wider agenda is essential to end long running disputes. One wonders why long running conflicts are not resolved in different parts of the world—Africa, Europe and Middle –East. The hurdles in peacekeeping lie in the slow progress made by Security Council. The decisions by the Security Council are blocked by veto power countries. The progress in Darfur is blocked by China as Sudan is one of its major suppliers of oil and China wants to protect its financial interests. All efforts to give independence to Kosovo were vetoed by Russia as Serbia is a major business and strategic partner. USA, while pretending to find solution to middle-East crisis, have blocked progress in the Israeli-Palestine issue, because of strong Jewish lobby in America. Moreover, it is arming Israel with the latest high tech weapons, which in turn has increased violence and bloodshed in the area. It is tragic that governments always find ways to delay effective international action while pursuing their narrow agenda.

For multi-lateral diplomacy to succeed, reforming the global institutions should be made a priority. The motto should be adapt to the 21st century or die. This means effective reforms of not only UN but also of G8/G20, World Bank, IMF and other global institutions.

Setting up an international agency to find solutions to inter-related global issues.

Most of the world problems today of peacekeeping, conflicts, development, climate change and human rights are inter-related and should be dealt in tandem. No country alone can solve any of these great challenges. That is why it is so important that we cultivate partnerships also try to understand why its so special to build partnerships with shared responsibility. However, there is no international agency which can implement these issues together as piecemeal solutions and hence an urgent need for a new agency to tackle the inter-related issues.

Lasting peace cannot be achieved if we concentrate solely on peace when all the inter-related issues are destroying our environment, creating a shortage of food, leading to conflicts and chaos. What we urgently need is a global collective security agency to tackle all these inter-linked problems in co-operation with UN and regional bodies. It is worth noting that players in the conflict zone can take a decisive role to contain the conflict.

Talking to terrorists and learning from the Northern Ireland Peace Process

The peace agreement in Northern Ireland is now held up as a beacon for conflict resolution around the world. The 'lessons of Ulster' have been applied by prime ministers, presidents, diplomats and intelligence agencies to numerous areas of violent conflict, including Spain, Sri Lanka, the Philippines, Afghanistan and Iraq.

On the basis of the British experience in Northern Ireland, it is now widely agreed that talking to terrorists is a pre-requisite for peace, and that governments should avoid rigid pre-conditions in their attempts to bring extremists into the political process. The British Foreign Office has revived contacts with Hezbollah and many suggest that it is now time to 'engage' with Hamas and the Taleban. But does this understanding really reflect how peace was brought to Northern Ireland? And can it be applied to other areas where democratic governments face threats from terrorist organisations?

Making Peace in Northern Ireland and the Basque Country suggest that what really matters is not the act of talking to terrorists itself, but a range of other variables including the role of state actors, intelligence agencies, hard power and the wider democratic process. But above all, there is a crucial difference between talking to terrorists who believe that their strategy is succeeding and engaging with those who have been made to realise that their aims are unattainable by violence.

Too many of the players in any dispute are locked into extreme, unjust and unsustainable positions for too long – fed up by continuing violence. The extremists in any conflict need to be marginalised and identified and the mainstream needs to move forward with conviction to solve in seeking sensible solutions

After 30 or more years of violence the people of Ireland North and South, Nationalist and Unionists, Catholic and Protestant were weary of the war. The power sharing agreement and the laying down of the arms by loyalist Para-military and decommissioning is a historic achievement for the society in Ireland without conflict and bloodshed, a place without guns and violence in the society.

Promoting the role of activism. Most of the changes for the better in our world have taken place because of campaigning, activism and advocacy. The repression, injustice and brutality of Iran regime was exposed by citizens protests against their government in Iran after the recent elections. The persistent demands of the UK public to hold an inquiry on the war on Iraq are examples of protests, and pressure which brings results. The US government did not get out of Vietnam but only due to the persistent protests of its citizens, who wanted to live in peaceful, genuinely democratic societies with good governance and rule of law.

Have an active campaign against the policy of governments/politicians leading their countries to war. Hold them accountable and at the same time help them prevent and resolve conflicts. In the past, activists have helped prevent disastrous mistakes, have changed the laws. Suffragettes and the Orange Revolution in Eastern Europe are credit to peace campaigners.

The power of internet technology and community actions like Twitter, Facebook and Youtube can harness the energy of citizens for effective campaigning. So write to your MP's, MEP's, newspapers, media and demand from our elected leaders that they work for a peaceful future and not encourage war mongering.

Let me summarise the peacekeeping alternatives and policy recommendations which are

- Using preventative diplomacy against the surge of war
- Prioritising, taking measures for protection of civilian against violence
- Continuing the work on general and complete disarmament, including nuclear weapons and conventional weapons.
- Promoting a culture of peace, reconciliation and non-violence as a vision of future peacekeeping
- Dealing with violations of human rights as a precondition for peacekeeping
- Convening a World Summit on disarmament, non-proliferation and terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction
- Making UN peacekeeping a global partnership, a united body more effective with a fast turnaround
- UN should provide better peacekeeping training and support regional peacekeeping training centres to increase global peacekeeping capacity, with tactical and strategic lift capacity, and other 'enablers' to help UN missions deploy quickly and completely.
- UN peacekeeping missions should only be deployed where mandates are achievable.
- The UN should work with regional partners such as the EU and the African Union to develop protection capacities that can be deployed quickly and respond effectively to counter threats against civilians.

- The UN should support the Responsibility to Protect as a global norm and use diplomatic resources to advance the concept among countries.

Conclusion

There is a book called 'The 33 strategies of war' by Robert Greene. It describes the horrific and brutal way wars are fought and won. The lesson from that book I learnt is that Generals and great warriors demonstrate prudence, agility, calm and keen understanding of conducting their armies in the battlefield, so that they can defeat their enemies. Similarly we need to organise ourselves on a massive scale and apply our resourcefulness, acumen, patience, dialogue, negotiation and diplomacy for making successful peacekeeping operations, otherwise peacekeeping will always remain a dream and a distant reality.

We have covered a lot of ground today from the role of the UN in international peace and security to reforms of the UN. Let me reiterate what I said in the beginning, affirming our faith in the vision of the preamble of the UN Charter and article 1 of Chapter 1 which categorically states for bringing peace by peaceful means.

Peacekeeping to be effective is combination of several factors which include dialogue and mediation at the pre-conflict stage, enforcement of peace during the war, giving parties breathing space to reach an agreement, and post-conflict reconstruction when the warring parties entered a peace agreement and trying to work things together for a future free of violence.

However, I will argue that the reconciliation and neutralising the tensions in the pre-conflict mode is the most important for not only finding causes for tensions and hostilities but also for resolving disputes before they become full-blown war. This is the sign of a successful peacekeeping operation. It not only saves millions of lives which are lost in a nasty war, but also saves billions of dollars (\$7 billion dollars at present spent on peacekeeping) and free much needed valuable resources (food, water, energy, etc) which are increasingly in short supply owing to global warming.

Let me conclude by saying that we have just drawn down the curtain on the bloodiest century of human history. Let us make the 21st century less violent than the one before and the UN has the tools to achieve it.

The United Nations is the most universal world body. It has the amazing ability to continually rise from its ashes and work for a better future for humanity. The priority for the United Nations and its agencies is to live up to their original mandate, which was to bring all nations of the world together to work for peace and development, based on the principles of justice, human dignity and the well-being of all people.

Thank you for listening

Notes

The following publications were consulted and excerpts have been taken from them during the writing of this article:

1. How Peace Keeping works - BBC World
2. Prompt Global Strike: Pentagon Plans series of 5-10 year wars
3. Research Institute (SIPRI). "Recent Trends in Military Expenditures".
http://web.sipri.org/contents/milap/milex/mex_trends.html 2009
4. Talk by Vijay Mehta at Royal Over Seas Club, Edinburgh Scotland.
'Reforming the UN for the 21st Century.' 8th December 2008
5. Talk by Vijay Mehta at House of Lords, London.
'World Security, Global Governance and the role of the UN.' 29th October 2008
6. World Trends – Fights among neighbours are the hardest to end. New York Times / The Observer London, May 31st 2009.
7. Wars, Guns and Votes – Author Paul Collier, Oxford University
8. The Guardian, 'An apathetic, greedy west has abandoned war-torn Congo,' 18 June 2009
9. Brookings Europe and the emerging powers at the G8 summit, July 1st 2009
10. Who's Priorities? A guide for campaigners on military and social spending – Colin Archer, International Peace Bureau, www.ipb.org

The full version of this speech can be downloaded from:

VM Centre for Peace
Action for UN Renewal

www.vmpeace.org
www.action-for-un-renewal.org.uk

Vijay Mehta is president of VM Centre for Peace www.vmpeace.org , Founding Trustee of Fortune Forum Charity www.fortuneforum.org , Chair of Action for UN Renewal www.action-for-un-renewal.org.uk and co-Chair of World Disarmament Campaign. He is an author and global activist for peace, development, human rights and the environment. Some of his notable books are The Fortune Forum Summit: For a Sustainable Future, Arms No More, and The United Nations and Its Future in the 21st Century.

His latest book is on Global Warming and is called 'Climate Change IQ,' which is available to download free of charge in electronic form from the website www.climatechange365.co.uk

He along with his daughter Renu Mehta founder of Fortune Forum charity held two summits in London in 2006 and 2007. The summits raised over a million pounds for charity and attracted a worldwide audience of 1.3 billion people (one fifth of humanity) including print and media coverage. The keynote speakers for the first and second summit were Bill Clinton, former US President and Al Gore, former US vice-President, and recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize 2007.

Vijay Mehta has appeared in various TV programmes including BBC World, Press TV, Ajjak-24 hour Indian news channel, and Think Peace documentary, Canada, among others. The Sunday Times, Independent, Observer and Guardian newspapers, among other journals have written about him. His life is devoted to the service of peace, humanity and our planet