

The Use of Force in International Peacekeeping : with the Cases of MONUC and KFOR

国際平和維持活動の武力行使に関して
－ MONUC と KFOR をケースに－

Katsumi ISHIZUKA, Kyoei University

共栄大学国際経営学部 石塚 勝美

Toshimichi MORIKUBO, University of Tokai

東海大学健康科学部 森久保 俊満

概要

本論は、国際平和維持活動における伝統的な課題である武力行使について論じる。平和維持活動、とりわけ平和執行部隊における武力行使は、国際連合（国連）や地域機構を代表とする非国連におけるミッション双方によって積極的に推進された経緯があり、それと同時にケース・スタディーとして多く論文等においてミッションの武力行使について論じられてきた。本論では、中でもコンゴ民主共和国における国連ミッションである MONUC とコソボにおける NATO のミッションである KFOR の2つの平和執行部隊の武力行使に関する効果について調査をした。その結果、武力行使においては兵力の規模や軍備の精度は過大評価されるべきではないという結論に至った。本論では、平和活動における武力行使や派遣国のあり方は国際的に規定されるべきであり、さらに派遣されるタイミングや、それに至る準備や PKO 要員の意識の高さ、さらには強健な政治的な意志も重要な要因であると結論付けている。

キーワード： 平和維持活動、武力行使、コンゴ民主共和国、コソボ、国際的な規定

Abstract

This paper deals with one of the traditional issues on international peacekeeping operations, the use of force. The use of force by peacekeeping operations, especially, peace-enforcement has been positively advocated by UN and non-UN missions, and a number of “lesson-learned” type of publications were identified. This paper then focuses on the two peace-enforcement operations led by the UN and NATO, namely, MONUC (Mission de l’Organisation des Nations Unies en République démocratique du Congo; United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo) in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and KFOR (Kosovo Force) in Kosovo and examines

the effectiveness of the use of force in those operations. This paper concludes that one should not overestimate the use of force in peace operations simply with a large number of troops and sophisticated equipment. This paper recommends that peace operations, especially in terms of the use of force and its contributing states, should be more regulated with an international consensus. The cases of MONUC and KFOR are strong indicators that the timing, preparedness and awareness, and the political will of robust operations are also important factors for the use of force in international peacekeeping.

Keywords: peacekeeping operations, the use of force, DRC, Kosovo, international regulations

Contents

1. Introduction
2. The Debates of the Use of Force and Enforcement in Peace Operations
3. The Case of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC)
4. The Case of Kosovo (KFOR)
5. A Comparative Analysis and Recommendations
6. Conclusion

1. Introduction

There has been increasing demand for international peacekeeping especially since the end of the Cold War. This demand has been encouraged by the emerging theories and recommendations such as Boutros Ghali's *Agenda for Peace* in 1992 and *the Brahimi Report* in 2000. The increasing demand for peacekeeping has also been promoted by emerging concepts such as humanitarian intervention and "Responsibility to Protect (R2P)". While a number of peacekeeping operations have been deployed to meet the demand, they have faced various new security challenges.

The use of force in United Nation (UN) peacekeeping operations has been among the most important issues for a long time. However, this issue has not got a clear answer while the scope and modality of international peace operations have significantly changed. Compromises seem to have been made between the main principles of international peacekeeping, namely a minimum force for self-defence, and the emerging terms of peace-enforcement and robust peacekeeping in the new security environment of the post-Cold War period.

This paper first will discuss the history of the use of force and enforcement in peace opera-

tions. This paper then will focus on the two Chapter-VII operations led by the UN and NATO, namely, MONUC in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and KFOR in Kosovo and it will examine the effectiveness of the use of force in those operations. Finally, it will conduct a comparative analysis of the two operations and provide the consequent recommendations for the proper use of force in peace operations in the future.

2. The Debates of the Use of Force and Enforcement in Peace Operations¹

An enforcement operation by the UN was initially advocated by then UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali in his official report *An Agenda for Peace* in June 1992. Facing clear changes in the post-Cold War security environment, he recommended that the UN Security Council should consider peace-enforcement units in clearly defined circumstances. He stated that the units would have to be more heavily armed than peacekeeping forces and would need to undergo extensive preparatory training within their national forces.²

However, in practice, the mission “to enforce peace” was considered quite vague for peace enforcing personnel, compared with conventional warfare. According to a US officer, “we are authorized to use military force but not too much. Targeting enemy armed force is difficult when we are not even sure who the enemy is. ... For all the above reasons, this highly complex mission is not popular with the military.”³

Peace-enforcement was increasingly criticized in the aftermath of the UN operations in Somalia (UNOSOM I, II) and Bosnia (UNPROFOR). For example, there was considered to be four dilemmas in the use of peace-enforcement: increasing risks to lightly armed peacekeepers in vulnerable positions; the killing and injuring of civilians as well as armed adversaries; undermining the perception of the impartiality of the peacekeeping force; and the deterioration of the decision-making system in the UN.⁴ Peace-enforcement was viewed in some quarters as self-directed intervention. It was argued that the problem with peace-enforcement was its characteristic of “the gamble that one can drop bombs from the air and at the same time negotiate co-operation on the ground with the same party.”⁵ The intrinsically complex and coercive functions of peace enforcement made it difficult to co-exist with other UN agencies, NGOs and local people. Peace enforcement was considered very difficult even to have common tactics among contributing states as illustrated in UNOSOM II.⁶ Some cases of non-UN intervention such as US intervention in Somalia (UNITAF) and Haiti, and French intervention in Rwanda (French Operation Turquoise) as peace-enforcement in the early-and mid 1990s were criticized, being warned that if the UN continued to approve such intervention, it would become “another UN fiasco.”⁷

Meanwhile, these criticisms were offset by the realism in the post-Cold War security environment. Kofi Annan asserted in 1993 that the UN demanded many types of missions, such as, to demarcate boundaries, control and eliminate heavy weapons, quell anarchy, and guarantee the delivery of humanitarian aid in war zones. Therefore, he asserted that there were increasing demands that the UN should enforce the peace, as originally envisaged in the UN Charter.⁸ Three years later, he reinforced his own stance: “the old dictum of ‘consent of the parties’ will be neither right nor wrong; it will be, quite simply, irrelevant.”⁹ Thus, the climate of factional disorder in internal conflicts justified the inevitability of peace-enforcement. Likewise, Willie Curtis noted that peacekeeping operations generally relied on the assumption that there was a desire for peace among the warring parties, although the desire for peace was not a high priority for the current factional parties.¹⁰ According to statistics, the proportion of civilian war-related death, which had averaged around 50% since the 18th century, increased to 73% in the 1970s and was close to 90% in 1990.¹¹ Therefore, a higher probability of the inevitable activity of enforcement has been supported, especially, by many practitioners. Furthermore, in Somalia and Bosnia, peacekeepers were attacked by men who placed women and children in front of armed men. One was wondering whether UN soldiers should be criticized for inevitably shooting at them in this situation where their own lives were put in jeopardy. Major General Lewis Mackenzie clearly pointed out the importance of advanced training for peacekeepers (or peace-enforcers) from his own experience as a former Commander of UN peacekeeping Forces, in Sarajevo.¹²

Therefore, the problem lied not in the use of force itself but in other factors, such as the adequacy of the mandate, training, operational consistency, and political will. For example, some claimed that the mission in Rwanda, where the UN did not prevent the death of one million people in three months, should have included the Chapter VII mandate. Operational consistency is also undermined by some factors such as a lack of clear objectives and by public opinion. For instance, the case of peacekeeping in Bosnia as well as in Angola indicated that peacekeeping occasionally responded to a need to “do something urgently” without clear objectives. Meanwhile, in Somalia, for example, the operation was highly influenced by American public opinion. Many also considered that it was the political side, rather than the military which effected the successful implementation of peace-enforcement. There was a tendency that peacekeepers or peace-enforcers could be easily used at the political level. As Marrack Goulding put it in 1996, this tendency “undermined the credibility of the UN by making it even more difficult for the general public to understand why UN soldiers should allow themselves to be pushed around by contemptible thugs; and caused politicians and planners to underestimate how vulnerable peacekeeping operations are to quite low levels of non-cooperation, obstruction and harassment.”¹³ French Foreign Minister Alan Juppe also pointed

out the lack of political will in UNPROFOR 1994 in the press when a French soldier was killed because of the delay in NATO airstrikes; "... the problem is not only delay. It is also will. One does not get the impression that UN representatives on the ground ... have a firm determination to use force each time it is necessary."¹⁴

The use of force in peacekeeping was strongly advocated in the 1990s, but most of the enforcement missions led by the UN such as in Somalia and former Yugoslavia were not successful in implementing their mandates. However, it was to be noted that it did not negate the use of force in UN peace operations itself but the ways of conducting such operations had been criticized. In short, what counts was not *whether* but *how* it ought to be performed. This view can clearly be recognized by *Supplement to An Agenda for Peace* in January 1995. In *the Supplement*, the Secretary General Ghali took peace enforcement as the positive side; he claimed that the arrangement provided the UN with an enforcement capacity it would not have otherwise have and it was preferable to the unilateral use of force by Member States without reference to the UN. Whereas he concluded that the UN did not have the capacity to deploy, direct, command and control peace enforcement missions at present.¹⁵ This stance was immediately illustrated in deploy the peacekeepers in Angola (UNAVEM III) until the Angolan parties indicated a commitment and willingness to implement the peace they had signed up to. Shashi Thadoor concluded that the UN "would rather have allowed war in Angola to continue than to have borne the costs of imposing peace on recalcitrants."¹⁶

While the controversy of UN peace enforcement faded out towards the end of the 1990s, the regional arrangement for coercive peace operations, led by NATO, ECOWAS and OAS, for example, had been increasingly demanded. These regional peace operations resulted from UN's incapability of coping with serious human rights abuse in post-Cold War ethnic conflicts such as Rwandan genocide in 1994 and Srebrenica massacre in July 1995. Compared with the UN, regional peacekeeping such as one led by NATO has a strong, resilient command and control structure, a properly tailored and flexible force and clear guidance on the use of force.¹⁷ Regional arrangement for peace operations and multi-national forces also have an advantage of rapid deployment. For example, the global issue of rapid arrangement of peacekeeping led to the development in Europe as a concept as the European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF). According to ERRF, up to 60,000 EU soldiers would be capable of being deployed within 60 days, and the EU would be able to sustain such a force on the ground for at least a year.

However, in reality, regional peace enforcement and great power-led multi-national forces have not always been successfully deployed and implemented. For example, back in 1984, the multinational forces in Lebanon, comprising the forces from the US, France, Italy and the UK, was

called off without implementing the mandate of assisting the Lebanese Government in restoring law and order. The MNF in Lebanon gave the lesson that forces comprised largely for regional actors may be more acceptable to local parties, and would tend to prevent superpower commitment and confrontation.¹⁸ The peace enforcement intervention of ECOWAS in Liberia in the early 1990s had many problems such as political issues, rapid deployment, and the shortage of peacekeeping forces.¹⁹ In the ethnic conflict in Bosnia, Srebrenica massacre triggered the establishment of long-standing NATO-led Stabilisation Force (SFOR) and following Implementation (IFOR) Force acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. In contrast Rwandan genocide was followed by the France-led *Operation Turquoise*, which was deployed six weeks after it had become apparent mass killing were occurring in Rwanda. Furthermore, *Operation Turquoise* was operated only for two months, and when it left the Tutsi-led rebel Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) immediately occupied the region and caused another instability.

Regional forces or multi-national peace operations cannot be substituted for the UN; the formers have not had to take responsibility for any human rights abuse or war criminals in their region while the latter, which should have the moral authority as the sole international organization, has the final duty to protect international peace when any other organization and great power refuse to do so. Above all, it is generally agreed that even multi-national forces and regional peace enforcement require authorization from the UN.

In 2002, Trevor Findlay's book *The Use of Force in UN Peace Operations* which includes the highly extensive records of UN and non-UN peace enforcement since ONUC in the Congo in 1960, identified the deficiencies in the use of force by the UN. It is also clear that he was hardly negative towards the idea that the UN should give up the idea of being prepared to use force. In the conclusion, he claimed that:

*Handled properly, the potential to use force [by the UN] can be only one small, albeit critical, tool of military strategy for peace operations, and only a minute element of a comprehensive effort to have peace and prosperity prevail.*²⁰

Findlay completed the book by rather ambiguously stating that that "it (the task) will be made easier still if it can be demonstrated that enhancing the UN's capability to use force means that UN soldiers are less likely to actually have to use it."²¹

On the whole, peace enforcement or the use of force by the international community was heatedly debated in the 1990s and early 2000s. The use of force by peace operations has been rather positively advocated by UN and non-UN or regional peace operations, and a number of "lesson-learned" type of literature was also identified during this period. However, there was little final consensus on the use of force in peace operations in the international community. One could not identi-

fy any official doctrine on peace enforcement to maximize it on operational areas.

3. The Case of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC)

The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), located in Central Africa, has an old precedent of UN peacekeeping operation back in the 1960s, namely, the UN Operation in the Congo (known by its French initials, ONUC: 1960-1964). The civil war in the Republic of the Congo in those days led to the establishment of ONUC to ensure the withdrawal of Belgian forces, to assist the Government in maintaining law and order and to provide technical assistance. However, the attacks on UN personnel continued, and finally ONUC was authorised to use of force. By Resolution 161 (1961) of 21 February 1961, the Security Council urged that the UN “take immediately all appropriate measures to prevent the occurrence of civil war in the Congo, including arrangements for ceasefire, the halting of all military operations, the prevention of clashes, and the use of force, if necessary, in the last resort.”²² Therefore, it is to be noted that ONUC was regarded as the first case of peace-enforcement led by the UN. In those days, UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold did not want to use force, but his successor U Thant considered that using force would be only way to crack down the secessionists in Katanga, while it would offer the UN the prospect of an honourable exit from the Congo. However, William Durch argued that the use of force and the great struggle by the UN in ONUC left their marks on the Organisation and helped to ensure that the UN funded no new peacekeeping operation for a decade.²³ ONUC had 250 UN fatalities including 245 military personnel and 5 international civilian staff, which was among the worst recorded in UN peacekeeping operations during the Cold War period.

In 1965, Mobutsu gained power in a military coup. His regime was among the most corrupt ones in the world. He allowed military leaders to engage in the business of exploiting natural resources such as gold and diamonds. Their soldiers resorted to crimes including theft, extortion, armed robbery, arbitrary arrests and illegal fines. Mobutsu also depended on corrupt local political leaders who supported him in return for political control at the local level.²⁴ After the Cold War, his liberalisation policy was not successful, resulting in a battle with military factions in 1993. In 1996, a coalition led by Laurent Kabila came to power with foreign support from Rwanda and Uganda. The foreign troops were so unpopular that Kabila ordered the foreign troops to leave the Congo. In 1998, Rwanda, Uganda and Brundi staged a new war against the DRC on the ground that Kabila, now president of the DRC, did not address their security concerns sufficiently. The war became more complex and deteriorated when Angola, Namibia and Zimbabwe rallied to Kabila.²⁵

The UN established the UN Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

(MONUC) on 30 November 1999 in accordance with Security Council Resolution 1279 (1999). MONUC was mandated to observe the ceasefire and disengagement of forces and maintain liaison with all parties to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement in July 1999 between the DRC and five regional states (Namibia, Rwanda, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe).²⁶ Furthermore, in Resolution 1291 (2000) of 24 February 2000, MONUC was authorised to conduct under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, which decides:

*that MONUC may take the necessary action, in the areas of deployment of its infantry battalions ..., ensure the security and freedom of movement of its personnel, and protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence.*²⁷

Therefore, MONUC can be categorised as peace enforcement or at least a “robust peacekeeping operation.” However, Resolutions 1297 (1999) and 1291 (2000) authorised only 5,537 troops to implement complex tasks throughout the territory of the DRC which is as huge as Western Europe. This is a large contrast with the two larger UN missions of UNAMSIL in Sierra Leone which authorised 17,500 troops and 170 civilian police in accordance with Resolution 1270 (1999) of 22 October 1999, and of UNTAET in East Timor which authorised 9,150 troops and 1,640 civilian police in accordance with Resolution 1272 (1999) of 25 October 1999. Indeed, while the national size of the DRC is about 150 times as large as that of the micro state of East Timor, MONUC was started with a smaller size than UNTAET, despite the fact that both of the missions are the Chapter VII-led operations.²⁸ Or, it should be proper to argue that it was unusual for the UN to establish as many as three Chapter VII-led peace operations in a month, from October to November 1999, which was one of the typical cases of the overstretch of UN operations in the post-Cold War period.

The problem of MONUC as baseline capacity was not only on its size. Most of the forces were from developing states including Uruguay, Tunisia, Senegal, Bolivia, Morocco, and Ghana. Then Special Representative of Secretary General of MONUC, Amos Namanga Ngongi stated with a limited view that:

*Clearly, it is understood that MONUC does not have the capacity to be able to ensure full protection of the civilian population in the DRC—that’s not possible. But clearly MONUC has the responsibility and the mandate to be able to protect those whose lives are imminent danger... . We can take dissuasive action, rather than proactive protection.*²⁹

Slow deployment was also problematic. In April 2000, there were only still 111 UN military forces in the DRC. It took two years that MONUC reached the original size of the authorised force despite the urgent necessity to improve the situation in the eastern part of the DRC, including the inter-ethnic tension in Ituri. In the early period of MONUC, its assessment as a UN operation is mixed. On the one hand, as Tull claimed, MONUC’s role was limited but effective. In fact, despite

its small size with less than 4,000 troops as of October 2000, MONUC did verify ceasefire violations and the withdrawal of foreign armies. On the other hand, the role of MONUC as a Chapter VII-led mission was highly questioned. In this context, Katarina Mansson claimed that the UN was concerned about becoming involved in problematic situations in the Congo where peacekeeping and peace enforcement were blurred and impartiality was lost, as in Bosnia and Somalia.³⁰

The humanitarian disaster occurred in Ituri in early 2003. From January to March in 2003, a militia group called the Union of Congolese Patriots (UPC) conducted a large-scale military operation to take control of Ituri, resulting in 330 civilians death in Bogoro and another 160 civilians killing in Mandro. Although, MONUC dispatched an investigation team to Ituri, the deteriorating security situations enforced the team to cut short its investigation. This humanitarian catastrophe in Ituri was responsible for 500,000 — 600,000 internally displaced persons. In April 2003, MONUC deployed an Uruguayan guard contingent in the area, although their tasks were limited - a presence at the Bunia airfield and protection of UN personnel and facilities. Violent clashes continued, often even near UN compounds. On 8 May 2003, the population of Bunia demonstrated against MONUC denouncing its incapability to guarantee any order, MONUC initially attempted to set up roadblocks and restore order, but these were immediately blocked. On 9 May 2003, MONUC headquarters itself became a target of attack.³¹ On 11 May 2003, a man was kidnapped from the MONUC compound and Uruguayan officers were informed but refused to intervene. The person was then executed less than 100 metres away.³² In May 2003 alone, the 700 blue helmets of MONUC were bystanders to the massacres of 400 civilians.³³ Claudia Morsut argued:

*While stressing the challenges and difficulties that the UN had to face in the DRC, all scholars agree that MONUC was coping with serious problem of overstretch, since not enough soldiers were deployed in the Ituri region and in particular in Bunia ...*³⁴

In this respect, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan requested help from France, and the EU accepted and set up its operation based on the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) in the DRC. On 30 May 2003, Security Council Resolution 1484 (2003) authorised the Interim Emergency Multinational Force (IEMF), acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, to contribute to the stabilization of the security conditions and the improvement of the humanitarian situation in Bunia. This operation was given the label *Operation Artemis*. While IEMF's rapid deployment was significant and militiamen were driven out of Bunia, IEMF's operational area was rather limited. Some 150,000 Congolese people fled to the areas surrounding Bunia, where there was no protection from the EU force and upsurges of violence and fighting continued, as the IEMF failed to disarm the militiamen. In other words, IEMF left Bunia as a “weapon-invisible” zone, rather than “weapon-free” zone. Furthermore, there was no coordination nor information and military equipment

sharing between IEMF and MONUC. After the termination of IEMF, or IEMF guidelines on the use of force for the protection of civilians were not transferred to MONUC.³⁵ IEMF ended on 1 September 2003 as officially planned.

In 2004, continued violence in the Congo required the Security Council to change the policy of MONUC. MONUC began to shift from reactive to preventive operations and increase its presence in the vicinity of vulnerable citizens of the Congo. At the same time, the mission expanded to 16,700 troops authorised by Security Council Resolution 1565 (2004) of 1 October 2004, the largest UN operation in the world with an annual budget for more than US\$1 billion.³⁶ Most of the newly-deployed troops came from unified Indian and Pakistan brigades. In fact, Resolution 1565 (2004) included the most critical and alerting terms;

*[Resolution] strongly condemns violence and other violations of international humanitarian law and human rights ... in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and demands that all parties and Governments concerned in the region ... take without delay any necessary steps to bring to justice those responsible for these violations...*³⁷

The UN provided MONUC with highly professional military officers from Europe. In early 2005 Major General Patrick Cammaert from the Netherlands was appointed commander of eastern division of MONUC including North and South Kivu. Furthermore, General Christian Houdet of the French Foreign Legion was appointed MONUC Chief of Staff.³⁸ They promoted more robust actions in MONUC. Major General Cammaert said:

*For the first time in the UN peacekeeping history, MONUC has established a full fledged Military Division with its Divisional HQ, three powerful brigades in Ituri and North & South Kivu plus a larger helicopter fleet, an impressive engineer capacity and special forces in order to conduct military operations under Chap VII in the most troublesome Eastern part of Congo.*³⁹

When MONUC peacekeepers were on a routine foot patrol to protect a camp of some 8,000 internally displaced persons at 80 kilometers north of Bunia on 25 February 2005, nine Bangladesh soldiers were killed in a coordinated ambush by FNI (Forces Nationaliste et Integrationnistes) militia. MONUC responded by its robust approach to the maintenance of peace in Ituri. On 1 March 2005 when MONUC came under heavy fire from FNI, MONUC commenced extended military operations, which was successful despite MONUC forces killing 50-60 FNI militia members.⁴⁰ Likewise, when fighting broke out between the rebellion by General Laurent Nkunda and the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (FARDC) in North Kivu in November 2006, MONUC took a robust operation, including the use of attack helicopters, resulting in many casualties among Nkunda's fighters.

MONUC's 3,700-strong Pakistani brigade in South Kivu also engaged in coercive efforts to protect civilians. For example, *Operation Safe Path*, was successful in ensuring safe passage of civilians through the Kafuzi-Biega park. A 50-troop strong Pakistani Rapid Reaction Force was deployed on high alert with light personal weapons as well as mortars. The Pakistani peacekeepers destroyed thirteen to sixteen camps of the FDLR (Forces Democratiques de Liberation du Rwanda), Hutu rebels, in 2006.⁴¹

These operations by MONUC in 2005 and 2006 were the result of MONUC's increasingly effective operations against the militia and that there was an acceptance of using force of MONUC troops where necessary by Congolese people.⁴² Their successful operations were also attributed to the leadership from Europe namely Dutch General Cammaert, robust peacekeeping tactics and sophisticated military facilities and equipments suitable for them.

In October 2008, there was the upsurge of violence in the Kivu conflict with heavy battles between the national armed forces supported by MONUC and Tutsi militia supported by Rwanda, threatening to take Goma, the capital of the North Kivu province. Despite the presence of MONUC, approximately 250,000 people were displaced by the conflict. It was hoped that this humanitarian crisis would be solved by reinforcing the force with another 3,000 peacekeepers. However, EU nations declined to intervene. French President Nicolas Sarkozy said that it would be a better decision to draw troops from neighbouring countries such as Angola, a regional power, instead of the distant EU countries. He also questioned the plan to reinforce another 3,000 MONUC troops, saying "There are 17,000 UN soldiers in the Democratic Republic of Congo. It is the biggest ever operation and only 800 are doing a useful job. Why send another 3,000?"⁴³ *The Economist* pointed out the problem of the Kivu conflict as well as MONUC on the whole:

*Plainly, the peacekeepers need reinforcing fast, with the right sort of troops. Instead of wringing its hands, the UN Security Council must resolve to send a robust force of extra troops forthwith. The biggest snag is that the kind of troops who could make a difference are not readily available. Many countries belonging to NATO, the world's best fighting force, are overstretched in such places as Iraq and Afghanistan.*⁴⁴

On the whole, MONUC could implement its mandate only sporadically. In fact, one of the mandates of MONUC, protecting civilians, might be partially implemented by the fact that the number of the international displaced persons has decreased since 2003. However, the security situation seriously deteriorated after a series of elections in 2006, especially in North and South Kivu. There is a dilemma with the mandates of MONUC including protecting civilians and supporting the "notorious" national armed forces which assaulted civilians at the same time. According to Secretary General's report on MONUC in June 2009, the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of

the Congo (FARDC) supported by MONUC and the Congolese National police were responsible for serious human rights abuses including arbitrary execution, rape, arbitrary arrests, detention and torture. While MONUC supported the deployment of FARDC to sensitive areas where protection needs were the highest, MONUC registered a total of 64 attacks against civilians in North Kivu.⁴⁵

4. The Case of Kosovo (KFOR)

Kosovo has a population of about 2 million and 90% of them are ethnically Albanian. While the Serbs are a minority there, Kosovo was viewed as the holy site of the Serb nation since it was the place where the Serbian Army was defeated by the Turks in the battle of Fushe Kosove/Kosovo Polje of June 1389. It is also a place which has many of Serbia's historic churches.⁴⁶ Kosovo remained a part of the Federal Republic of Serbia after the disintegration of Yugoslavia. The declarations of independence of Slovenia and Croatia in July 1991 encouraged the Kosovar people to demand the independence of Kosovo rather than gaining the status of a republic. The League for Democratic Kosovo (LDK), the dominant political organization in Kosovo, promoted the policy of non-violent movement to achieve their political goal.⁴⁷ Meanwhile, Slobodan Milosevic, the President of Serbia, led a number of military campaigns to unit ethnic Serbs in neighbouring republics and areas into a Great Serbia, and Kosovo also became one of the targets for Milosevic to enforce his policy. The excessive and indiscriminate use of force by the Serbian security forces and the Yugoslav Army resulted in numerous Albanian casualties and the displacement of over 230,000 people from their homes. The Kosovar citizens increasingly supported the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), which conducted terrorist attacks to resist Milosevic, rather than LDK. The UN Security Council adopted its Resolution 1160 (1998) and 1199 (1998) which, acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, called upon the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) and the Kosovo Albanian leadership to enter immediately into a meaningful dialogue.⁴⁸ However, the campaign of ethnic cleansing of Kosovo Albanians, or *Operation Horseshoe*, was conducted by Serbian Police and the Yugoslav Army directed by President Milosevic in early 1999. Eventually, this campaign triggered NATO to carry out its second air strikes against Yugoslavia following *the Operation Deliberate Force* in Bosnia and Herzegovina in September 1995. Even after the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia on 24 March 1999, the Serbian forces continued *Operation Horseshoe*. As a result, Kosovo was facing a serious humanitarian crisis; 90 percent of Kosovar Albanians were displaced from their homes by early June 1999.

As the NATO airstrikes were getting successful, Milosevic inevitably accepted a foreign military presence in Kosovo commanded by NATO, followed by a UN Security Council resolution.

Thus, the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR) was authorised by UN Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999) of 10 June 1999 as a peacekeeping force, responsible for establishing a safe and secure environment in Kosovo, acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Resolution 1244 (1999) also placed Kosovo under interim UN administration, namely, the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK). Resolution 1244 (1999) required the UN to assure the safe and unimpeded return of all refugees and internally displaced persons to their homes to Kosovo. Resolution 1244 (1999) also required the KLA and other armed Kosovo Albanian groups be demilitarized.⁴⁹

Unlike the case of the DRC, peacekeeping in Kosovo was initiated by multiple frameworks. KFOR was in charge of the maintenance of security, and the other peace-building missions were divided into four pillars. The pillar of humanitarian assistance was led by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The pillar of civil administration was headed by the UN itself. The pillar of democratisation and institution building was initiated by the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). And the pillar of the reconstruction and economic development was led by the European Union (EU). Alexandros Yannis argued that Resolution 1244 (1999) had three underlying objectives: to end the NATO air campaign; reverse the ethnic cleansing against Kosovo's Albanians; and to lay the groundwork for a political settlement.⁵⁰ Therefore, KFOR was in charge of the first two objectives of the above. Unlike the case of the DRC, KFOR started with a massive number of sophisticated European troops from NATO and non-NATO states including Sweden, Finland and Ireland, which are all well-known as the traditionally consistent contributors to UN peacekeeping operations. Therefore, it was accepted to argue that there was a political consensus among the Western community that the security crisis in Kosovo needed to be urgently solved. It was significant for the entire stability in Europe.

One of the main tasks of KFOR was to secure the phased withdrawal of Serbiam/FRY Forces from Kosovo. The Military Technical Agreement between KFOR and the Government of FRY authorised KFOR to "take all necessary actions" to establish and maintain a secure environment for all citizens of Kosovo. The Agreement also authorised the commander of KFOR to do all that he judged necessary and proper, including the use of military force, to protect KFOR and the international civil implementation presence.⁵¹

However, in Kosovo, KFOR came across the rather unexpected scale of retaliatory violence conducted by Kosovo's Albanians against the Serbs and Roma. According to UNHCR, more than 164,000 people became refugees, and others moved to enclaves for KFOR protection. This violence culminated on 23 July 1999 when fourteen Serb farmers were murdered. The security crisis during this period is a convincing indicator of long-lasting discrimination against Kosovo's Albanians by

the Serbs and the following formers' hatred towards the latter.⁵²

The new mission in Kosovo was how to protect Kosovo's minorities such as the Serbs and Roma from the Albanians. However, the response of KFOR to this mission was not adequate, and KFOR's records on preventing security crisis during this period were poor. At best, KFOR started their mission in protecting the minority rather slowly. The frequent abuse by Albanians towards the Serbs and Roma reflected the lack of a police force in Kosovo. In this situation, the KFOR contingents tried to fill the security gap with military police operating police stations in major towns. There was the issue of a lack of consistency in operations. KFOR's differing interpretations of the mandate by each national contingent resulted in an uneven response to attacks and threats against minorities. In such areas as Gorazdevac, Podujevo, and Kosovo Polje, KFOR provided direct protection to the Serbs and Roma. In other areas, however, KFOR was unwilling to intervene to prevent displacement.⁵³

Above all, in his book *Kosovo: An Unfinished Peace*, William G. O'Neill, former senior adviser on human rights to UNMIK, claimed that KFOR adopted a rather soft approach in the early days, which enabled KLA to take control of numerous sectors of the economy and to intimidate moderates. He maintained that KFOR as well as UNMIK should have made it clear to the KLA leaders that revenge and violence would not be tolerated in internationally administered Kosovo. KFOR's soft approach eventually convinced the KLA of their "zero tolerance" policy that they would allow no Serbs to remain in their areas.⁵⁴ O'Neill further maintained:

*Many Albanians I interviewed shared the view that if KFOR and UNMIK had acted with greater toughness, rigor, and clarity in early days, violence would have diminished and many problems relating to security, economy development, and relations between the ethnic communities would also have been less grave.*⁵⁵

According to the report of the Secretary-General on UNMIK in October 2001, since 31 May 2001, KFOR reported that nearly 1,000 individuals had been detained and processed. Over 1,100 rifles and pistols, about 1,700 grenades, nearly 1,100 anti-tank weapons and about 170,000 rounds of ammunition had been seized throughout Kosovo. Nevertheless, he described in the report that the number of incidents involving the use of weapons remained "alarming", and a number of Kosovo Serbs and Roma were hospitalized with injuries caused by hand-grenade attacks.⁵⁶ Therefore, there had been only marginal success in facilitating freedom of movement for minority communities in Kosovo.

As security in Kosovo gradually improved, KFOR downsized as normalization proceeded. The size of KFOR which was approximately 32,000 in December 2002 had been scaled down to nearly 17,000 in March 2004. In fact, by 2004 there was a sense of normality in Kosovo and UNMIK po-

lice took over major responsibility for security to the Kosovo Police Service (KPS).

However, over the 17 and 18 March 2004, a violent crisis spread across Kosovo. There were 33 major riots and 51,000 rioters, some using military weapons. The Kosovo Albanian rioters mainly targeted the properties of the Serbs. The violence was more planned than spontaneous, and the riots were very violent. For example, at Caglavica about 13,000 Kosovo Albanians threw rocks, petrol bombs and lampposts at the security forces. During the riots, about 730 houses belonging to Kosovo minorities and even 36 religious and cultural sites were damaged or destroyed. Furthermore, 65 international police officers, 58 KPS officers and 61 KFOR personnel suffered injuries. On 23 March, a Ghanaian UNMIK police officer and a KPS officer were killed when a group of Kosovo Albanians fired on a UNMIK police vehicle.⁵⁷

UNMIK and KFOR responded to these riots by establishing a senior crisis team to coordinate policy and security actions. In order to suppress the riots, KFOR reinforced its presence by deploying another 2,000 troops and by re-establishing several checkpoints for security purposes.⁵⁸ However, the individual performance of KFOR personnel was rather weak when dealing with many incidents in the riots. On some occasions, KFOR troops just stood aside the incidents:

*In Svinjare, a Serb village south of Mitrovica, 137 homes were destroyed during the riots. This was seen as particularly appalling given that the French logistics base was located only a couple hundred metres away from the village and in spite of KFOR receiving notice from the UNMIK police that a mob was assembling.*⁵⁹

The report from the International Crisis Group (ICG) was more critical of the response of KFOR, especially, in terms of the use of force:

*KFOR was caught without a contingency plan. Its troops often appeared to lack a coherent use-of-force continuum, caught between ineffectively attempting to stop mobs with their bare hands and firing live rounds at them — a last resort which ... was used sparingly. KFOR did a creditable humanitarian job, but a terrible military one.*⁶⁰

It might be true that, as the ICG report recommended, KFOR should have increased its capacity of its troops to deal with violent disorders by equipping, instructing and training them better in graduated use of force responses to riot situations.⁶¹ Ray Murphy argued that there were no apparent standing operating procedures or contingency plans to cop with the situation, and the use of force ROE (Rule of Engagement) did not work in Kosovo in 2004.⁶² On the whole, KFOR's case in March 2004 also witnessed the issue of overstretch in peace operations. Presumably, the reduction of the total strength from nearly 50,000 to 17,000 of KFOR was partly due to the reinforcement of the NATO troops in ISAF in Afghanistan and the war in Iraq. Accordingly, fixed positions including checkpoints had been replaced by less intensive mobile patrols.⁶³

Meanwhile, Kristine Hoglund pointed out that there was a lack of mental and technical preparedness and awareness in KFOR in the 2004 riots. For example, in KFOR there was no readiness for how quickly large crowds were mobilized and turned into violent riots. KFOR should have recognised that public protest in war-torn societies was different from that in stable and democratic societies. The former is more dangerous than the latter because, for example, citizens in Kosovo were estimated to possess more than 300,000 guns. Hoglund also argued that the particular local conditions should have been taken into account. Conflicts had been frozen in the small society of Kosovo by the massive international presence including KFOR and UNMIK. However, such a lid by international troops was generally fragile and once the outbreak of the violence, stimulated by sporadic incidents, the consequence would be disastrous. In this case, one should recognise that international and regional institutions such UN or NATO-led peacekeeping could themselves come under attack. This was exactly what happened in Kosovo in 2004.⁶⁴

Since the 2004 riots, KFOR has reformed itself to better deal with any new riots. More troops have been retrained and re-equipped. The five regional multinational brigades have been relabelled as six multinational task forces, more accountable for KFOR headquarters.⁶⁵ The continuous strong commitment of Western society to Kosovo's issue was recognised by the fact that in December 2008 NATO Foreign Ministers stressed the deployment of the European Union's Rule and Law Mission (EULEX) throughout all Kosovo to enhance the function of the rule of law, especially, in the police, judiciary and custom areas. While EULEX is the largest civilian mission launched under the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) in EU, it works under the framework of UN Security Council Resolution 1244. It consists of the personnel from most EU member states as well as Norway, Switzerland, Turkey Croatia, the US and Canada. The target number of final staff is around 3,200 including 1,950 internationals and 1,250 locals.⁶⁶

Thus, it is to be noted that KFOR has enjoyed ideal circumstances on building security in Kosovo. After the riots KFOR strengthened its troops by retraining its personnel, by reequipping themselves, and by deploying additional troops. KFOR has also enjoyed conducting its operations with like-minded organisations from other organizations such as the UN and the EU. In fact, as the entire security in Kosovo has improved, KFOR has been downsizing, and was reduced to 17,000 in February 2004.

Meanwhile, the fact that KFOR has been successfully retrained and reformed does not necessarily mean that it can deter sporadic riots and security crises by using its forces effectively and efficiently. There was, again, a tension between the Kosovo Albanian and Kosovo Serb communities after its declaration of independence from Serbia on 17 February 2008. UNMIK and KFOR came under attack by protesters and a violent confrontation ensued. It resulted in the wounding of 64

UNMIK police officers and 24 KFOR soldiers and the killing of a Ukrainian UNMIK police officer in Mitrovica in March 2008.⁶⁷

On the one hand, KFOR has successfully implemented the mandates of Resolution 1244 (1999) of ending the NATO air campaign, ensuring the withdrawal of the FRY troops from Kosovo, and of stopping the ethnic cleansing against Kosovo's Albanians. There has been no major civil wars and disastrous battles between Kosovo's Albanians and minorities since the deployment of KFOR. On the other hand, even after the declaration of independence, the northern part of Kosovo, which has the major Serbian communities, has not been controllable for the Kosovar Government. Since independence the Belgrade Government has consolidated its grip on Serbian areas of Kosovo, including almost all of the regions north of Mitrovica.⁶⁸ Therefore, as the UN Secretary General has described several times in his reports to the Security Council, the overall security situation in Kosovo has remained relatively calm, but potentially fragile.⁶⁹ Kosovo has virtually been in the situation left with "a frozen conflict"⁷⁰. Since 1999, international peacekeepers including KFOR and UNMIK have not been capable to respond to the security crises either from the Kosovo Albanians or Serbs with the proper use of force when they decisively resorted to the violence. Therefore, although there has been a temporary period of stability in Kosovo, the stability is, as the UN Secretary General repeatedly argued, fragile, and there is the possibility of outbreaks of sporadic violence and riots triggered by ethnic hostilities between Kosovo's Albanians and the Kosovo minorities.

In February 2010, KFOR still consisted of all of the major Western contributors including 25 NATO states and 7 partner countries such as Austria, Finland, Ireland, and Sweden. The US dispatched 1,480 troops, Germany 1,507 troops, Italy 1,409, and France 807. Meanwhile, the total size of KFOR has been reduced to 9,923 troops. The downsizing of KFOR troops is due to the decision of NATO Defence Ministers to adjust KFOR's posture to "a deterrent presence"⁷¹. However, the above-mentioned historical riots in Kosovo since 1999 and the following KFOR's failure to respond to them professionally made one wonder if size has been a significant factor in the effective use of force in peace operations or not.

5. A Comparative Analysis and Recommendations

This paper provided two Chapter VII-led peace operations, MONUC in the Democratic Republic of Congo as a UN operation and KFOR in Kosovo as a NATO operation. The two missions have several commonalities. Both of them were established in 1999 and are still operational. Both of them are the missions which have been involved in the internal conflicts.

There are also several significant differences. The operation of MONUC has been more seri-

ously affected by the issue of overstretch of peacekeeping. MONUC, although it was a vast country in Africa, was not deployed rapidly and had to start with merely about 5,000 troops from developing countries, whereas KFOR, in a tiny part of Serbia, enjoyed the stationing 50,000 troops from the well-equipped Western countries in a prompt manner. In fact, in 2003 the EU-led IEMF was established to respond to the humanitarian disaster in Ituri in the DRC, and the Chapter VII-led mission was successful in contributing to the stabilization of the security condition. However, the deployment of the EU mission was just temporary and their operational areas were limited. It might be difficult to conclude that the IEMF contributed to the entire security of the DRC in its aftermath. Furthermore, the request for another 3,000 troops to reinforce MONUC from the international community in the Kivu conflict in October 2008 was declined by the Western states. Meanwhile, KFOR had an opportunity to reinforce its force with an extra 2,000 personnel from NATO countries in the sporadic security crisis by the Albanians riots in March 2004. A lack of political will in the international community in the DRC was clearly identified towards MONUC, and one was wondering if MONUC learned the lessons from the previous Chapter VII-led UN operations in Africa such as UNOSOM in Somalia in the 1990s. However, it is to be noted that such a lack of political enthusiasm was exacerbated by the current issue of overstretch of international peacekeeping. The proper use of force can be conducted by a proper number of troops with proper timing. Although MONUC has gradually increased its size to meet the demand of reinforcement and still has a total strength of over 20,000 troops, its operational effectiveness has been seriously criticised. Meanwhile, the size of KFOR has constantly been reduced, and currently its total strength is less than 10,000.

However, in terms of the extent of “robust” response with the use of force in peace operations, there was less disparity between the UN-led MONUC and NATO-led KFOR. This paper indicated many cases in MONUC and KFOR where the peacekeepers were so “weak” and so “soft” that they were not capable of responding to the sporadic outbreaks of conflicts and riots. In several cases the peacekeepers even with their proper equipment could hardly react to the incidents of humanitarian violations and war crimes which happened in front of them in both operations. This issue might not be much related to whether the troops are from developed or developing countries or whether the incidents were responded by poorly-equipped or heavily-equipped contingents. Most of the international peacekeepers or peace-enforcers have been rather powerless when they could not anticipate security crises and when the parties to the conflicts are determined to involve themselves in the crises. It is to be noted that, in the case of MONUC, due to strong leadership by the force commander, several peacekeepers from the developing countries performed well and successfully engaged in coercive efforts to protect civilians in 2005 and 2006. Meanwhile, one could identify differing interpretations of mandates in terms of the use of force in KFOR. While the international community

became aware of the significance of its responsibility to protect civilians, and the necessity of more robust peacekeeping operations as recommended by the Brahimi Report, much still needs to be discussed in order to use the robust force consistently and broadly.

Furthermore, as Kristine Hoglund argued in the case of Kosovo, mental and technical awareness and preparedness should be enhanced in order to improve the effectiveness of the use of force in UN or non-UN peace operations. Presumably, it was impossible for the peacekeepers in both MONUC and KFOR to anticipate and react properly to sporadic riots and conflicts. It will be impossible for any peacekeepers who came from abroad without proper knowledge on the fragility and security in war-torn societies, and an understanding of realising the particularity of local conditions where they will be dispatched. For example, one wonders how many peacekeepers in MONUC know that the wars in the DRC were so complicated, and involved many neighbouring states such as Rwanda, Uganda, Brundi, Namibia Zimbabwe and Angola. Likewise, one wonders how many KFOR soldiers have learned that the majority of Yugoslavian people possess guns and know how to use them due to the state's history which prepared it for a possible invasion by the Soviet Union during the Cold War period. The more robust the operations of the international community became, the more attention it should pay to enhancing such awareness and preparedness in advance for despatching international troops to the operations.

In accordance with the above analysis, this paper will give several recommendations. First of all, this paper evidently identified the issue of overstretch of peacekeeping and a serious lack of imbalance of its troop contributors. This issue is considerably related to a political aspect. These political factors can be solved by universal consensus and by creating regulations, laws or treaties. Therefore, it is recommended that the international community should create regulations on contributing states to international peacekeeping, such as the maximum strength of each contributing state in accordance with their military sizes, and a fixed ratio in dispatching troops between UN and regional peacekeeping. Likewise, the international community is recommended to set the target of operational terms to ensure that the long term presence of a large number of international peacekeepers will be difficult since it will make the next potential peace operations difficult to collect a proper number of troops.

Second, there is the necessity of an international consensus on a doctrinal basis for robust peacekeeping operations and peace enforcement. In this sense, it is significant that the UN set a clear guideline on this: while robust peacekeeping involves the use of force at the tactical level with the consent of the host authorities and/or the main parties to the conflict, peace enforcement may involve the use of force at the strategic or international level.⁷² Such a clear consensus will require proper training, equipment, operational tactics, entire strategies and, above all, the willingness of

peacekeepers to use force, and of decision makers to dispatch their countries' troops.

Third, the international organizations and regional organizations are recommended to create some lessons on specific studies such as local history, culture, and politics on the site where their peacekeepers are dispatched. Not only military or physical awareness and preparedness but also mental and psychological awareness and preparedness by obtaining local knowledge will affect the legitimate and effective use of force in operational areas.

6. Conclusion

The current coercive and political nature of peacekeeping is a significant shift from its early periods when it was created in the 1950s.⁷³ Likewise, in his paper “The Dual Nature of Peacekeeping” in 1996, Alan James claimed that it is because of apolitical characteristics that peacekeeping can be an enormously valuable instrument for those who are interested in the maintenance of peace. He also pointed out the danger of the overload of peacekeeping in the post-Cold War period, and warned that an important aspect of the apolitical nature of peacekeeping seems to have been forgotten. He continued:

*The talk of a new world order spawned ideas about tougher peacekeeping, about peacekeeping being conducted in the context of Chapter VII of the Charter, of collapsed states being taken in hand. The idea was advanced that peacekeeping was not a self-contained and distinctive activity, but part of a security continuum, up which the UN could freely move. ... (However) Peacekeeping cannot be expanded to meet all problems. It is more in the nature of an already-tailored device, which is suitable for some problems and quite unsuitable for other.*⁷⁴

Presumably, the issue which Alan James raised on peacekeeping operations in the 1990s has not been responded to sufficiently. Or should it be more appropriate to say that James' concern is still applicable at the present time. That is, “Peacekeeping has been expanded to meet all of the official agenda, reports, and concepts, such as *An Agenda for Peace*, *the Brahimi Report*, and the concepts of *Human Security*, and *the Responsibility to Protect*.” However, the important thing to be noted is that such expansion policies by the international community have failed to take into account political, military and geographical balance in dispatching peace operations. Consequently, the current situation in international peacekeeping is sort of anarchic. Ironically, current peacekeeping has been encouraged to expand by political liberalism, but the expansion has been distorted by political realism.

The issue of the use of force in peace operations has been marginalised despite the constant at-

tention of the international community to the issue. However, the new security challenge in the international community has increasingly required more opportunities to use coercive forces in conflict resolutions.

This paper concludes that one should not overestimate the use of force simply with a large number of troops and sophisticated equipment. This paper rather recommends that peace operations, especially in terms of use of force and its contributing states, should be more regulated with an international consensus. The case of MONUC in the DRC and KFOR in Kosovo illustrated that one should take into account not only the physical size but also the timing, awareness, and willingness for robust operations. The UN is highly encouraged to take the initiative on this issue.

¹ Some parts of this section are quoted from Ishizuka K. "PKO and its Issues", *Journal of Kyohei University*, Vo. 2, March 2004

² UN Document A/47/277-S/24111, *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping*, 17 June 1992, para. 44

³ Corum J. S. "Airpower and Peace Enforcement", *Airpower Journal*, Winter 1996, p. 13

⁴ Roberts A. "The Crisis in UN Peacekeeping", *Survival*, Vol. 36, No. 3, Autumn 1994, pp. 102-104

⁵ Tharoor S. "Should UN Peacekeeping Go 'Back to Basic'?", *Survival*, Vol. 37, No. 4, 1995, p. 61

⁶ See Murphy R. *UN Peacekeeping in Lebanon, Somalia and Kosovo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 185-195. Murphy stated the example in UNOSOMII as follows:
On a visit to Baidoa in the weeks prior to the American withdrawal, US personnel were astounded to find that the Irish organizing football matches with locals, helping in a local orphanage, and providing welfare services to the local hospital. The difference in approach was obvious, especially to the Americans. ... Most United States soldiers admitted to never having engaged an ordinary Somali in conversation, let alone a game of football. (p. 194)

⁷ Childers E. "Peacekeeping's Great Power Handicap", *War Report*, Issue 28, September 1994, p. 29

⁸ Anan K. "UN Peacekeeping Operations and Cooperation with NATO", *NATO Review*, Vol. 41, No. 5, October 1993, p. 4

⁹ Annan K. "Peace Operations and the United Nations: Preparing for the Next Century", unpublished paper, New York, February 1996

¹⁰ Curtis W. "The Inevitable Slide into Coercive Peacemaking: The US Role in the New World Order", *Defence Analysis*, Vol. 10, No. 3, 1994, p. 312

¹¹ Fetherston A. B. *Towards a Theory of United Nations Peacekeeping* (London: Macmillan, 1994), p. 20-21

¹² Mackenzie L. "Military Realities of UN Peacekeeping Operations", A presentation paper to Royal United Services Institute for Defence Studies (RUSI), 9 December 1992

¹³ Goulding M. "The Use of Force by the United Nations", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 3, No. 1, Spring 1996, p. 9

¹⁴ *The Washington Post*, 21 March, 1994

¹⁵ UN Document A/50/60-S/1995/1, 3 January 1995, paras. 77-80

¹⁶ Tharoor S. p. 58

¹⁷ Rader S. R. "NATO" in Findlay T. (ed.) *Challenges for the New Peacekeepers* (Solona, Sweden: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 1996), pp. 154-157

¹⁸ Caligaris L. "Western Peacekeeping in Lebanon: Lessons of the MNF", *Survival*, Vol. 26, No. 6, November/December 1984, pp. 262-268

- ¹⁹ Ofuatey-Kodjoe W. “Regional Organizations and the Resolution of Internal Conflict: The ECOWAS Intervention in Liberia”, *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 1, No. 3, Autumn 1994, pp. 289-292
- ²⁰ Findlay T. *The Use of Force in UN Peace Operations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 389
- ²¹ Ibid. p. 390
- ²² UN Document S/5002, Resolution 169 (1961), 24 November 1961
- ²³ Durch W. J. “The UN Operation in the Congo: 1960-1964” in Durch W. J. (ed.) *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993), pp. 346-348
- ²⁴ Eriksen S. S. “The Liberal Peace Is Neither: Peacebuilding, State building and the Reproduction of Conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo”, *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 16, No. 5, November 2009, pp. 654-655
- ²⁵ Tull D. M. “Peacekeeping in the Democratic Republic of Congo: Waging Peace and Fighting War”, *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 16, No. 2, April 2009, p. 216
- ²⁶ UN Document S/RES/1279, Resolution 1279 (1999), 30 November 1999
- ²⁷ UN Document S/RES/1291, Resolution 1291 (2000), 24 February 2000
- ²⁸ Indeed, the size of the DRC is about 150 times as large as that of East Timor.
- ²⁹ Holt V. K. and Berkman T. C. “The Impossible Mandate? Military Preparedness, The Responsibility to Protect, and Modern Peace Operations”, The Henry L. Stimson Center, September 2006, p. 168
- ³⁰ Mansson K. “Use of Force and Civilian Protection: Peace Operations in the Congo”, *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 12, No. 4, Winter 2005, p. 508
- ³¹ UN Document S/2003/566, *Second special report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo*, 23 May 2003, paras. 9-16
- ³² International Crisis Group (ICG), “Congo Crisis: Military Intervention in Ituri”, ICG Africa Report No. 64, 13 June 2003, p. 12
- ³³ Tull D. M. p. 217
- ³⁴ Morsut C. “Effective Multilateralism? EU-UN Cooperation in the DRC, 2003-2006”, *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 16, No. 2, April 2009, p. 263
- ³⁵ Mansson K. p. 511, Morsut C. p. 264, and Medecins Sans Frontieres Report, “Ituri: Unkept Promises? A Pretense of Protection and Inadequate Assistance”, 25 July 2003
- ³⁶ Eriksen S. S. p. 657
- ³⁷ UN Document S/RES/1565 (2004) Resolution 1565 (2004), 1 October 2004
- ³⁸ Turner T. *The Congo Wars: Conflict, Myth and Reality* (New York: Zen Books, 2007), p. 161
- ³⁹ Cammaert P. “Ongoing UN Operations and New Challenges in Peacekeeping”, p. 51. http://www.bmlv.gv.at/pdf/publikakitionen/19_pkf_cammaert.pdf. accessed on 21 March 2010.
- ⁴⁰ UN Document S/2005/167, *Seventeenth report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo*, 15 March 2005, para. 19
- ⁴¹ Holt V. K. and Berkman T. C. “The Impossible Mandate? Military Preparedness, The Responsibility to Protect, and Modern Peace Operations”, The Henry L. Stimson Center, September 2006, p. 166
- ⁴² Terrie J. “The Use of Force in UN Peacekeeping: the Experience of MONUC”, paper to be presented to the AFSAAP Conference 2008, p. 7
- ⁴³ *2008 Nord-Kivu Campaign*. http://en.wikipedia.org/2008_Nord-Kivu_campaign. Accessed on 28 May 2010
- ⁴⁴ *The Economist*, 1 November 2008, p. 20
- ⁴⁵ UN Document S/2009/335, Twenty-eight report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Organizations, 30 June 2009, paras. 26-38
- ⁴⁶ Independent International Commission on Kosovo, *Kosovo Report* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 33-34
- ⁴⁷ Ibid. pp. 45-46
- ⁴⁸ UN Document S/RES/1160, 31 March 1998, and UN Document S/RES/1199, 23 September 1998

- ⁴⁹ UN Document S/RES/1244 (1989), 10 June 1999
- ⁵⁰ Yannis A. “Kosovo Under International Administration”, *Survival*, Vol. 43, No. 2, Summer 2001, pp. 32-37
- ⁵¹ Military Technical Agreement between the International Security Force (“KFOR”) and the Governments of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Serbia, 9 June 1999
- ⁵² Human Rights Watch “Federal Republic of Yugoslavia: Abuses against Serbs and Roma in the New Kosovo”, *Human Rights Watch Report*, Vol. 11, No. 10, August 1999, p. 2
- ⁵³ Human Rights Watch “Federal Republic of Yugoslavia: Abuses against Serbs and Roma in the New Kosovo”.
- ⁵⁴ O’Neill W. G. *Kosovo: An Unfinished Peace* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2002), pp. 47-48
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.* p. 48
- ⁵⁶ UN Document S/2001/926 *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo*, 2 October 2001, para. 8
- ⁵⁷ UN Document S/2004/348 *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo*, 30 April 2004, paras. 3-4
- ⁵⁸ UN Document S/2004/348 *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo*, 30 April 2004, paras. 8-9
- ⁵⁹ Hoglund K. “Managing Violent Crises: Swedish Peacekeeping and the 2004 Ethnic Violence in Kosovo”, *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 14, No. 3, June 2007, p. 405
- ⁶⁰ International Crisis Group, *Collapse in Kosovo*, ICG Europe Report No. 155, Pristina/Belgrade/Brussels, 22 April 2004, p. 19
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.* p. iii
- ⁶² Murphy R. *UN Peacekeeping in Lebanon, Somalia and Kosovo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 197
- ⁶³ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁴ Hoglund K. p. 409
- ⁶⁵ International Crisis Group, *An Army for Kosovo*, ICG Europe Report No. 174, Pristina/Belgrade/Brussels, 28 July 2006, p. 10
- ⁶⁶ EUREX Kosovo Homepage. <http://www.eulex-kosovo.eu/en/info/whatisEulex.php>. Accessed on 23 May 2010
- ⁶⁷ UN Document S/2008/458, *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo*, 15 July 2008, para. 7
- ⁶⁸ *The Economist*, 31 May 2008, p. 61
- ⁶⁹ UN Document S/2009/497 30 September 2009, para. 20, and UN Document S/2010/5 5 January 2010, para. 22
- ⁷⁰ *The Economist*, 22 March 2008, p. 55
- ⁷¹ *NATO’s Role in Kosovo*, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_48818.htm. Accessed on 23 May 2010
- ⁷² *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, Principles and Guidelines*, The United Nations, 2008, p. 19
- ⁷³ For example, when the first UN peacekeeping force, namely UNEF I, was created, as the following content was described:...*Thus, UNEF I was established to prevent the recurrence of British and French imperialism, and the immediate dispatch of troop contributors to UNEF I was a convincing indicator that the contributing states were more motivated by universal and comprehensive factors than by self-oriented motives. It should also be noted that the ten contributing states — Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, India, Indonesia, Norway, Sweden and Yugoslavia — did not have direct political interests in the Middle East. Their troops could perform as neutral peacekeepers.* Ishizuka K. *Ireland and International Peacekeeping Operations 1960-2000* (London: Frank Cass, 2004), p. 3

⁷⁴ James A. “The Dual Nature of UN Peacekeeping” in Bouratonis D. and Evriviades M. (eds.) *A United Nations for the Twenty-First Century* (The Netherlands: Kluwer Law International, 1996), pp. 180-182