ROLE OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING IN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS.

S. M. TARIQUL ISLAM

Abstract: This paper examines the international security context from both realists and idealists perspective and subsequently analyzes how the international security be achieved through international organizations, especially by United Nations peacekeeping operations. There is a great debate has raged between realists and idealists who have been respectively pessimistic and optimistic in their response to this central question of securing peace and security through UN peacekeeping. Realists believe that the structure of international system is anarchical. Sovereign states are the only actor in the structure and their security is highly relative and interdependent between and among states. This anarchical structure imposes competitive and self-help conditions for its security. On the other hand, idealists believe that security can be achieved through international organizations. After the end of Second World War, United Nations was established for keeping the peace through peaceful means to collective security. But, the great power rivalry at the very beginning blocked UN ability for the collective security action. As a result, peacekeeping evolved as an alternative to collective security that the UN designed. This paper identifies the facts that the great powers are reluctant to operate peacekeeping missions outside of their own sphere of interests. Without the consent of great powers, there would be no peacekeeping. Moreover, the great powers see peacekeeping as a tool of their foreign policy. As a result, peacekeeping is facing problems for keeping the peace.

Introduction

The central issues of international security have certainly changed after the end of Cold war. The end of bipolar confrontation facilitated the resolution of half a dozen lingering conflicts in Central America, Asia and Southern Africa through the United Nations (UN) peacekeeping. This new international security context, the UN and regional organizations of all stripes have been called upon to deploy multilateral peace operations. Peacekeeping is one of the major means by which UN fulfills its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security. An increased UN peacekeeping role has been especially evident, and other international organizations have occasionally also been involved in peacekeeping.

The political context for international security is the anarchic structure of the international system. States are the principal referent objective of security; the dynamics of national security are highly relational and interdependent between states. With this usage, individual national securities can only be fully understood when considered in relation both to each other, and to larger patterns of relations in the system as a whole. If security depends on either harmony or hegemony, then it cannot be lasting and achieved within anarchy. As a result, under anarchy, security can only be relative, never absolute. Consequently, as long as anarchy holds, these conditions remain. If there is a structural shift out of anarchy, then the entire framework of the security problematic would have to redefine. Within the anarchic system UN peacekeeping can contribute to serve as an effective instrument to reduce conflict within the international system. Moreover, fundamental idea of international security is already contained in the UN Charter. There is a great debate has raged between realists and idealists, who have been respectively pessimistic and optimistic in their response to this central question of securing peace and security through UN peacekeeping. Idealists believe that cooperation is possible and international security can be achieved through international organization such as UN. On the other hand, realist theorists of international relations argue that the international system necessarily has to be self-help system made up of unitary state actors.

Moreover, Western states have been accused of being reluctant to take on some operations and multilateral peacekeeping forces often lacked the political will to find a common aim and make a difference. Many nations are increasingly reluctant to operate outside their own sphere of national interest and doubted whether the UN could operate effectively in many countries such as Sierra Leon. There is also
allegation that many countries continue to occupy their neighbor’s territory contrary to the Security Council’s decisions. Therefore, the peacekeeping is facing problems to become an institution for ensuring international peace and security. This article examines the international security context both from realist and idealist perspective and subsequently analyzes how the international security be achieved in an anarchic international system through peacekeeping operations.

Peacekeeping

The UN was set up to preserve peace between states after the Second World War. Its main purpose was to maintain international peace and security, in the sense of dissuading states from attacking each other, and to organize counter measures if this happened. The SC was created with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security under the Charter that the UN should be able to enforce peace by collective security. However, peacekeeping was a product of the strategic consequences of the Cold War. In the early years the superpowers found themselves in increasing disagreement over the post- World War II world, and then the clash of interests rapidly provided an atmosphere of distrust and hostility, especially in the cases of Greece, Iran, Indonesia, and Lebanon and Syria. Thus, from the very beginning, growing rivalry among superpower blocked the ability of the UN to act. Lack of unanimity and hostility between US and the Soviet Union paralyzed the SC. As a result, it was hardly favorable to the implementation and carrying out of Charter provisions for keeping the peace. Moreover, the SC failed to come up with specific decision about the conflicts of Indonesia, Palestine, and Kashmir. In these conflicts the SC hardly made use of the provision of collective security under the Chapter VII of the Charter, though the situation threaten the international peace and security. Moreover, no military, economic, or enforcement action was taken despite the warfare was on going. The SC failed to authorize collective security system because of rift among great powers. As a result, the collective security system under UN Charter VII provision proved unworkable. The failure of collective security demonstrated the limitations of the UN in dealing with threats to international peace and security. The early UN peace observation missions were an attempt to fill the void left by collective security. The mixed record of peace observation and the new challenge of the Suez crisis led the organization to seek a new strategy. It was peacekeeping that was invented in the Suez crisis.3

Peace-keeping is a technique that expands the possibilities for both the prevention of conflict and making of peace under Chapter VI of the UN Charter.4 Peace-keeping is also encompass actions ranging from inter-personal conflict resolution through classical inter-positional peace-keeping, operations under Chapter VII (peace- enforcement) of the Charter, and democratic development measures to post-conflict reconstruction and development. It proved effective at managing conflicts between states and as a sort of transitional authority while more permanent solution of the conflicts was hopefully established. Peacekeeping contributed significantly to international peace monitoring cease-fire arrangements and separating combatants. After the Cold War, political tension in the SC was reduced, allowing the UN to become more responsive to conflicts in which United States and former Soviet Union interests had previously prevented its effective involvement. As a result, in the 1990s the number of UN forces involved in conflict resolution increased. The focus of the SC had moved to civil wars and inter-communal violence, in many cases to states that had degenerated into anarchy. The UN forces were deployed with more intrusive mandates than before. Problems suppressed by the influence of East- West rivalry emerged in regions and states that previously had been comparatively stable.

The end of the Cold War there has been a dramatic increase in the number of peacekeeping operations undertaken by the UN. Since the 1988, peacekeeping has involved very rapidly in the post Cold War situation. Varied types of post-Cold War operation are as follows: 5

Preventive deployment

The idea is that, in a potential threaten situation, the UN, at the request of one of the parties to the potential conflict, would deploy troops, as a confidence-building measure that would raise the political price if the potential aggressor were to attack the other party. There is an only one example, Macedonia. Traditional peacekeeping

The function is to support peacemaking efforts by helping to create conditions in which political negotiation can proceed. It involves monitoring ceasefires, controlling buffer zones, and so on. There are three subtypes. Unarmed military observer groups are currently in Near East, Kashmir and Western Sahara. Armed infantry-based forces that
were deployed in cases to control small incidents, as in Cyprus, Syria, Lebanon and Croatia. The third type is an operation set up as a consequence of peace-enforcement operation, as on the Iraq-Kuwait border. It has nevertheless been operated in accordance with the principles of peacekeeping.

**Helping implement negotiated agreements**

The end of the Cold war and the new effectiveness of the SC have made it possible to negotiate partial or comprehensive settlements of several regional conflicts. This is a new type of peacekeeping operation. The United Nations is currently carrying out this short of operation in El Salvador, Cambodia Angola and Mozambique.

**Protecting delivery of humanitarian supplies**

This kind of deployment of UN troops is to protect the delivery of humanitarian supplies in civil war or inter-state war situations. This has been tried in Somalia, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**Painting a country blue**

The United Nations moves into a country that is in a state of total disorder, the institutions of government have collapsed, and there is no political authority with which one can negotiate. The UN did it once in the Congo in the early 1960s. The UN forces in Somalia have the same task.

**Cease-fire enforcement**

This is not a peacekeeping but the Secretary General, in An *Agenda for peace*, called “peace enforcement,” though “cease fire enforcement” is perhaps a more accurate way of describing it. It was in Bosnia.

**Peace enforcement**

Peace enforcement is the use of UN forces in a war to support aggrieved country such as Kuwait and Korea. Nevertheless, in both cases, the troops were not under the command of Secretary General; they were under the command of national authorities like as ad hoc coalition of willing states that had been authorized by the SC to use force for a specific purpose.

An important aspect of the issue of legitimacy for the UN is the question of international perceptions especially with regard to the collective use of force by the United Nations. The challenge is that UN cannot operate solely on the basis of ideals and principles, divorced from the realities of the world power politics. This would render it a utopian project. On the other hand, the UN cannot simply mirror the world *realpolitik*. The UN should be the place where power relations are recognized but mediated by ideals and principles. It is the unique blend that can give the UN legitimacy on a universal plane.

**International Security and Peacekeeping**

The main political context for international security is the anarchic structure of the international system. The anarchic context sets the elemental political conditions in which all meanings of international security have to be constructed. The structure of anarchy is highly durable, because their actions states take to preserve their independence and sovereignty automatically perpetuate and anarchic system. That structure generates system wide effects on relations among states. An anarchic structure imposes competitive, self-help conditions of existence on the states within the system. That international anarchy makes cooperation unlikely or impossible. Idealist argues for security as an outcome of the prevention of warfare and the removal of the quest for power, to the contrary realists argue that security is best maintained with the maximization of power. This power enabled nations to maintain deterrence through the readiness to wage war and when it served the national interest, the waging of war. From a broad realist perspective, power is synonymous with security when it provides the ability to control one’s environment. Moreover, central to the realist concept of security is the national interest, which is the traditional intrinsic goal of national security. The formula of the national interest has come to be practically synonymous with the formula of national security. In international politics this perspective offers a static and rather pessimistic picture of the state system and its processes.

Today the international security environment is far more complex than it was in the Cold War era of bipolarity. The diminished threat of a world war has been replaced by the reality of intra-state conflicts that undermine stability and security at the domestic and regional level. A serious challenge for the international system is the increasing number of weak or even failed states and their inability to control and manage their own affairs and territory. The weakest unsubstantial states
with their high level of domestic conflict present an increasing dilemma for the UN, because large-scale domestic conflict presents an awkward problem for a collective security system based on sovereign states.

The end of the Cold War the theoretical debate regarding conflict and cooperation has not been changed greatly. According to dominant tradition in the discipline of international relations, namely realism, the changes are limited in nature. After all anarchy prevails, and the international system remains a system of sovereign states with no system-wide authority, no world government. The absence of government with a legal monopoly of physical force in the international system leads realist theorist of international relations to the conclusion that the international system necessarily has to be self-help system made up of unitary state actors. For the realist, the international source of insecurity is rooted in anarchy, a condition that is fundamental fact of international political life. In a system of sovereign states, there can be no central political authority. The structure of the system is necessarily anarchic, with each state retaining the right to judge its own cause and decide on the use of force. The incentives for aggression, risk of tension, conflict, and war in such a system are high.8 In arming for their security, states set in motion a vicious circle. Attempts to increase the security of one state undermine the security of another, creating security dilemma.9 Each state considers it's vulnerable and states operate self-help system. State operating in a self-help world always acts according to their self-interest. In addition to, states in the international system aim to maximize their relative power positions over other states. The aim is to acquire more military power at the expense of potential rivals. Therefore, in the international system, there is no higher authority to prevent and counter the use of force. Security can therefore be realized through self-help. In an anarchic structure, self-help is necessarily the principle of action.10 Therefore, states will have to depend for themselves in the aged-old game of balance of power. On the other hand, the era of idealism was motivated by the desire of prevent war. The First World War shifted liberal thinking towards a recognition that peace is not a natural condition but is one that must be constructed. According to Woodrow Wilson, peace could only be secured with the creation of an international institution to regulate the international anarchy. Security could not be left to secret bilateral diplomatic deals and blind faith in the balance of power. Like domestic society, international society must have governance system that has democratic procedures for coping with disputes, and an international force could be mobilized in negotiations failed.

Liberalist analysis supports a more optimistic view of the post Cold War world. They believe even in the absence of an order in an anarchical world—states can set aside their differences, unite for the greater good, and overcome international anarchy. If organized properly, international society can eliminate the anarchy that makes problems.11 Idealists believe in cooperation among nation-states. They argue that march to democracy is an important factor in the world politics. The march of democracy within states around the globe, increase in liberal free-trade arrangements that assume trust and the benefit of all, strengthening of international law, the renewed role of international institutions like the UN to undertake collective security initiatives, the proliferation of arms control agreements, and international humanitarian responses to state human-rights violations as evidence of the fulfillment of Wilson’s specific idealistic predictions about what international politics would like.12 Democracy creates domestic institutions aimed at cooperation that help pave the way for international institutions. Economic interdependence promotes transnational relations in general and creates an incentive for developing international cooperation. This is thus having to main views of the world after Cold War. A pessimistic realist view, and a rather more optimistic liberal / idealist view.

Peacekeeping is neither the collective security nor the balance of power. Peacekeeping is the functional innovation of the UN. Peacekeeping is concerned with the problem of rivalry. For a variety of reason, the use of UN for peacekeeping purpose is more appropriate and more feasible in the present era, and performance of the task that it involves is more acceptable to members of the organization, than would be true of a collective security system. Indeed, the very factors that make the world situation wrong for collective security make it right for peacekeeping.13 Given the limits of collective security, some of its proponents argue that two less ambitious forms of the theory might be realizable: peacekeeping and concerts and they are portrayed as the “budget” version of collective security.14 Some experts think that peacekeeping and concerts might still be powerful force for international stability.15 Realists are very pessimistic about the
peacekeeping of UN. Mearsheimer argues, in essence, peacekeeping is mainly useful for helping implement ceasefires in wars involving minor powers. He also states that peacekeeping has no role to play in disputes between great powers. Moreover, it forbids the use of coercion, which is essential to a collective security system. Its mission is far away from the ambitious goals of collective security. Peacekeeping by the UN or by regional organizations like the organization of African Unity (OAU) can enhance the prospects for world peace only on the margin. Although the realists are pessimistic about the peacekeeping, these days there have a powerful Western community and a surge in multilateral security management, reflecting US power and influence. Realists therefore, believe that institutions are not an important cause of peace. Institutions have minimal influence on state behavior, thus hold little promise for promoting stability in the world politics.

UN Peacekeeping: Tool of National Interest or Common Interest

Although international society may have substantial elements of law, order, and authority, it clearly lacks hierarchical government. Waltz argues, domestic systems are centralized and hierarchical, but international systems are decentralized and anarchic. Realists claim that in anarchy, states compete with other states for security, markets, and influence. The first move of the state is to organize power domestically, and the second is to accumulate power internationally. Therefore, with respect to states themselves, national-state to be the only actor in international relations. Such things as MNCs and IGOs are seen as tools of the most powerful states.

The core national interest of all states must be survival. Survival is held to be a precondition for attaining all other goals, whether these involve conquest or merely independence. According to Waltz, survival is the goals of state and states are unitary actors with a single motive—the wish to survive. The survival motive is taken as the ground of action. By assumption, economic actors seek to maximize expected returns, and states strive to secure their survival. According to Mearsheimer, the ultimate goal of the states is to achieve a hegemonic position in the international system. States always desire more power and are willing, if the opportunity arises. All politics is a struggle for power, analyzed the national interest as nothing more than the selfish interest of the dominant groups in a state. Considering the United States invasion to Haiti in 1994, President Clinton stated the American people that what happens in Haiti "affects our national security interests" and it was therefore imperative that “we must act now” to protect our interests.

In a national interest based international system the peacekeeping missions are actively supported by great powers or powerful powers when they have their national interests related to it. In the Cold War period only thirteen peacekeeping missions were established and many conflicts were excluded, because of great power rivalry and their vital interests or sphere of interests. During the Cold War, peacekeeping advanced US interests in the Middle East, where six operations were deployed between 1948 and 1978 and promoted the security of Israel, one of America’s closest allies. Peacekeeping efforts also served US allies, such as Turkey, Greece, Pakistan, and Morocco. In effect, the SC became a victim of great power interests and the US in particular, used the UN to further its national interests. The International Institute of Strategic Studies reports indicate that peacekeeping operations tended to be more effective when one nation, or a small group with a specific interest in the country they were policing, took a leading role. Consider the US-led war against Iraq in 1991. Even allowing that US interests were completely egoistic—oil, regional security, and international security—institutional and normative focus were essential to the ability of the US to realize those objectives. Without United Nations authorization, many Americans, as well as many allies in Europe and Middle East, would have been less willing to participate. If countries have substantial national interest, states are willing to pay considerable financial and political price. International Institute of Strategic Studies cited the examples of Australia in East Timor, and to an extent, Nigeria in Africa. In 1999, the UN Security Council unanimously authorized an Australian-peacekeeping mission to use whatever means necessary to end a wave of terror by pro-Indonesian militants, who killed thousands and displaced hundreds of thousands after East Timor voted for independence from Indonesia. The report also said the US was unlikely to withdraw from the Balkans because it maintains a core strategic interest in European stability. However, the US might be slower to deploy military support in less pressing regions. IISS reported “With respect to substantial engagement in peacekeeping in non-strategic areas, such
as sub-Sahara Africa, US officials and the American public probably will remain reluctant to place troops at risk." Therefore, the peacekeeping mission of UN is depends on the national and security interests.

The UN in general fell into disfavor with the Regan administration as it appeared that Soviets and Third World nations were using it as a tool directed against American interests. But with the decline and fall of the Warshaw pact and the Soviet Union, and with the success of the gulf war, the United States found that the UN could again serve American foreign policy interests. President Bush argued for a more activist role for the United Nations and pushed to pay U.S. dues. He viewed the institution as capable of supporting American interests.

In the period of Clinton administration has argued that the U.S. participations in operation to enforce sanctions, provide humanitarian relief and assist peacekeeping, when, and only when it is our interest to do so. The attitude of Clinton administration towards the role of UN in its foreign policy had changed in 1994. Presidential Decision Directive 25 sought to reassess US support for new and continuing peacekeeping operations in included whether participation would advance US national interest. Moreover, it reduced share of cost level to only from 31.7 percent to 25 percent. Washington was selective in its support, providing more funding and assistance to those missions most closely aligned with American interests such as the Middle East. In this, the Clinton administration's approach has not been substantially different from its predecessors' that have long viewed UN peacekeeping as a useful “tool” for promotion of American interests and values abroad.

The great powers became increasingly reluctant to operate outside their own sphere of interest and doubted whether, for example, the UN could operate effectively in countries such as Sierra Leone. Moreover, UN activities also became victims of other great power interests. For example, the Bush administration said that it would consider cutting as many as a dozen UN peacekeeping missions in a growing dispute over the new International Criminal Court.

Overall, the American approach to peacekeeping reflects the mixture of self-interest and ideals of multilateralism and unilateralism that has always characterized American foreign policy. For the United States, multilateralism is a tool to be used when it can support the achievement of American interests or support US idealism. As Ambassador Madeline Albright told a Senate Committee, When threats arise, we may respond through UN, through NATO, through a coalition, through a combination of those tools or we may act alone. We will do whatever is necessary to defend the vital interest of the United States. On the other hand Peacekeeping operations are serving common interest in many cases. For Canada, multilateralism has always been viewed as an attractive means to achieve broad foreign policy objectives. Canadian internationalism simply equates Canada's well being with broad global stability and the belief that Canadians should help the international community foster that stability... they can offer corresponding skills-mediating disputes; counseling, good governance in a diverse society; helping the less fortunate; and peacekeeping.

Idealists believe that after the Cold War states are now engaged in restoring a pace for morality in foreign policy. They are pursuing collective, cooperative interests that all states have always had in common—like peace, justice, and a better way of life. These are interests about welfare within and among states rather than warfare among states. And these moral goals that lead to a better way of life for people and states are as much in states’ individualistic national interests as they are in their collective interests. Because the world has been recognized, they are realizable once again. Central to idealism was the formation of an international organization to facilitate peaceful change, disarmament, arbitration and enforcement. The UN Charter was signed in June 1945. Outside the military security issue area, liberal ideas made an important contribution to global politics even during the cold war. The principle of self-determination, championed by liberal internationalists for centuries, signaled the end of empire. The protection of individuals from human right abuse was enshrined. The security scheme of the Charter was conceived as an arrangement for collective action against relatively minor disturbance of the peace, in cases where the great powers were united in the desire to permit or take action. Peacekeeping evolved as an alternative to collective security that the UN designed. Some experts think that peacekeeping might still be a powerful force for international security overarching structure of anarchy. However, it is unlikely that many countries are reluctant to actively participate in peacekeeping missions, considering their national interest. Experience shows, however, that although there
were missions to prevent human suffering, and protect human rights, many deadly conflicts were ignored. The UN’s or SC’s selectivity in these crises suggest that a range of state and great power interests, continue to affect the role of the SC. In effect, without the consent of the great powers, there would be no peacekeeping. The great powers continued to see peacekeeping as a foreign policy tool.

For this, need participating counties to agree on a common solution to keeping the peace. On the other hand, while absolute security is not attainable in an anarchical society, relative security may be achieved. In this regard the development of the idea of common security, including the strategy of non-provocative defence; such ideas seek to deal with the military problem that lies at the heart of the security dilemma.

**Conclusion**

At the turn of the century, the international situation is undergoing profound changes and the world is not all peace. Various factors that threaten world peace and security still exist. The common development of all countries is being hindered by complicated problems and conflicts. People all over the world are calling, more strongly than ever before, for peace, stability and development. How to enable the UN to more effectively maintain international peace and security and create a favorable environment for the development of all countries has become a pressing task. In this respect, peacekeeping of UN is trying to make the international security possible. Although, UN was unable to end the conflicts in Cambodia, Somalia or the former Yugoslavia, the peacekeeping missions saved thousands of lives. Fortunately, the UN has had a number of successes, most notably in Cambodia, El Salvador, and Namibia and its more recent operations in Mozambique and Angola. Former UN Secretary-General said,

Multilateral operations through the United Nations are the most effective way of maintaining peace. This is particularly so now that conflicts within state boarders is more common than war between countries—making the resolution of conflicts seem of little importance to the national interest of most other states. But, the effectiveness of multilateralism is difficult to demonstrate in the absence of adequate money, materials and movability from one type of an operation to another.\(^{51}\)
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