



A critical study of the ethical challenges to United Nations Peacekeeping Missions and National Sovereignty in Africa with specific reference to Congo, Somalia, Rwanda and Sudan

By

Herbert Chingono

*(Diploma in War and Strategic Studies; BA (Honours) in War and Strategic Studies; MSc National Security Strategy; MBA; MA International Relations)*

Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Academic Requirements for the  
Degree of:

Doctor of Philosophy

In the Subject of

Ethics

at the

School of Religion Philosophy and Classics,  
College of Humanities  
University of KwaZulu-Natal  
Pietermaritzburg

Supervisor

Dr Munyaradzi Felix Murove

June 2017

## DECLARATION

I, Herbert Chingono declare that:

- i. The research presented in this thesis except where otherwise indicated, is my original work.
- ii. The thesis has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.
- iii. This thesis does not contain other persons' data, pictures, graphics or other information, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons.
- iv. This thesis does not contain other persons' writing unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other researchers. Where other written sources have been quoted:
  - a. Their words have been rewritten but the general information attributed to them has been referenced.
  - b. Where their exact words have been used, their exact words have been placed inside quotation marks and referenced.
- v. This thesis does not contain text graphics or table copied and pasted from the internet unless specifically acknowledged and the source being detailed in the thesis and in the reference sections.

Candidate: H Chingono

Signed: ..... Date .....

Supervisor: Dr M. F. Murove

Signed: ..... Date .....

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my beloved parents for their abundant and endless love, spiritual support and encouragement. I will forever cherish their sacrifices towards giving me a firm educational foundation that has enabled me to attain this academic achievement.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been successfully completed without the total and unflinching critical support from my supervisor, Dr Munyaradzi Felix Murove. I remain forever indebted to him for the professional, rigorous guidance and constructive criticism he gave me throughout the research project. There is no doubt that he invested a lot of his valuable time and energy marking my chapters and giving me timeous and detailed feedback. I cannot fully express my profound gratitude and appreciation for his enormous contribution to the successful completion of this thesis.

I am equally greatly indebted to my Commander, General Constantino Guvheya Chiwenga who was my pillar of professional strength and inspiration throughout my research project. He personally encouraged me to embark on the PhD study programme and provided me with the logistical and financial support that enabled me to visit several countries in search of relevant research material for my thesis. His personal academic focus and achievement inspired me to excel in my research endeavours.

I would also like to thank the Commander of the Zimbabwe National Army Lieutenant General Philip Valerio Sibanda who released me to attend to the demanding working visits to University of KwaZulu-Natal for consultations with my supervisor at a time when office demands and financial resources were a big challenge. General Sibanda equally shared with me his most valuable experience as Commander of UNAVEM II in Angola. I found his experience extremely useful and relevant to my broad area of study. Retired Lieutenant General M Nyambuya who served with UNOSOM shared with me his personal experiences and professional views regarding UN/US peacekeeping missions in Somalia. I remain indebted to him for his contribution to the successful completion of this study.

Lieutenant Colonel (Dr) Sadiki Maeresera, a Post-Doctoral Research Fellow at the University of KwaZulu-Natal was extremely generous with his sharing of research experience and how to remain focused on addressing the issues under investigation. Mrs Celeste Johns was an outstanding librarian throughout my studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. Without her professional assistance, my usage of library books could not have been as effective as it was.

I wish to sincerely thank Zimbabwean ambassadors accredited to the countries I visited for my field work namely South Africa, Ethiopia and Russia. A special thank you goes to various diplomats accredited to the AU Headquarters in Addis Ababa for the invaluable assistance they gave me through interviews and the provision of research materials for my fieldwork. I wish to

single out Mr Simon Badza who personally helped me in scheduling and coordinating my interviews with diplomats accredited to the AU despite his having a busy schedule at the AU Department of Political Affairs. A special acknowledgement goes to all the interviewees that spared their precious time to grant me the opportunity to engage with them. I wish to single out the following interviewees: Ambassador I.A. Moyo; Ambassador Manzou; Ambassador Mapuranga; Ambassador Mtetwa; Ambassador Maupanga; Professor Madhuku; Professor Manyeruke; Professor J. Moyo, Dr. Gomesh; Dr. Ibbo Mandaza; Dr. N. Mlambo, Dr. R. Uriga; Dr. J. Mukusha and several serving and retired army and police officers who served with various missions in the countries under study who agreed to grant me interviews. Special mentions also go to all the academics and political analysts that agreed to spare their precious time for my interviews.

The research project could not have been a success without the professionalism and dedication to duty of my office staff who worked odd hours in helping me to put together the various parts of the interviews as well as the desk research. Mr J. Maguranhinga was outstanding with his clerical and editing contribution. Ms M. Nyamandi was always cheerful and prepared to go an extra mile despite the clerical overload that she had to handle to ensure this study was successfully completed.

Last but not least I wish to express my profound appreciation for the patience and moral support I received from my beloved wife Loice Chingono and my immediate family members. The demanding workload for the successful completion of this study saw her assuming greater family responsibilities as I was working hard to meet deadlines agreed to between my supervisor and myself. The views expressed in this thesis are attributed to the author's point of views.

## ABSTRACT

Africa has become the epicentre and experimental laboratory for UN peacekeeping missions. The UN peacekeeping doctrine has evolved through numerous operational experiments in Africa culminating in the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine that has been erroneously portrayed as the doctrine of harmony of interests and of international solidarity designed to serve international interests. This thesis concludes that the UN peacekeeping doctrine conceals the fact that it is primarily designed to advance the self-interests of the big powers at the expense of the weak states in conflict situations.

This thesis demonstrates that UN peacekeeping missions facilitate the continued looting of Africa's natural resources by big powers whose international policies are designed to entrench their privileged positions in violation of host state sovereignty and at the expense of the suffering populations. UN peacekeeping missions have been unethically used to facilitate regime change agendas in countries whose leaders would have fallen out of favour with the US and its Western allies. In this regard, humanitarian and other altruistic justifications for peacekeepers' deployment have been used to camouflage and conceal the true nefarious intentions of the big powers in what is known as "organized hypocrisy" on the part of the main sponsors of UN peacekeeping operations. The study revealed that African countries with greater geo-political and geo-strategic importance receive significantly higher attention and probability for UN peacekeeping deployments and not countries with the highest human suffering requiring the most urgent international attention.

The study demonstrated that it is a myth and a fallacy to believe that UN peacekeepers deployed in Africa serve the interests of local populations affected by conflicts. UN peacekeepers were accomplices in the assassinations of national leaders of Congo and Rwanda. In Somalia, the most powerful warlord was targeted for assassination by UN peacekeepers while in Sudan, the sitting head of state was indicted for prosecution at The Hague. The UNSC response to the genocide in Rwanda was morally and ethically reprehensible.

In countries of no significant geo-strategic or economic interests, the big powers resort to what has been termed "collective waffling" as part of "organized hypocrisy." In that regard African leaders must prioritise the protection of their populations as it is their internationally acknowledged responsibility to protect their own civilian populations without relying on foreign peacekeepers to play that vital role.

## KEY TERMS

United Nations Peacekeeping Missions, State Sovereignty, Self-Determination, Peacekeeping Challenges, Ethical Challenges, National Self-Interests, Protection of Civilians, Responsibility to Protect, Consent, Impartiality, Use of Force and self-determination, Organized Hypocrisy.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AHM	Austro- Hungarian Monarch African Union
AMIS	African Mission in Sudan
ANC	National Congolese army
AOR	Area of Engagement
AU	African Union
BBTG	Broad Based Transitional Government
CHRIR	Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative Report
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CNPC	China National Petroleum Company
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
CHRIR	Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative Report
DPKO	Department of Peacekeeping Operations
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ESAP	Economic Structural Adjustment Programme
EU	European Union
GoR	Government of Rwanda
GoS	Government of Sudan
HCFA	Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement
HRO	Humanitarian Relief Organisations
HRW	Human Rights Watch
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICISS	International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICTR	International Criminal Tribunal on Rwanda
IEA	International Energy Agency
IPEP	International Panel of Eminent Personalities
IPA	International Peace Academy
JEM	Justice and Equality Movement
MIC	Military Industrial Complex
NAM	Non Aligned Movement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

OAU	Organisation of African Unity
OFDA	Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance
ONUC	Organisation des Nations Unies au Congo
P-5	Five Permanent Members of the United Nations Security Council
PPD 25	Presidential Policy Directive No. 25
R2P	Responsibility to Protect
ROE	Rules of Engagement
RPF	Rwanda Patriotic Front
RPF/A	Rwanda Patriotic Front Army
RPTC	Regional Peacekeeping Training Centre
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAM	Surface to Air Missile
SG	Secretary General
SLA	Sudan Liberation Army
SPLM/A	Sudan People's Liberation Movement/ Army
TCC	Troop Contributing Countries
UK	United Kingdom
UN Charter	United Nations Charter
UN	United Nations
UNAMID	United Nations and African Union hybrid Mission in Sudan
UNAMIR	United Nations Assistance Mission in Rwanda
UNAMIS	United Nations Mission in Sudan
UNCIVPOL	United Nations Civilian Police
UNEF	United Nations Emergency Force
UNITAF	United Nations Intervention Task Force
UNOSOM I	First United Nations Peacekeeping Mission to Somalia
UNOSOM II	Second United Nations Peacekeeping Mission to Somalia
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSCOB	United Nations Committee on the Balkans
UNSG	United Nations Secretary General
UNTAC	United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia
UNTSO	United Nations Truce Supervisory Organisation
US	United States
USSR	Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DECLARATION.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>DEDICATION.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>KEY TERMS.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction and Scope of the Study.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Background to the Study.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Statement of the Problem.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.3 Objectives of the Study.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.4 Research Questions.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.5 Hypothesis.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.6 Preliminary Literature Review and Reasons for Choosing the Topic .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.7 Gaps in Existing Literature.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>1.8 Principal Theories upon which the Research Project will be constructed.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>1.9 Research Design and Methodology .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>1.10 New Knowledge.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>1.11 Limitations of the Study.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>1.12 Outline Structure of the Thesis.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>CHAPTER TWO.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>The Evolution of Peacekeeping Operations.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>2.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>2.2 An overview of peacekeeping operations .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>2.3 The genesis of “peacekeeping” missions .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>2.4 Peacekeeping operations under the League of Nations (1920-1925) .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>2.5 UN peacekeeping missions.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>2.5.1 UN first generation peacekeeping missions .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>2.5.2 UN second generation peacekeeping .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>2.5.3 UN third generation peacekeeping operations .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>2.6 Conclusion .....</b>	<b>46</b>

<b>CHAPTER THREE .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Ethical Challenges to United Nations Peacekeeping Mission in the Republic of Congo with reference to the period (1960-1964).....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>3.1     Introduction.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>3.2     Background to the 1960-64 Congo crisis.....</b>	<b>50</b>
3.2.1     Congolese Government Request for UN military assistance .....	53
3.2.2     UNSC authorization of ONUC .....	57
3.2.3     Interpretation of the Security Council Resolutions by the UNSG and Prime Minister of Congo.....	60
<b>3.3     Unethical deployment of pro-western troops and US civilians in Congo.....</b>	<b>64</b>
3.3.1     Implications of Soviet military assistance to Lumumba .....	68
<b>3.4     Mishandling of the Congo constitutional crisis by ONUC officials .....</b>	<b>69</b>
3.4.1     The Assassination of Patrice Lumumba.....	72
<b>3.5 Termination of secession in Katanga Province .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>3.6     Conclusion .....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>CHAPTER FOUR.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Ethical challenges to UN and US “humanitarian” interventions in Somalia: from peacekeeping to peace-enforcement (1992-1995) .....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>4.1     Introduction.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>4.2     Background to the “humanitarian intervention” in Somalia .....</b>	<b>79</b>
4.2.1     A Brief historical background to the crisis .....	79
4.2.2     UN/US opportunity to experiment with new concepts of peacekeeping .....	81
<b>4.3     UN non-humanitarian motives for intervention in Somalia .....</b>	<b>83</b>
4.3.1     Unethical circumventing of the requirement for host state consent.....	85
4.3.2     An ethical analysis of non-humanitarian motives for military intervention in Somalia	87
4.3.3     An ethical analysis of the relationship between Boutros-Ghali and Farah Aideed.....	88
<b>4.4     Ethical analysis of US motivations in launching of UNITAF.....</b>	<b>90</b>
4.4.1     The influence of the donor agencies .....	92
4.4.2     Unethical and non-altruistic influence of the US military establishment .....	94
4.4.3     Unethical US political desire to operationalize the New World Order.....	97
4.4.4     Unethical economic factors that motivated US military intervention in Somalia.....	98
<b>4.5     An ethical analysis on application of UN peacekeeping principles in Somalia.....</b>	<b>99</b>
4.5.1     Ethical violation of the principle of host state consent .....	99
4.5.2     Unethical violation of the principle of impartiality.....	101
4.5.3     Ethical challenges to the use of force for UN humanitarian peacekeeping missions..	102
<b>4.6     Some views on ethical challenges to foreign humanitarian interventionism .....</b>	<b>104</b>

<b>4.7 Conclusion .....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>CHAPTER FIVE .....</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>A case study of failed UN peacekeeping mission in Rwanda 1993-1995 .....</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>5.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>5.2 Historical factors that contributed to the genocide in Rwanda .....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>5.3 UNSC ethical challenges in handling the Rwanda crisis .....</b>	<b>114</b>
5.3.1       UNSC unethical response to the genocide .....	119
5.3.2       UNSC double standards in the use of force to stop the Rwandan genocide .....	122
<b>5.4 Ethical challenge of sovereignty and human security.....</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>5.5 Unethical Belgian participation in UNAMIR.....</b>	<b>130</b>
5.5.1       Anti-Belgian sentiments in Kigali.....	132
<b>5.6 An analysis of unethical conduct by UNAMIR .....</b>	<b>134</b>
5.6.1       UNAMIR unethical intrusiveness in Rwanda domestic affairs .....	134
5.6.2       An analysis of UNAMIR's failure to use force to stop the genocide.....	137
5.6.3       Unethical and senseless withdrawal of peacekeepers amid genocide .....	140
5.6.4       UNAMIR's unholy alliance with the RPF .....	142
<b>5.7 Conclusion .....</b>	<b>147</b>
<b>CHAPTER SIX .....</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>Multilateral Response to Humanitarian Crisis in Darfur: A Case Study of United Nations Organized Hypocrisy in Peacekeeping.....</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>6.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>6.2 Background to the Darfur conflict .....</b>	<b>152</b>
<b>6.3 AU response to the Darfur crisis .....</b>	<b>154</b>
<b>6.4 Organized hypocrisy: UN response to the Darfur crisis.....</b>	<b>158</b>
6.4.1       Definition of organized hypocrisy .....	158
6.4.2       An overview of UN response to the Darfur crisis .....	159
6.4.3       An ethical assessment of UN response to the crisis in Darfur .....	160
6.4.4       Ethical and political justification for a hybrid peacekeeping Mission in Darfur .....	162
<b>6.5 Political and ethical challenges to UNAMID peacekeeping operations .....</b>	<b>165</b>
<b>6.6 US attitude and response to the Darfur crisis .....</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>6.7 China's Strategic Interests in Darfur and their impact on UNAMID .....</b>	<b>174</b>
6.7.1       Chinese Response to the Darfur Crisis.....	175
<b>6.8 Conclusion .....</b>	<b>178</b>
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN.....</b>	<b>182</b>
<b>An ethical critique of the violation of UN peacekeeping principles.....</b>	<b>182</b>
<b>7.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>182</b>

<b>7.2</b>	<b>Host state consent.....</b>	<b>183</b>
7.2.1	The problem of state sovereignty and human security.....	186
7.2.2	A critique to the principle of host state consent.....	188
<b>7.3</b>	<b>The ethical principle of impartiality.....</b>	<b>188</b>
7.3.1	Ethical challenges to the maintenance of impartiality .....	190
<b>7.4</b>	<b>The use of force in UN peacekeeping missions .....</b>	<b>191</b>
7.4.1	Problems related to the use of force.....	193
<b>7.5</b>	<b>Theoretical explanations for systematic violation of peacekeeping principles .....</b>	<b>196</b>
7.5.1	UN peacekeeping as a vehicle to spread neo-colonial and neo-liberal values.....	197
7.5.2	Double Anarchy and UN peacekeeping operations .....	199
7.5.3	Group Morality and the conduct of UN peacekeeping missions .....	200
<b>7.6</b>	<b>The need for African leaders to be suspicious of UN peacekeeping missions .....</b>	<b>205</b>
<b>7.8</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>211</b>
<b>CHAPTER EIGHT.....</b>		<b>213</b>
8.1	Prelude to ethical recommendations .....	213
8.2	Ethical and Policy Recommendations.....	219
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>		<b>223</b>
Appendix 1: Letter of Informed Consent to Participants.....		260
Appendix 2: Questionnaire .....		265
Appendix 3: List of Interviewees .....		268

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **Introduction and Scope of the Study**

### **1.1 Background to the Study**

Since the end of the Cold War, United Nations (UN) peacekeeping in Africa has taken centre stage at both the academic and policy levels in an endeavour by the world body to promote collective international peace and security on the continent. This development has triggered debate on policy formulation and execution of UN peacekeeping missions that has often been problematic in all fields of study. This is due to the fact that the dynamics of conflict internationally and regionally are always shifting and also because of the contending view points between Euro-centric and Afro-centric expectations on peacekeeping outcomes.

A major contradiction and ethical problem arises when peacekeepers are deployed in a conflict country without the full and voluntary consent of the host country and are expected to protect the local civilian population yet it is the responsibility of the host state to protect its own citizens. In such situations, the host state's responsibility of protecting own citizens is immediately usurped by the deployment of UN peacekeepers with a mandate of protecting local civilians in conflict situations, leaving the host state at the mercy of the peacekeepers. As a result of this peacekeeping practice, this thesis argues that UN peacekeeping missions in Africa are failing to fulfil their mandates as a result of the normative and ethical conflict and dilemma that exists between UN peacekeeping missions and safeguarding of nation state sovereignty especially where UN peacekeepers are involved in regime change activities against the host government.

Whilst much has been written about UN peacekeeping missions in Africa, there has not been significant scholarly research specifically addressing the ethical tension and dilemma that continues to exist between UN peacekeeping missions on the continent and the aspect of nation state sovereignty. According to the UN Charter, nation states are sovereign within their territories and are immune to external interference except in grave circumstances, such as war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity (United Nations Charter 1945). The UN sometimes deploys peacekeepers, without invitation or full consent from affected member states, as happened in Somalia in violation of its Charter which prohibits interference in internal affairs of member countries (Findlay 2002). In Sudan, President Al Bashir was coerced to host

UN peacekeepers against his wish as he preferred African peacekeepers and troops from friendly countries to constitute peacekeepers in Darfur (De Haas 2008; Badescu and Bergholm 2009). Elsewhere outside Africa, Welsh (2008) cites Haiti, Kosovo and East Timor as examples where coerced consent was derived from host countries as a result of pressure from some big powers to have peacekeepers deploy. When a country is subjected to UN peacekeeping operations, its sovereignty is compromised in that such deployments imply that the country's ability to protect its own borders and citizens would have been temporarily compromised or even suspended by the peacekeepers' presence in the country (Hansch 1994). Thus, major ethical challenges to UN peacekeeping missions in Africa revolve around this dilemma.

Experience has demonstrated that UN peacekeeping missions have either left the host countries with a new government through UN sponsored regime change agenda as happened in the Congo during the early 1960s (Wedgwood 1995) and Rwanda in 1994 (Al Qaq 2009) or the host country is left with recommendations that the previous government should be sent to the International Criminal Court (ICC) or the International Court of Justice (ICJ) for trial as happened in the Ivory Coast. The same scenario is what is currently being orchestrated against President Al Bashir in Sudan. These peacekeeping activities clearly undermine host state sovereignty. In some of the worst cases, peacekeeping missions have even led to the deaths of sitting heads of state and government as was the case in Congo in 1961 when Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba was assassinated through the active connivance of UN peacekeepers (Collins 1993) and (Spooner 2009). In Rwanda, the Presidents of Rwanda and Burundi were assassinated in 1994 in a plane crash under the watch of UN peacekeepers (Davenport and Stam 2009) and (Del Ponte and Chuck 2011). In 2001 the DRC President Laurent Kabil was assassinated when UN peacekeepers were deployed in the capital Kinshasa although there is no substantiated complicit of UN peacekeepers. These examples demonstrate that UN peacekeepers should not be overly trusted with safeguarding the well-being of the local population and the country's leadership. This thesis attempts to demonstrate that UN peacekeepers' unpronounced main objective prior to withdrawal is to leave behind a political system of government in power that is amenable to the dictates and interests of some of the big powers in the UN Security Council and not a system of governance that is necessarily accountable to the majority local population as happened in the Congo and Rwanda (Sitkowski 2006).

At Congo's independence, a group of Western states under the leadership of the US grossly interfered with the political system of Congo under the umbrella of UN peacekeeping

operations (Collins 1993). The US, Belgium, Britain and Canada decimated Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba's ruling coalition government, ultimately leading to the assassination of the Prime Minister that was made possible with the active and deliberate connivance of some UN peacekeeping officials (Spooner 2009:109). The case study in chapter three of this thesis demonstrates that Patrice Lumumba's assassination was a result of a well-planned and orchestrated conspiracy to eliminate him from the Congolese political stage (Collins 1993 and Spooner 2009). It also demonstrates that the main conspirators were UN peacekeeping officials, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and Colonel Mobutu Sese Seko (*Ibid.*). Colonel Mobutu Sese Seko who was instrumental in the assassination of the first democratically elected Prime Minister of Congo ultimately became Africa's most despotic dictator that nearly brought Congo/Zaire to the brink of financial bankruptcy as state funds were siphoned out to Swiss banks which are shielded by state-enacted secrecy regulations (Grovogui 2002:317).

The outcome of the UN peacekeeping mission in Congo was both negative peace and negative state sovereignty in which an African dictator and his autocrats were protected by the US and its western allies while the toiling Congolese population was left unempowered and unprotected both politically and economically (Lyons and Mastanduno 1995). The net effect of the UN Congo peacekeeping mission was effective transfer of power and wealth from Congo/Zaire to Europe; specifically to Belgium and Switzerland (*Ibid.*). This view is shared by Collins (1993) who observed that the UN mission heralded the introduction of the Cold War in Africa and scuttled the transition of Congo from colonialism to full national sovereignty. This was so despite the fact that the UN peacekeeping mission had been invited by a legitimately elected Congolese government to help it with dealing with a Belgian foreign troop invasion that had violated Congo's national sovereignty.

Three decades later, the UN was back again in Africa this time in Somalia without a proper and ethical invitation to intervene, purportedly to address humanitarian concerns in an on-going civil war situation. What happened thereafter as reflected in chapter four was that UN peacekeepers together with US troops<sup>1</sup> attempted to destroy the most powerful warlord General Mohammad Farah Aideed in a bid to leave the country under US preferred leadership of

---

<sup>1</sup> US troops in this case were not UN peacekeepers in that they were not subordinated in any way to UN command and control as is the case with other troops participating in this mission. Whereas other troop contributing countries forego some measure of control of their troops deployed in UN missions, the US does not allow its troops to be under any foreign command structure. The US is only comfortable operating under UN political umbrella without subordinating its troops to UN command structures.

General Aideed's main rivalry Ali Mahdi Mohammad. This military intervention launched under the umbrella of humanitarian intervention, violated Somalia's national sovereignty and did not have the support and approval of the Somali population as evidenced by the resistance of the Somali population against UN peacekeepers' attempts at imposing warlord Ali Mahdi Mohammad as the preferred leader of Somalia. The Somali resistance manifested itself through deadly military skirmishes that forced the Americans to retreat and abandon the mission unceremoniously. A worse fate was to befall the Rwandan population two years later when UN peacekeepers were deployed in that country to facilitate regime change that served the self-interests of foreign powers thus undermining Rwanda's national sovereignty (Grunfeld and Huijboom (2007).

In Rwanda, the legitimately elected President Habyarimana was assassinated on 06 April 1994, together with his Burundian counterpart in a mysterious plane crash under the watch of a Belgian contingent of UN peacekeepers. Belgian peacekeepers were deployed in Kigali, with a specific mandate of guarding the capital and the airport. The Rwandan President, who had grudgingly granted consent to the deployment of UN peacekeepers under duress from the US and the British, was assassinated by unknown assailants when the airport was under the effective control of Belgian peacekeepers, triggering the worst genocide Africa has witnessed in living memory.

Chapter six demonstrates that UN peacekeepers were complicit in the assassination of the Rwandan President in 1994 (Bruguiere Report 2006; Black 2014), as was the case in Congo in 1961 when Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba was assassinated with direct and wilful connivance of UN peacekeepers (Collins 1993 and Spooner 2009); incidences that expose the extent to which UN peacekeepers can go towards the violation of host state sovereignty in order to appease some powerful members of the UN Security Council. The chapter also demonstrates that UN peacekeepers facilitated the down fall of the Rwandan government to enable the Rwanda Patriotic Front (RPF), a rebel movement fighting the legitimate government of Rwanda, to come to power as part of a grand strategy by the US and its allies to displace French influence from that Central African region. Up to this day the UN Security Council (UNSC) has not authorised an international enquiry into the assassination of the two African presidents in Rwanda on 06 April 1994 an omission that raises suspicion as to why no official independent enquiry has been sanctioned by the world body. The use of UN peacekeepers in toppling host governments that fall out of favour with the US and her Western allies did not end up with Congo and Rwanda (Al Qaq 2009).

In 2011, a UN peacekeeping mission in the Ivory Coast evolved into an offensive military operation whose objective was the overthrowing of a sovereign government whose leader President Gbagbo, had fallen out of favour with the US and its French ally in the UNSC. The big powers in the UNSC also happen to be the major sponsors of UN peacekeeping missions hence their investment of financial and logistical resources in UN sponsored peacekeeping missions are expected to produce outcomes predominantly beneficial to themselves as the leading investors. These outcomes are not necessarily tailor made or designed to address the root causes of the conflicts that bring untold suffering to populations in conflict situations where UN peacekeepers are deployed. Thus, the motives of big powers that decide on the deployment of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa have become questionable and ethically suspicious especially when the sovereignty of a target country for peacekeeping mission is violated with impunity while at the same time the missions fail to guarantee or prioritise the protection of vulnerable civilian populations in target countries.

The central argument of this thesis is that UN peacekeeping missions in Africa have undermined the UN principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P), the idea that each country, in its capacity as a sovereign state, has the responsibility to protect its own citizens from internal and external threats. Without protection from their own governments, populations under the jurisdiction of UN peacekeepers have remained vulnerable to abuse by both peacekeepers and belligerents to the conflict situation as witnessed in Somalia (Atack 2002) and in the DRC (Anderson 1999). Such scenarios beg ethical answerers to the question why UN missions in Africa continuously fail to safeguard the well-being of endangered civilians they purport to protect each time they are launched. Many accounts have been reported, where UN peacekeepers have been accused of rape; human trafficking; weapons proliferation, drug and minerals smuggling and even murder of the very same people they purport to protect hence the suspicion regarding the true intentions of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa.

The UN peacekeeping missions in Africa continue to suffer credibility crisis in that they raise the security expectations among affected civilians in conflict situations yet ultimately fail to deliver and live up to expectations as witnessed in Congo; Somalia; Rwanda and Sudan (Gomez 2015). In this regard, they expose the defenceless populations to retributive action from belligerents opposed to the presence of UN peacekeepers in the country. The behaviour of UN peacekeepers, as demonstrated in the four case studies of this thesis, reflects that in practice, they do not have as their primary objective the safety and well-being of affected

African populations, but rather the self-preservation of peacekeepers' lives and the promotion of the values and geo-strategic self-interests of the powerful countries that sponsor them.

In line with Peter Singer (1981) who observed the tendency of kin altruism, it appears that the Permanent Five (P-5) members of the UNSC; China, Britain, France, Russia and the US have developed a tendency of promoting and protecting not only their own self-interests, but also interests of allies and friends resulting in the UN failure to deploy effective peacekeeping missions where they are needed most as happened in Rwanda during the genocide (Wedgwood 1995). A classic example is the favouritism and protection that Israel enjoys from the US regarding the Palestinian problem. The ethical challenge of selectivity in the deployment of UN peacekeeping missions arises from the inevitable conflict between the self-interests of the P-5 and the genuine need to come to the assistance of endangered civilian populations in African conflict situations as demonstrated in the case studies of this thesis.

The Rwandan genocide experience is another classic example where either countries of little interest to some of the P-5 members results in UN inaction; or where inaction actually served the self-interests of some of the big powers whose veto powers influence the nature and size of the UN mission to be deployed and the magnitude of logistical and financial support that mission would eventually enjoy (Kabau 2012). In Rwanda, the Belgian UN peacekeeping contingent fled Kigali, leaving the defenceless Tutsi population and moderate Hutus exposed to an orgy of Africa's worst twentieth century genocide (Luttwak 1999). Belgium went a step further to unethically influence the withdrawal of the bulk of UN peacekeepers at the height of the genocide demonstrating little or no respect for African lives that were abandoned for mass slaughter (Adebajo and Landsberg 2000:174). Chapter six of this thesis demonstrates that this UN withdrawal of peacekeepers was supported by Britain and the US as it served to facilitate the coming to power of the RPF guerrilla movement that was a protégé of the Anglo-American alliance designed to displace French political influence in the Central African region (Branch 2005). This observation is supported by the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative Report (CHRIR) that acknowledges that Kagame had the military and diplomatic support of the Anglo-American and the UN authorities (CHRIR 2009). Grunfeld and Huijboom (2007) observed that the big powers' unethical actions during the genocide were influenced more by petty national self-interests of geo-politics than addressing the basic needs of humanity. Such geo-political machinations by UN peacekeeping missions demonstrate that in the majority of cases, UN peacekeeping operations are launched in countries where one or more members of the Security Council have vested self-serving interests in the outcome of the mission and that they will do

everything in their powers to ensure their strategic plans prevail irrespective of the impact on the majority local population.

Such experiences have led some scholars to argue that peacekeeping missions can only be effective when undertaken by regional groupings such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). The rationale behind this school of thought is that conflicts can best be resolved effectively by fellow regional country members, as evidenced by the SADC coalition of the willing intervention in the DRC conflict during the period 1998-2002.<sup>2</sup> The SADC military intervention was meant to support the Congolese government of President Laurent-Desire Kabila against foreign invasion by Rwandan and Ugandan foreign sponsored insurgency. SADC coalition of the willing operation code named Operation Sovereign Legitimacy (OSL) was primarily aimed at safeguarding DRC's sovereignty by militarily supporting the host government, after a formal and legitimate invitation by President Kabila's government. This was a classic example of a regional economic and security organization forming a coalition of the willing to protect the national sovereignty of a member state against external aggression. Unfortunately it would appear as if the idea of regional peacekeeping as opposed to international peacekeeping has never been favoured and fully endorsed by the powerful countries in the West especially where the regional initiative lacks the backing of some of the members of the UNSC. This assertion is based on the deliberate exclusion of SADC countries that helped safeguard the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the DRC, from participation in UN peacekeeping missions in that troubled country.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

There appears to be ethical challenges that exist between UN peacekeeping missions and safeguarding of nation state sovereignty that ultimately contribute towards UN missions in Africa failing to fulfil their mandates. UN missions are primarily regarded as designed to protect the host population in a conflict situation whilst at the same time respecting host state sovereignty. In practice, it appears UN missions in Africa intervene where the US and her Western allies have geo-strategic benefits accruing from the peacekeeping interventions, such

---

<sup>2</sup> In an interview with General Chiwenga on 28 November 2015, he cited the intervention of the Coalition of the Willing SADC Members who came to the rescue of the DRC in 1998 following a military invasion by Rwanda and Uganda as a living example of what regional countries can collectively achieve if they work together to enhance regional security without the involvement of outside powers. SADC intervention in the Lesotho crises was also cited as evidence of successful regional interventions to seek regional solutions to regional problems.

as access to oil and other strategic mineral resources. In the process of entrenching US self-interests in the intervened country, UN peacekeepers seemingly appear to be deliberately violating host state sovereignty with impunity especially in cases where the host government would have fallen out of favour with the US and its allies. This violation of host state sovereignty is manifested through peacekeepers' active participation in the assassination of heads of state and government as well as activities meant to bring about regime change, thus undermining host state sovereignty.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

1. To critically explore the extent to which African sovereign states with their mandate of responsibility to protect their own citizens can offer effective peace and security to their citizens rather than outside peacekeeping interventions.
2. To analyse why UN peacekeeping missions in Africa, specifically in Congo/Zaire, Somalia, Rwanda, and Sudan have failed to attain the desired objectives.
3. To proffer scholarly and policy options on how sovereign states particularly in Africa, with the UN mandate of responsibility to protect, can offer effective peace and security to their citizens rather than UN peacekeeping interventions.

### **1.4 Research Questions**

1. To what extent can African sovereign states, with their responsibility to protect, offer effective peace and security to own citizens without outside intervention?
2. Why have UN peacekeeping missions in Africa and more specifically, Somalia, Rwanda, Sudan and DRC failed to achieve the desired objectives?
3. What ethical scholarly solutions can be suggested to enable African states to effectively offer peace and security to their citizens rather than depend on outside interventions?
4. What policy solutions can be proffered to enable African states to offer effective peace and security to their citizens rather than depend on UN peacekeeping interventions in future?

## **1.5 Hypothesis**

*It is the sovereign state, with its UN mandate of the responsibility to protect, which can offer effective peace and security to its own citizens in times of internal conflict rather than outside peacekeeping interventions.*

## **1.6 Preliminary Literature Review and Reasons for Choosing the Topic**

The UN was primarily established to enhance collective security among member states yet the advent of the Cold War during which members of the UN Security Council exercised their veto powers to block certain decisions related to collective security efforts led to the establishment of UN peacekeeping operations (James 1990; Rikhye 1984; Goulding 1993). Bellamy, Williams and Griffin (2010) in their voluminous book, *Understanding Peacekeeping*, address both the evolution, successes and failures of UN missions as well as extensive coverage of the impact of humanitarian missions on host populations.

During the Cold War period, rarely were formal UN peacekeeping missions authorized for civil wars, since this would violate the strong belief of most member states in the primacy of state sovereignty (Al Qaq 2009). Leading contemporary authors on UN peacekeeping missions such as James (1990), Goulding (1993), Ramsbotham and Woodhouse and Ramsbottom (1996), and Gibbs (2000) have noted the increasing interference of peacekeepers in the internal affairs of host countries. James (1996) extensively examined the international politics around UN missions across the globe and the extent to which they were employed to entrench US hegemony in former colonies of departed Western powers. Studies such as this, led to the concept of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa coming under greater scrutiny in a bid to determine the real motives behind such deployments which are costly in financial, material and human lives. Findlay (2002) observed that UN peacekeepers' interference in the internal affairs of Congo in the 1960s and Somalia in the early 1990s raised ethical as well as legitimacy questions on the extent the UN could interfere in the domestic affairs of a sovereign member state without its granted consent, especially in cases where there were no fully functional central government in control of state affairs. Intervention in civil wars was usually interpreted as illegitimate meddling in domestic affairs of a sovereign state. This view is now being challenged by a growing number of states, mostly in Europe, but including some from Africa and Latin America as they argue that the sovereignty of the individual citizen can be equally important as the sovereignty of the state. This school of thought argues that, when states blatantly violate the human rights of their people, through warfare or genocide, the international

community has a “Responsibility to Protect”, sometimes called R2P. This school of thought is highly controversial. Some states believe it violates the essence of the UN system, while others maintain it is the essence of the UN existence. Some dismiss it as simple imperialism; others believe it is essential to the credibility of the UN. Vogel (1996:4) argues that humanitarian politics are essentially hegemonic politics since humanitarian action is frequently used as a substitute for political action. Dowty and Loescher (1996:51) posit that humanitarian responses to political crises undermine the effort to solve the underlying problems since “charity alone often helps to perpetuate the injustice that caused the refugee flight, since it relieves the sending country of pressure to correct the injustice”. This is what appears to be happening with UN peacekeeping missions in Africa.

Security challenges in Africa are considered to be so serious to the extent that the continent’s armed conflicts have accounted for approximately two thirds of the UN Security Council’s activities and have involved nearly three quarters of all its active peacekeepers. This is evidenced by the annual financial allocation to UN peacekeeping missions in Africa of USD 5.8 billion out of a total annual budget of USD 8 billion (Williams 2008). The current practice results in billions of dollars spent on peacekeeping missions that do not necessarily improve the well-being of the local populations. This therefore leads to the argument that if this money was spent on improving the lives and well-being of affected countries and regions, the impact could have been more positive than what has been experienced to date through the deployment of UN peacekeepers. Contestation and criticism of peacekeeping missions arise from the simple fact that intervention negatively affects state sovereignty. The end of the Cold War brought with it an epistemological crisis as policy makers and security experts accelerated the questioning of conventional concepts in strategic and security studies.

Throughout the past two centuries, state sovereignty was considered inviolable and sacrosanct. According to Mindzic (2010:174) the “pre-eminence of sovereignty...the fidelity to principles of non-intervention and non-interference in states’ private affairs,” is being undermined and eroded through the development of an international system that promotes the protection of human rights even when it means the violation of state sovereignty, as enshrined in the UN Charter. This new international norm that is evolving acknowledges and promotes the right of the international community to intervene in a country under the pretext of protecting its population from massive human rights abuses (Simons: 2001). Three UN documents, predominantly influenced by Euro-centric views, namely, The UN’s Agenda for Peace (1992), UNDP’s Human Development Report (1994) and the International Commission on

Intervention and State Security (2001), constitute key regulatory documents that paved the way for moral justification of humanitarian intervention to protect civilian populations in violation of nation state sovereignty.

According to Ayoob (2002), the new doctrine of humanitarian peacekeeping intervention constitutes a clear violation of the basic principle of state sovereignty and that the right to intervene represents a neo-colonial threat to the poorest and defenceless countries. This view was buttressed in 1999 at the UN General Assembly general debate, when Algerian president Abdelaziz Bouteflika expressed similar concerns and even defined sovereignty as “the last defence against the rules of an unjust world” (*Ibid.*). The concept has been criticized primarily as locating insecurity in post-colonial states in the Global South, thereby reconfiguring the North-South relations as primarily based on security concerns (Chandler 2008:435). It is further argued that this doctrine, rather than being guided by ideas of global citizenship and material well-being of all peoples, it is based on the idea of containment and a “self-help survival strategy” based on self-reliance and isolating troubled regions from the rest of the world, in order to create conducive environments for global business by multinational corporations and other international business players (Al Qaq 2009). According to this school of thought, it follows that UN peacekeeping missions are not primarily meant to address the root causes of the conflict in host countries but rather to create an enabling business environment for foreign powers and their multinational corporations; objectives that undermine host state sovereignty and national aspirations for political and economic self-determination.

The UN interventions in Somalia, Sudan and DRC have demonstrated that military interventions are not an alternative to diplomacy, neither are they the only and unavoidable alternative to end violent intra-state conflicts. The UN and some regional organizations have resorted to military interventions before exhausting diplomatic and political options and processes as if the international community is losing faith in the power of diplomatic engagements to resolve political problems in developing countries. This practice poses ethical challenges as military interventions always result in deaths of soldiers and collateral damage in which innocent civilians, meant to be beneficiaries, end up being victims. Ethical challenges are evident and manifest in the manner and ways in which goals, interests, and means employed to achieve set objectives are defined, crafted and implemented. Huntington (1992) strongly lamented that it was morally unjustifiable and politically indefensible that US members of the armed forces should be killed to prevent Somalis from killing one another. This meant that where there are no strategic national interests, the US would not allow its soldiers to die for

humanitarian reasons, hence their ineffective and counterproductive response to the Rwanda genocide.

In Rwanda, the world community watched hopelessly as approximately one million Tutsis and moderate Hutus were butchered during the 1994 genocide (McNulty 1996:501). The UNSC was deeply divided on what action to take as the massacres took place in Rwanda with the USA “scandalously” declining to label the situation “genocide” lest it forced it to oblige to act in compliance with the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide (Findlay 2002:281). In contrast, the US made serious attempts to label the situation in Darfur “genocide” when the gravity of the massacres were far less severe compared to what had happened in Rwanda, reflecting the US pursuit of national interests in Sudan, and not necessarily, the protection of the suffering population. Instead of reinforcing the 2500 strong UN mission in Rwanda following the genocide, the UNSC decided to reduce the strength to a pathetic 270 and downgraded its mandate (UN Document S/1999/1257). This was an unethical move that demonstrated selectivity and insensitivity of the US and Britain where their national interests are not at stake. Inevitably, humanitarian intervention on a selective basis arouses suspicion and cynicism as it undermines the credibility of the UN<sup>3</sup> and divides the international community.

Following the Rwanda 1994 genocide, a huge failure on the part of the UN collective security system, a consensus appears to be building up among UN member states that a “state’s sovereignty should not shield it from outside military intervention when it brutalizes its own people, and certainly, when a genocide is taking place” (Chatterjee and Scheid 2003:5). Ethical challenges and objections to such interventions arise when considering two issues namely; the violation of national sovereignty and the use of force with the concomitant and unavoidable loss of life and human suffering resulting from military operations (Findlay 2002). The ethical challenges arise when considering the conditions, under which military humanitarian interventions should be undertaken against a sovereign state, the countries to intervene, the decision making process and the interests of the authorizing powers. Thus, a conflict appears to exist between the legality and morality of such robust interventions on humanitarian grounds

---

<sup>3</sup> The fact that the UN is divided into two main entities of the UN Security Council dominated by the Permanent Five Members and ten rotating members on one hand and the General Assembly comprising the rest of the UN membership implies that the UNSC has un proportional and unrepresentative influence towards influencing world events as well as the responses that the world body ultimately adopt to a given situation. In this regard, such responses are not necessarily reflective of the generality of UN membership.

(Ibid.). These are some of the issues that this research will be examining in an effort to come up with a better understanding of the ethical challenges associated with UN peacekeeping and national sovereignty when dealing with peacekeeping missions in Africa. Current debate on UN peacekeeping in Africa does not fully address the negative implications on the sovereignty of the host nation as it is seriously undermined by the presence of peacekeepers and humanitarian agencies that are bent on promoting their national and organizational strategic interests and not addressing the real root problems of the conflict.

The UN peacekeeping intervention in Somalia was legitimized as a humanitarian mission, whose aim was to protect convoys that delivered food to starving Somali population. It will be observed in the case study on Somalia that self-serving motives, not mandated by the UNSC resolution, were adopted as the US troops as they openly declared, with fanfare, their objective of capturing General Mohamed Farah Aideed. In this regard, the humanitarian mission was transformed “into a security postulate and a symbolic and prestigious political and military objective” resulting in the death of many civilians as collateral damage. Finnemore (1996:158) argues that humanitarian justifications for military interventions are used to disguise deeper and more important motives. He adds that, while humanitarian motives may be genuine, they usually constitute a portion of a mix of motivations driving states into interventions. In the case of Somalia, international diplomacy was given little chance to ameliorate the conflict as ethical considerations<sup>4</sup> were not given adequate attention prior to the launch of robust military operations. The end result of the military intervention was more conflict, more civilian suffering and deaths and prolongation of the Somali conflict, all pointing towards unethical outcomes of the intervention.

Mandates for most missions in Africa are not always clear, as they are rather diffuse, and above all, they are not always democratically legitimized. One ethical challenge, as demonstrated in Somalia, Sudan (Darfur) and DRC, is that humanitarian aid can sometimes exacerbate conflict by supporting the war economy or providing legitimacy to combatants (Anderson 1999). The ethical challenges come with the collateral damage of well-intended assistance since the

---

<sup>4</sup> Ethical considerations that were ignored included internal displacements of the population, collateral damage to both infrastructure and civilian population as well as the hostility that was to be further fuelled between Aid Agencies and the local militias resulting from the robust military intervention purportedly to save the starving population of Somalia. Efforts to seek political solutions among Somali ethnic groups that were being spearheaded by Ambassador Sahnoun, UN special representative were scuttled by the rushed decision to embark on robust military intervention as the militias considered the intervention as a military invasion.

continuation of fighting always affect civilians who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of UN peacekeeping missions. Since the UN is dominated by the Five Permanent Members of the Security Council which has the primary responsibility of maintaining world peace, the duration of UN missions deployed is dependent on the wishes of these permanent members and not necessarily the wishes of the majority states of the General Assembly.

Chesterman (2004) and Wheeler (2000) rightly point out that the “right to intervene” does not primarily address the humanitarian needs of the affected populations for three reasons: first it emphasizes the claims and rights of the interveners rather than the needs of the beneficiaries; second, it sticks to the traditional language and the act of intervening rather than on preventive and long term engagements; and third, the rhetoric of intervention trumping questions of sovereignty cut short a discussion on potential dissent. To further buttress this point, Makaremi (2010:113) argues that the reduction of human security to protection or freedom from fear, turns the concept’s initial ambition of ‘deepening’, ‘widening’ and demilitarizing security upside down. Thus, the legitimacy of military action for protection purposes leads to a re-militarization of security. He argues further that prioritization of protection shifts the focus from matters of everyday insecurity related to health and food towards the question of violence (*Ibid.* 113). Such misplaced priorities justify this research project, as it aims to argue that military solutions are not the best options in addressing security related problems in intra-state conflicts in Africa.

### **1.7 Gaps in existing literature**

Existing literature on UN peacekeeping missions extensively covers various aspects of UN peacekeeping operations ranging from the political justification, legality of the missions, factors affecting success and failure of operations and their humanitarian justification. There has been no systematic and focused study on the extent to which UN peacekeeping missions deliberately and systematically violate host state sovereignty in Africa with the ultimate aim of realising regime change in a bid to promote self-interests of Western powers under the guise of coming to the rescue of African populations in conflict situations. Moreover, existing literature does not adequately address the magnitude of negative implications of deploying UN peacekeepers in African countries bedevilled with internal conflicts, especially the negative impact on host state sovereignty. This research aims to address that gap through a focused analysis of four case studies. The research aims to unbundle the real unethical motives that have influenced the deployment of UN peacekeepers as well as establishing if there is indeed

a pattern of using UN peacekeepers as proxies to undermine and in some cases, depose African political regimes that would have fallen out of favour with Western powers.

## **1.8 Principal Theories upon which the Research Project will be constructed**

This research will be influenced to a very large extent, by four theories namely: the theory of *hermeneutics of suspicion*; the theory of realism and ethical sceptical realism; the theory of state sovereignty and the theory of organized hypocrisy.

The theory of *hermeneutics of suspicion* is used by researchers and practitioners involved in critical analysis of a given phenomenon, it is a widespread practice of interpretation embedded in more mundane, diffuse and variegated forms of life (Felski 2011:220). Considering that the central argument of this thesis is that authentic peacekeeping does not come from without the nation state through UN peacekeeping interventions but rather from within the state, it is appropriate to use this guiding theory as peacekeepers' activities are not always transparent and tend to serve the interests of outside powers at the expense of the local populations they purport to come and rescue.

The thesis argues that foreign sponsored peacekeeping missions are suspicious and retrogressive to the host populations and their governments, as they are not designed to promote the well-being and prosperity of the local citizens thereby undermining host state sovereignty. Critically, the study demonstrates that UN peacekeeping missions in practice do not wrestle with or address the deep rooted complexities related to the causes of the conflict situation hence they rarely create opportunities for “emancipatory social transformation” that is truly in favour of the host population (Featherstone 2007:198). Rather they are primarily motivated by the promotion of self-interests of the main sponsors of peacekeeping missions, who happen to be Western powers and former colonial masters trying to re-invent their lost control and influence over their former colonies in Africa (Ayoob 2002; Al Qaq 2009). The basis of this argument and suspicion is that, since the former colonial powers did not rule Africa on the principle of promoting prosperity, peace and harmony among their colonies, it therefore becomes suspicious when Western powers return to African countries experiencing conflict and turmoil on the pretext of promoting peace among the tribal/ethnic groupings and upholding human rights which they never observed and safeguarded during colonialism.

Deep and critical hermeneutics are useful in this study as they lead to objective interpretations of real motives and interests of both sponsors and practitioners of peacekeeping operations especially the troop contributing countries; multinational corporations and various non-

governmental organizations. Related to the theory of *hermeneutics of suspicion* is the theory of *sceptical realism* which states that peacekeeping missions are usually undertaken with an aura of motives which at closer scrutiny are not about peacekeeping but the promotion of national self-interests of troop contributing countries (TCC) and major sponsors of UN peacekeeping missions.

The theory of realism in international relations emerged from identified weaknesses of idealism which was viewed as being utopian implying that it propounded for desirable outcomes that were not realistic in practice<sup>5</sup>. The idealist/liberalist school of thought was castigated by theorists such as Edward Carr (2001); Morgenthau (1985) and others following the failure by the idealist oriented League of Nations to stop World War II.

Hobbes (1962) propounded the realist argument that it was not feasible to have a common world government simply because each nation state acts in a way that promotes its self-interests whilst at the same time remaining suspicious of the motives and intentions of other states hence there was little room for morality in the conduct of national business with other states in international politics. Hobbes' observations dovetail with the theory of *hermeneutics of suspicion* in that international relations is dominated by acts of aggression, deceitful political practices and power politics exercised by international actors in their endeavour to maximise their self-interests irrespective of the impact on the receiving states. Murove (2005:8) is of a similar view as he argues that it is futile to wish the existence of a shared moral world view among nation states in their interaction in world affairs. Sceptical realism emphasizes the limits of morality and ethics in the conduct of international politics and this includes UN peacekeeping operations.

Political theorists that deny the role of ethics in international politics include Charles Beitz (1979:15) who argues that realism is derived from a firm foundation that is of the view that "moral judgments have no place in discussions of international affairs or foreign policy." Buchanan and Keohane (2004) are of the view that the way international relations are conducted by the main actors, rules out considerations of morality in that sphere." Cohen (1986) argues that the conduct of nation states assessed and judged exclusively by self-serving

---

<sup>5</sup>The major attributes for liberalism or idealism were: power of ideas hence the euphemistically referred to as idealism; positive mindedness towards others hence raising the capacity and opportunities for collaboration among different states; peaceful behaviour that emanated from institutions that discouraged selfishness and resort to war and lastly upholding of democratic value systems and civil liberties.

and amoral national interests. These sentiments are in sync with what Meinecke (1924) had earlier observed that the primary role of political leaders is to promote and advance the self-interests of their own countries ahead and above all other considerations. This line of thinking is what has guided US attitude and influence on UN peacekeeping operations as revealed in this thesis. The fact that the US has always paid more towards financing of UN peacekeeping missions than any other UN member state indicates that it has had correspondingly more influence in the conduct of peacekeeping operations in pursuit of its self-interests as revealed in the case studies of this thesis. The case studies demonstrate that the pursuit of US self-interests dominate the determination of the size, level of funding and resource allocation for all the four case studies of this thesis with little or no attention paid towards safeguarding of host state sovereignty.

The theory of national sovereignty is based on the Westphalian Treaty of 1648 that ended the Thirty Years War in Europe and gave birth to nation states that were sovereign implying that they did not have any other authority over them. The Westphalian concept of national sovereignty was predicated on non-recognition of a supranational authority and non-interference in the internal affairs of United Nations member states (Gelot and Söderbaum 2012:132). The UN Charter upholds nation states' sovereignty within their territories and acknowledges their immunity to external interference except in grave circumstances, namely: war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity. Article 2 (7) of the UN Charter prohibits the world body from intervening in matters that are within the purview of domestic jurisdiction of member states (United Nations Charter 1945). The founding fathers of UN peacekeeping operations allayed fears regarding the violation of host state sovereignty by adopting the peacekeeping principles of "host state consent, impartiality and use of force only in self-defence" (Pelz and Lehmann 2007:2). However, case studies of this thesis demonstrate that these principles were flagrantly violated by UN peacekeepers deployed in decolonised countries on the periphery as their sovereignty was viewed as "quasi states"<sup>6</sup> a derogatory classification deliberately meant to undermine their national sovereignty.

The theory of organized hypocrisy is not very common among many scholars hence the political and diplomatic dynamics associated with this concept are little known to students and

---

<sup>6</sup> Jackson (1990) argues that these decolonized states are not truly sovereign, but only "quasi-states" as if they deserve to be treated like a football pitch for the big powers that can play their football games in these weak decolonized countries.

practitioners of global politics and diplomacy (Dijkzeul and Beigbeder 2003). These dynamics have direct implications on the conduct of UN peacekeeping missions and global governance (*Ibid*). According to Lipson (2007) organized hypocrisy is a phenomenon espoused by organizational behaviour theorists to explain how organizations respond to conflicting and challenging pressures emanating from external environments through adoption of contradictory actions and statements in order to deliberately mislead the public. Organized hypocrisy is manifested by inconsistencies and contradictions between publicly pronounced organizational expressions and aspirations to respect norms such as state sovereignty yet in real practice, these norms are violated. Krasner (1999) argued that organized hypocrisy explains the enduring and routine violation of state sovereignty.

Brunsson (1989), one of the leading theorists on organized hypocrisy argued that organized hypocrisy refers to organizational responses to “conflicting logics of consequences and appropriateness.” It also refers to parallel structures that are set by organizations as what happened during UN peacekeeping operations in Congo during the early 1960s where Secretary General Hammarskjold established a secretive cabinet of American special advisers and himself known as the “Congo Club” to run the affairs of the UN peacekeeping mission whose aim was to entrench US hegemony in Africa after dislodging Belgian post-colonial influence in that country (O’Brien 1962:56). Brunsson (1989:27) concluded that “organized hypocrisy is a fundamental type of behaviour” in most political organizations such as the UN.

### **1.9 Research Design and Methodology**

Research design in this thesis refers to the methodology adopted for data collection as well as data generation to satisfy the requirements of the study. Based on the preliminary literature review and the objectives of the study, this research adopted a predominantly historical and comparative case study approach and design.

The researcher embarked on a rigorous, systematic investigation to find answers to the research questions stated above. The research involved exploring repetitively, carefully and closely some major phenomenon regarding ethical challenges existing between UN peacekeeping missions in Africa and violation of host state sovereignty. The qualitative research methodology adopted, served as a strategy of enquiry that moved from the underlying philosophical assumptions to research design and data collection. The research design served as a framework and a guide in systematic data collection and analysis.

The research adopted a qualitative approach as its methodology since qualitative research yields data that provides depth and detail to create understanding of phenomena and lived experiences (Bowen 2005). The research used grounded theory with comparative study being a product, rather than a method of this research project. To analyse the ethical challenges to peacekeeping and nation-state sovereignty in Africa, the researcher used the comparative case study approach focusing on a comprehensive comparison between four UN peacekeeping missions in Africa: Congo, Somalia, Rwanda and Darfur-Sudan. Case study research falls under qualitative research and it focusses on providing a detailed analysis of one or more cases. According to Hancock (1998:6) the case study approach offers “richness and depth of information not usually offered by other methods.” The research attempted to illustrate the relationship between practical peacekeeping and theoretical debates in other sub-fields of ethics, international relations and international diplomacy.

A focused comparison offered methodological advantages for a better understanding of ethical variables associated with UN peacekeeping missions in Africa. Congo experienced traditional peacekeeping operations that ended with the UN undertaking offensive military operations in violation of existing peacekeeping principles. Somalia experienced humanitarian peacekeeping intervention soon after the end of the Cold War where UN sponsored peacekeepers launched offensive operations to kill or capture General Mohammad Farah Aideed the leading warlord. In Rwanda, despite having the worst humanitarian disaster among the case studies under investigation in which approximately one million people were butchered in cold blood, the affected population did not benefit from the sympathy of the international community reflecting the organized hypocritical nature of the UNSC decision making process regarding peacekeeping operations. In Darfur, a very weak and ineffective AU/UN hybrid peacekeeping mission was deployed yet the local population was being subjected to crimes against humanity. The experiences of all four countries under study are very different and therefore offer great scope for the study of ethical challenges to UN peacekeeping in Africa and how they impact on host state sovereignty.

This research study was based on various sources of data and information, some of which include the following: perusal and study of primary official documents on UN peacekeeping missions and international diplomacy regarding state sovereignty with specific reference to countries under study and the examination of secondary published and internet material on the subject under study. Personal interviews were extensively used in this study and the target groups included diplomats accredited to Zimbabwe whose countries have played host to the

missions under study. Current and previous force commanders of both military and civilian police were contacted to get first-hand information of their views and experiences regarding the ethical dilemma between UN peacekeeping operations and host state sovereignty. Where feasible and applicable, participants (military and civilian police) and others were interviewed to gather detailed personal insights of the subject under study.

Resources of various university library facilities as well as the Regional Peacekeeping Training Centre (RPTC) library in Harare, were extensively used to gather valuable secondary data. Equally, additional valuable data was obtained from the AU Headquarters in Addis Ababa Ethiopia through extensive interviews with various authorities and diplomats who proved to be extremely valuable. Additional secondary information was accessed from the AU peacekeeping department. Officials at the AU headquarters responsible for peacekeeping in Africa were interviewed for their views and they shared with the researcher, their detailed perspectives at the strategic and operational levels of UN peacekeeping operations. Previous force commanders of both military and civilian police were approached and interviewed in order to get first-hand information of their views and experiences. An interview guide was extensively used during the information gathering stage of the research project.

To enhance the trustworthiness of the research findings the researcher was guided by the recommendations made by Denzin and Lincoln (1994) who stated that the safeguarding of credibility, transferability, dependability and conformability of research findings was crucial throughout the study. In order to realise and guarantee the trustworthiness of the research findings, the researcher carried out interviews in the most rigorous ways possible in order to enhance the reliability and validity of the findings.

Given the fact that peacekeeping operations are still on going in Darfur-Sudan at the time of concluding this research, and due to limited financial resources available for the project, regional and local interviews were limited to those officials that were accessible and willing to participate in the research project. Research trips to affected countries were replaced by extensive interviews conducted in Addis Ababa during a three week study tour in Ethiopia. In addition, interviews were carried out in Zimbabwe among embassies accredited to Zimbabwe.

## **1.10 New Knowledge**

The new knowledge that this thesis contributes to existing body of knowledge is a deeper understanding of the degree to which UN peacekeeping missions engage in illegal and

unethical practices when used as proxy forces for some big powers in order to further their geo-strategic self-interests under the guise of coming to the rescue of civilian populations in conflict situations in Africa. The study dispels the myth that UN peacekeeping missions are inherently ethical undertakings designed to produce positive results such as durable peace and security, re-building war-torn societies and the promotion of the rule of law for the good of the world community. The thesis reveals a deliberate and unethical trend of using UN peacekeepers to subvert host state governments even to the extent of participating in the assassination of sitting heads of state and governments as happened in Congo and Rwanda.

### **1.11 Limitations of the Study**

The thesis primarily focusses on the four case studies of Congo, Somalia, Rwanda and Sudan (Darfur). Other UN peacekeeping missions will only be referred to in passing in order to buttress a given point of view.

### **1.12 Outline Structure of the Thesis**

The outline structure of this thesis is as detailed below.

#### **Chapter One: Introduction and Scope of the Study**

This chapter consists of the background to the study and reasons for choosing this area of study. It contains the objectives of the study, research questions, theoretical framework adopted, preliminary literature review, and research methodology used to gather necessary data. This chapter sets the stage for detailed research to address the requirements of the research topic.

#### **Chapter Two: The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping Operations**

Chapter two traces the historical evolution of peacekeeping operations from ancient times up to the twenty-first century. This approach is aimed at giving a succinct and firm foundation to readers in order to facilitate their conceptualization and understanding of the roots and concepts of UN peacekeeping doctrine and practice.

#### **Chapter Three: Ethical Challenges to United Nations Peacekeeping Mission in the Republic of Congo with reference to the period (1960-1964)**

Chapter three is the first case study in a series of four cases that attempt to demonstrate that UN peacekeeping operations are routinely involved not only in unethical practices but also illegal activities that are deliberately meant to seriously undermine host state sovereignty in

pursuit of serving foreign interests and not to further national aspirations of host countries and their populations. The Congo peacekeeping operation generated serious controversies resulting from the mission's "entrapment" into a complex web of interlocking local, regional and international crises that resulted in deliberate violation of Congo's national sovereignty.

#### Chapter Four: Ethical challenges to UN and US "humanitarian" interventions in Somalia: from peacekeeping to peace-enforcement (1992-1995)

This chapter dispels the myth that since UN peacekeeping missions are authorised by the UNSC on behalf of the world community, they are inherently ethical undertakings meant to produce positive results such as durable peace and security, re-building war-torn societies and the promotion of the rule of law for the good of the world community. The chapter demonstrates that the joint UN/US military "humanitarian intervention" in Somalia was not driven by purely humanitarian motives and that the use of force by the UN sponsored missions in Somalia caused more harm than good for the ordinary Somali citizens. To make matters worse, the chapter established that the Somali population was left in worse political and security situation than what the UN peacekeepers found on the ground following the US abandonment of the mission.

#### Chapter Five: A Case Study of United Nations Peacekeeping Mission in Rwanda 1993-1995

The chapter argues that the peacekeeping mission in Rwanda undermined host state sovereignty through the provision of a false sense of security for the host government and its population as the mission reneged on its duties to protect both Rwandan government officials and civilians during the genocide. Instead, the mission facilitated the establishment of a pro-Anglo-American regime in Rwanda through a regime change strategy that was implemented with the full knowledge of the UN peacekeepers whose unethical connivance with the RPF rebel movement was a conspiracy aimed at the demise of the host Rwandan government in violation of that country's state sovereignty.

#### Chapter Six: Multilateral Response to Humanitarian Crisis in Darfur: A Case Study of UN Organized Hypocrisy

The chapter exposes the myth that Western powers are truly concerned about saving civilian strangers' lives in African conflict situations when they organize highly publicized marches and campaigns such as the "Save Darfur" rallies in Western capitals. Instead of coming to the effective rescue of dying civilians in Darfur, the Security Council opted for the adoption of an

ineffective and under resourced AU/UN hybrid peacekeeping mission that exposed the hypocrisy of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa as the reaction to the atrocities in Darfur were similar to that of Rwanda during genocide.

#### Chapter Seven: An ethical critique of the violation of UN peacekeeping principles

The chapter highlights the cardinal, normative principles of UN peacekeeping and how in practice they are manipulated and violated by the big powers through peacekeepers deployed in the field to undermine host state sovereignty. The chapter also proffers some theoretical explanations as to why UN peacekeepers do not genuinely come to the rescue of African populations in conflict situations.

#### Chapter Eight: Ethical and Policy Recommendations

This chapter provides scholarly and practical recommendations that will result in African states themselves prioritizing the security of their populations singly or collectively. It argues that African leaders should desist from relying on foreign UN peacekeepers that engage in unethical practices that undermine national sovereignty and the dignity of African populations in target countries. The chapter further argues that African leaders themselves should endeavour to be part of the solutions and not continue to be part of the problems that create conducive environments for conflict on the continent by desisting from applying divide and rule strategies. The chapter emphasizes that where national dialogue to resolve domestic conflicts fail, African leaders should resort to regional political and security arrangements to resolve their conflicts before the AU is invited to intervene. Primarily the chapter recommends that African leaders should do some serious introspections as to why internal conflicts continue to surface on the continent and that they should give voice to the voiceless minorities that are generally marginalised and given a raw deal in the sharing of the national resources. Serious commitment to African based conflict resolution mechanisms should see an end to the involvement of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa whose primary agenda is neither the resolution of African conflicts nor the upliftment of African lives but rather, the entrenchment of western neo-colonialism and unfettered access to African natural resources that sustain their economies at the expense of indigenous African populations.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **The Evolution of Peacekeeping Operations**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

The term peacekeeping does not appear in the United Nations Charter. According to O'Neill and Rees (2005:30) and Hill and Malik (1996:25) the term itself explicitly came into use after the creation and deployment of the first armed UN operations in Egypt (1956-1967) and Congo (1960-64). The use of the term peacekeeping was officially formalised when the UN General Assembly commissioned a Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations in February 1965 to deal with peacekeeping matters (Rikhye 1984 and Siekmann 1985). The lightly armed peacekeeping operations in Egypt and Congo were different from earlier observer missions undertaken by unarmed UN personnel deployed in the Middle-East to separate Israel and her Arab neighbours. However, the official view is that the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization (UNTSO), deployed in June 1948 following the first Arab-Israeli war, is the first peacekeeping operation (Goulding 1993:452).

Peacekeeping missions have evolved through three different eras: “first generation” peacekeeping during the Cold War, “second generation” peacekeeping in the late 1980s and early 1990s during the transition to the post-Cold War, and “third generation” peacekeeping since the late 1990s to date (Woodhouse and Ramsbotham 2005). According to (Osmançavuşoğlu 2000) first-generation peacekeeping was the traditional or classic version in which two warring states consent to the deployment of international troops to establish a buffer between them as the former protagonists implement a peace agreement. The second generation was characterised by multidimensional missions that included “robust peacekeeping,” peace enforcement missions and humanitarian interventions, a development that was in conflict with the concept of Westphalian nation-state sovereignty predicated on non-recognition of supranational authority and non-interference in the internal affairs of United Nations member states (Gelot and Söderbaum 2012:132). The third and current generation of peacekeeping evolution is characterized by humanitarian interventionism, peace-building activities and the “slowly building consensus” that the UN has a “responsibility to protect” innocent civilian lives under severe threat from their respective governments (Frederking 2007:45). Most of the evolutionary changes materialized at the end of the Cold War as the ideological deadlock that crippled decision making in the Security Council during the early years of the Cold War eased. Reduced mutual suspicion between the superpowers led to cooperation in attempts to resolve

international conflict creating an environment conducive to experimenting with new forms of peacekeeping that were not applicable during the Cold War era.

The official and popular narrative of the United Nations is that post-World War II concept of peacekeeping evolved out of necessity to create a conducive environment for the peaceful resolution of international conflicts following the failure of collective security arrangements as enshrined in the UN Charter. Fetherston (1994:12) writes that: “It was this need to avert the potential escalation of local conflicts into superpower confrontations, coupled with an inability to act, that led to the development of peacekeeping.” Ebegbulem (2011) observed that the envisaged United Nations collective security system has failed mainly due to the unwillingness of most countries to subordinate their national sovereign self-interests to international collective action. This view is supported by Rourke and Boyer (1998) who argues that “...governments have generally maintained their right to view conflict in terms of their national interest and to support or oppose UN action based on their nationalistic point of view.” In that regard the concept of peacekeeping was developed as a compromised approach to solving direct conflicts between member states in situations where disputing states agreed to peacekeeping interventions. A deeper analysis of the evolution of peacekeeping however reveals that peacekeeping operations have been used as proxies to advance Western liberal agendas in developing and under developed countries as they became increasingly intrusive in internal political affairs of target countries. This chapter attempts to provide contextual ethical insights towards explaining the evolutionary trends of peacekeeping operations and their relationship with state sovereignty.

The chapter is divided into six main sections. The first section is the introduction. The second section covers the conceptual definitions and broad overview of peacekeeping operations that attempt to unpack the underlying logic of peacekeeping operations. The third section attempts to identify and highlight pre-League of Nations peacekeeping operations as a precursor to modern peacekeeping. The fourth section highlights peacekeeping missions under the League of Nations. The fifth section examines in detail the evolution of peacekeeping under the United Nations. Section six is the conclusion that summarises the chapter. The next section examines the conceptual definitions and meaning of peacekeeping operations.

## **2.2 An overview of peacekeeping operations**

There is no agreed definition of peacekeeping. Peacekeeping is a technique which was developed by the United Nations to help manage and resolve armed conflicts first between

states and later within states (Goulding 1993). Classical or traditional peacekeepers separate combatants at a physical distance thereby preventing accidental clashes of opposing forces thus inhibiting minor incidents that could result in major conflict. Traditional peacekeeping does not involve military enforcement measures but entails the active participation of United Nations personnel in helping to control and resolve actual or potential international conflicts or internal conflicts which have a clear international dimension (*Ibid.*). This view is supported by Goulding (1993) who defines peacekeeping as follows:

Field operations established by the United Nations, with the consent of the parties concerned, to help control and resolve conflicts between them under United Nations command and control, at the expense collectively of the member states, and with military and other personnel and equipment provided voluntarily by them, acting impartially between the parties and using force to the minimum extent possible (Goulding 1993:455)

Mullenbach (2005:529) views peacekeeping as constituting “a military and/or civilian personnel deployment by one or more third-party states, under the auspices of a global or regional organization, into a conflict or post-conflict situation for the purposes of preventing the resumption of military hostilities between two parties and/or for the purpose of creating an environment conducive for negotiations between two antagonistic parties.” The International Peace Academy (IPA) defines peacekeeping as:

The prevention, containment, moderation and termination of hostilities between or within States through the medium of a peaceful third party intervention organized and directed internationally using multinational forces of soldiers, police, and civilians to restore and maintain peace (IPA 1974:11).

Basing on the above definitions it is clear that there is no agreed definition of peacekeeping hence it has evolved to assume certain characteristics and responsibilities that were never envisaged at its conceptualization.

The need for UN peacekeeping operations arose after the Charter had already entered into force, when the nature of international conflicts could not be addressed through the mechanism provided for in Chapters VI and VII of the Charter. According to Diehl (1988:486) the provisions provided for in Chapter VI, concerning the pacific settlement of disputes, were considered inadequate and the Security Council stalemate resulting from the use of the veto powers effectively signalled an end to collective security as a viable option for settling international conflict since the permanent members of the Security Council could not agree on collective measures provided for in Chapter VII. The proliferation of decolonized states in the developing world increased the demand for peacekeepers to manage the transition to statehood.

Jackson (1990) argued that sadly these decolonized states are not truly sovereign, but only “quasi-states”. Such an argument seems to suggest that these newly decolonized states are liable to outside intervention if they fail in their duties of state governance, especially safeguarding human security (Lang 2010:335). The evolutionary nature and characteristics of United Nations peacekeeping operations seem to buttress the controversial views expressed by Jackson (1990) that decolonized states are indeed “quasi states” susceptible to interference in their internal affairs by outsiders. According to Wedgwood (1995:634), the concept of UN peacekeeping is deeply connected to strategic conflict management where a need arose to “neutralize and quarantine quarrels with strategic potential” to spread across the affected region or even beyond, hence the selectivity in the conflicts that attracted the attention and intervention by the UN peacekeepers.

Peacekeeping troops are deployed in the classical sense first with authorization of the Security Council and the consent of the host governments and/or the main parties to the conflict after the fighting has stopped rather than before or during the conflict. Diehl (1994) observes that in classical peacekeeping, troops deploy, occupy and patrol a given area while acting as an interposition force between protagonists. This means that ideally, peacekeepers have neither military offensive role nor the offensive capability to engage the protagonists. The goal of peacekeeping was to provide a buffer zone between hostile forces and prevent dangerous shooting and provocative incidents that could escalate hostilities and permanently jeopardize the cease-fire agreement (Diehl 1994:6). Peacekeeping has traditionally involved primarily a military model of observing ceasefires and the separation of forces after interstate wars, compared to current practice where it is involved in complex operations that include the military, civilian police and civilian organizations, working together to build a presumed firm foundation for sustainable peace (The United Nations Today 2008:780). In theory, this sounds like an ideal and worthwhile undertaking that primarily aims at alleviating the suffering of affected populations, which unfortunately is not the case in real practice as will be demonstrated in the case studies that are covered in this thesis.

William Durch (1993) observes that peacekeeping supplements other efforts and initiatives targeted at conflict management and resolution such as diplomatic and political initiatives. These initiatives are applied in the self-help system of international politics with the help of “disinterested” outside assistance that is meant to assist parties to a conflict disengage themselves from fighting. Durch further observes that United Nations peacekeeping missions may include in their mandate in ascending order of complexity and intrusiveness:

...uncovering the facts of a conflict; monitoring of border or buffer zones after armistice agreements have been signed; verification of agreed-upon force disengagements or withdrawals; supervision of the disarming and demobilization of local forces; maintenance of security conditions essential to the conduct of elections; and even the temporary transnational administration of countries (Durch 1993:3-4.).

In this regard, peacekeeping is designed to be a confidence building initiative that provides a means and opportunity for nations or factions “exhausted of war, but suspicious of one another’s intentions to live in relative peace whilst they explore lasting and durable areas of agreement to live in peace after the withdrawal of the peacekeepers” (*Ibid.*).

The term ”peacekeeping” was first used during the deployment of the first United Nations armed peacekeeping mission in Egypt in 1956, the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF). The exact origins of peacekeeping operations remain contested (Goulding 1993:452). In terms of having developed a systematic approach to solving interstate and intrastate disputes, it is commonly agreed that the UN invented peacekeeping missions although the phenomenon did not originate with UN or even its predecessor, the League of Nations. Pre-UN prototype “peacekeeping” was a system originally designed to deal with interstate conflicts as part of the broader conflict and dispute management systems applied by powerful nations dating back to ancient times (Heldt and Wallensteen 2007:4). The next section attempts to trace the origins of peacekeeping from ancient times up to the formation of the League of Nations.

### **2.3 The genesis of “peacekeeping” missions**

Some historians have argued that the origins of peacekeeping can be traced as far back as the Delian League of ancient Greece in the fifth century. Sorenson and Wood (2005:1) argue that it is virtually impossible to determine exactly when the first peacekeeping mission was launched since the deployment of military forces to maintain peace between potential combatants could be traced to the period of pre-Roman Empire. They noted that ancient Greeks developed and established the idea of peaceful resolution of conflicts through the institutionalization of a religious “Amphictyony” which resembled a "league of neighbours" that was designed to resolve differences among the city states of ancient Greece around the mid-7th century BC. The Greek model of “amphictyonia” can be viewed as the collective will among the city states to manage crises in order to avert potential wars and that this collective security system foreshadows the League of Nations and the UN system that institutionalized peacekeeping practices. From a Western view perspective, the closest example from history that first resembled peacekeeping was initiated by the early medieval Catholic Church through its initiatives related to “the Peace of God and Truce of God” in the late tenth century to try

and limit the spread and effect of war. This was a Catholic Church European medieval movement that applied spiritual sanctions to limit the violence of private war in the feudal societal system of governance and conflict prevention and management (*Ibid*).

Heldt and Wallensteen (Op.Cit:4) trace the origins of peacekeeping to the 19th Century during the years 1849-50 when Sweden and Norway deployed a 4 000 strong military contingent to conduct a “peacekeeping” operation following an armistice between Denmark and German to resolve the political issue of whether or not the Schleswig – Holstein region should be divided. The multinational military troops deployed were tasked to maintain law and order in the contested region until a comprehensive peace agreement had been established. Withdrawal of these troops in July 1850 took effect following the successful conclusion of a peace treaty between affected countries (*Ibid.*).

At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, European powers began a scramble to fill the vacuum left by the crumbling Ottoman Empire. According to Pasqualini (2006:23) a multinational military force was deployed to Crete during period 1897-1906 following riots between Christians and Muslims, a situation that was aggravated by contestation for absolute control of the island between Athens and Constantinople. The Great European Powers deployed a multinational force “to sedate the riots and above all to keep a situation of security in the island and the equilibrium in the Mediterranean Sea” (*Ibid.*). European powers were keen to ensure that no single power dominated the Mediterranean Sea hence the multinational “collective security/peacekeeping” effort was undertaken to keep the balance of power in the geo-strategic Mediterranean region (*Ibid*). At face value, it would appear as if the multinational military deployment was simply meant to assist the Cypriots settle their differences yet the geo-strategic importance of Cyprus and the strategic need to deny any regional powers to dominate this region were the actual motives hence the deployment was designed to serve the interests of the big European powers and not those of affected populations. In order to effectively pacify the post-Ottoman Empire geo-strategic situation and fill in the vacuum created by the declining empire, a regiment of International ‘Gendarmerie’ composed of European -military personnel was formed and deployed in Cyprus to replace the local Turkish regiment that was dominated by the majority Muslim elements viewed as “highly corrupted and above all unable to secure public order” (Pasqualini (2006). Thus the international regiment effectively replaced the Turkish regiment in order to effectively pacify the volatile situation in a characteristic modern day peacekeeping and regime change fashion.

Pasqualini (2006) further observed that the Cyprus multinational mission had significant similarities with contemporary modern peacekeeping missions in that:

...the mission was multinational; the area of the island was divided into Areas of Responsibility (AOR) for the countries participating in it; the mission wanted to have the consent of the two armed parties; the military command was unified in order to reach the political and diplomatic strategies sought for by the Powers involved; involvement of the military components of the mission in activities not strictly military like the administration of justice, local disarmament, building and reorganizing the local police, this task particularly given to the Italians, to the Carabinieri (Pasqualini 2006:24).

The 19th century multinational military deployments with characteristics similar to those of modern peacekeeping operations can indeed be classified as prototypes and forerunners of UN peacekeeping missions. Based on the facts above it is evident that military deployments in support of political and diplomatic initiatives to resolve conflicts or consolidate peace following the signing of peace treaties date back to pre-modern times when the idea of having the UN was not even on the horizon.

Jakus (2005:81) observed that indeed peace support and crisis management through military operations are not novel initiatives and undertakings as the military has been involved in similar activities such as diplomatic, police, administrative and humanitarian tasks. He highlights the fact that during the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries prior to the establishment of the UN, the armed forces of the Austro- Hungarian Monarch (AHM) were involved in crisis prevention and crisis management missions which were known as “fire extinguisher missions.” Examples include troop deployments in Crete 1897-1909 and in Skutar 1912-1913 (*Ibid.*). Evidence of these deployments give further credence to the argument that military peacekeeping operations were not invented by the UN Organization. The purposes of these missions were never meant to serve the interests of affected populations but rather those of the big powers sanctioning the deployments.

James (1990) posited that the rationale for European powers’ participation in conflicts within Europe and on the periphery was to serve European self-interests by ensuring the maintenance of the balance of power on the European continent or to promote the newly achieved balance of power where the outcome of the conflict had weakened the opposing power bloc. He further concluded that European powers deployed “fire extinguisher” missions to conflict areas because the conflicts had taken place on European soil hence they aimed at mitigating the spread of the conflict (James 1990:82). James further pointed out that one of the major reasons for the deployment of military contingents was that they served to facilitate the establishment

of European spheres of regional influence and interests designed to fill the vacuum left by the collapsing and shrinking Ottoman Empire (*Ibid*).

Based on the facts above, it is clear that prior to the establishment of the League of Nations, the Great Powers of Europe indeed participated in military deployments synonymous with modern day peacekeeping missions. The Concert of Great Powers in Europe decided where and when peace should be maintained in order to maintain international peace and security at the same time promoting and safeguarding their own interests primarily the maintenance of the Balance of Power Concept (James 1990). These military deployments were therefore not primarily meant to promote the interests of the host countries but rather, those of the intervening states, a practice we will keep encountering during operations undertaken by the League of Nations during the 1920s as well as UN peacekeeping missions since 1948.

The next section examines “fire extinguisher” military deployments that seem to define military commissions deployed under the League of Nations during the inter-war period.

#### **2.4 Peacekeeping operations under the League of Nations (1920-1925)**

This section highlights the character of prototype “peacekeeping operations” undertaken by the League of Nations as forerunners of United Nations peacekeeping missions.

Alan James (1990) traces the origins of peacekeeping back to the inter-war period, (1919-1938) when delimitation commissions were established in the 1920s to draw several European frontiers following the end of World War I. These were missions deployed under the League of Nations in an endeavour to implement the collective security paradigm as enshrined in the League of Nations Covenant. These missions and those discussed above, led James (1990:11) to argue that peacekeeping can be considered as “little more than a modern application of an ancient arrangement – that of the use of impartial and non-threatening go-betweens” in an effort to diffuse tension between state parties in a conflict situation.

The immediate aftermath of World War I witnessed the victorious powers exercising political control over most of Europe, including attempts to solve disputes and conflicts among European countries. Some of the strategies used by these powers, with wisdom of the hindsight, can be categorized as “peacekeeping operations” although this term was never used during this period. Initially the World War I victorious nations were facilitating these arrangements to realign and re-dress the frontiers of affected states, in an environment where affected weak states had “little option but to accept what was on offer” (James 1990:18). Basically what this

implied was that the big powers imposed their views on the weak hence there was little room for consent as the weak nation states had to cooperate willingly or unwillingly with the dictates of the powerful nations. It is equally important to note that affected states in most cases would have earlier given their formal and in some cases coerced consent to the operations that were to be undertaken. It appears the big powers practiced some respect for the national sovereignty of affected countries and tried to remain as impartial as they could possibly be since the Westphalian Treaty agreement viewed the respect for state sovereignty as critical for the maintenance of peace and security in Europe.

A Conference of Ambassadors held in Paris in 1920 after the First World War was convened to interpret and implement peace treaties entered into between the victorious and defeated European powers. The conference was mandated to attend to “all matters concerning the execution and interpretation of the peace treaties” (James Op.Cit:24). A number of delimitation commissions, with integrated military officers were established to re-draw the national boundaries and in the process address any political issues that could arise in the process of discharging their mandates. The multinational military officers were tasked to facilitate the implementation of the mandates given to the delimitation commissions (James Op.Cit:19). This activity qualifies to be categorized under international peacekeeping operations as the multinational military teams were engaged in impartial and non-threatening activities meant to promote peaceful co-existence among European countries. An additional task undertaken by these missions was the administration of territory on behalf of the League of Nations, a practice carried forward to the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*Ibid*).

In 1920, the League of Nations called for a plebiscite in Vilna (now Vilnius) after the cessation of hostilities between Poland and Lithuania over the disputed Lithuanian territory. It was planned that the disputed region would be neutralized, and British, French, Spanish and Belgian Governments each offered to provide troops to keep order in the region to facilitate a peaceful plebiscite which did not eventually materialize due to continued disagreements between the parties to the conflict. The planned operation, though not launched, had many characteristics reminiscent to United Nations peacekeeping operations (Briscoe 2003:15).

The first League of Nations “peacekeeping” mission was to attend to a dispute between Sweden and Finland over the Aaland Islands which resulted in the creation of a commission of inquiry to investigate and make recommendations on possible solutions to the controversy (James 1990. Although the dispute did not point to an imminent armed conflict between the two

countries, this mission set a precedent that the League could intervene in a neutral manner to resolve disputes between its members in pursuit of a peaceful resolution. The two countries unenthusiastically accepted the final report of the commission which helped establish the League's reputation as a fair arbiter, a practice that was adopted and institutionalized by the UN through peacekeeping operations (*Ibid.*:33).

The second category of "peacekeeping" operations undertaken by the League of Nations involved the use of multinational military forces in a "law and order" maintenance role, especially in situations where peace treaties signed and entered into, provided for the holding of plebiscites to facilitate the re-drawing of national frontiers with the full and accurate knowledge of the wishes of people concerned (James 1990). In order for such exercises to be transparent and credible, neutral and impartial military forces had to facilitate and monitor the entire process and report back. Multinational forces were, in this regard, deployed in support of plebiscite commissions for the purpose of maintaining law and order during the referendums (*Ibid.*).

At the conclusion of the Spanish Civil War the League of Nations deployed a dozen "observers" that constituted the International Military Commission mandated to verify the withdrawal of foreign troops (*Ibid.*). The deployment which lasted from October 1938 to June 1939 had striking similarities with operations conducted by the United Nations. In that regard, it is considered a fair assessment to conclude that the concept of "peacekeeping" missions manifested itself in operations conducted by the League of Nations during the inter-war period and was eventually formalized by the UN after World War II.

## **2.5 UN peacekeeping missions**

This section seeks to demonstrate that United Nations peacekeeping practice evolved and developed from an ad hoc mechanism designed to help manage the transition to formal independence through decolonization, and as a device used to institutionalise and police a certain set of post-colonial relationships in countries on the periphery. These missions were used as "an all-encompassing apparatus" to facilitate the reorganization of state-society relationships along narrow neo-liberal lines, including, where necessary, facilitating the transfer of power from one elite group to another (Al Qaq 2009:7). The section traces and

highlights the three phased evolution of United Nations peacekeeping operations as a basis for the case studies to be undertaken in this thesis.<sup>7</sup>

The authors of the United Nations Charter anticipated that disputes and conflicts were to be “pacifically” settled through the employment and application of traditional methods of conflict resolution such as enquiry, conciliation, mediation and other similar initiatives (James 1990:10). In addition to these measures, the drafters also envisaged economic and military sanctions being imposed as a means of dealing with threats to and actual breaches of international peace and security (*Ibid.*). This did not materialize as the two superpowers namely the United States of America (USA) and the Soviet Union were suspicious of each other’s intentions as they conducted their realist dominated international foreign relations policies that give birth to the Cold War situation during period 1945 to 1988.

The outbreak of the Cold War soon after the end of World War II ushered in a world divided along ideological camps of capitalism versus communism. This ideological division curtailed the United Nation’s ability to engage in collective action, a direct result of impediments by East-West divisions which effectively limited cooperation among the permanent members of the Security Council (O’Neill and Rees 2005:1). It became apparently clear that the United Nations could not effectively carryout the job it had been created for through collective security arrangements. Faced with minor wars and conflicts during its nascent period, the UN being a “neutral” world organization improvised a peacekeeping system to resolve these inter-state conflicts primarily to avoid direct superpower confrontation (Durch 1993:1). The evolutionary phases of UN peacekeeping operations are discussed below starting with the “first generation” peacekeeping missions.

### 2.5.1 UN first generation peacekeeping missions

The UN observer mission (UNTSO) deployed in 1948 to monitor, observe and report illegal incursions across the armistice lines between Israel and its Arab neighbours is generally considered to be the first peacekeeping mission deployment by the UN (Durch 1993:85-86). In

---

<sup>7</sup> There are different ways of categorizing the evolutionary phases of UN peacekeeping operations. The most commonly adopted categorization is that the first generation of peacekeeping stretched from the 1948 to mid-1950s and these were mainly small, unarmed observer missions in the Middle East and Asia. The second generation started with the deployment of a large contingent of armed UN troops in Egypt following the Suez crisis in 1956. This was followed by the deployment of the UN mission in Congo during period 1960-1964. This second generation lasted up to the end of the Cold War. As from 1992, starting with the humanitarian mission in Somalia till now, missions launched by the UN constitute third generation operations that are launched in response to internal conflicts with a bias towards humanitarian considerations.

old style UN peacekeeping, peacekeepers were portrayed as third parties disinterested in the outcome of a dispute, neutral/impartial towards the disputants as well as non-threatening since they were mandated to use force only in self-defence. This portrayal of peacekeepers influenced Fabian (1971) to entitled his study *Soldiers without Enemies* depicting the non-threatening posture of traditional peacekeeping operations. According to Hill and Malik (1996:6), the adoption of peacekeeping approach or concept towards resolving international conflict through collective security was a compromise, designed to maintain the United Nation's relevance in the sphere of maintaining international peace and security which happens to be its primary objective. Osmançavuşoğlu (2000), observed that early peacekeeping missions played a relatively minor role that was largely confined to solving crises in the Middle East and regional conflicts associated with de-colonization, especially crises in which neither superpower had major geo-strategic interests thus forestalling their direct involvement and subsequent escalation of the conflicts. This assessment misses the point that these missions served to formalize the withdrawal of the British and French colonial masters from the Middle East and their replacement by American influence thus effectively keeping the Soviet Union out of this oil rich region.

During the first decade of its existence (1946-1956) the UN deployed three observer missions and commissions to which the term “peacekeeping” was not used. The first mission to be deployed by the UN was the UN Committee on the Balkans (UNSCOB) deployed during period 1947-1951. This followed a request by the Greek Government for UN Observers to investigate foreign supplies of military weapons and equipment to the communist guerrillas fighting the government. The mission’s task was to investigate outside support for Greek Communist guerrillas fighting the Greek government. Despite being the first UN deployment, this mission is not acknowledged as the first peacekeeping mission because the other parties to the conflict did not consent to the deployment of foreign troops to monitor their activities (Hill and Malik 1996:27-28).

The next observer mission was the deployment of UNTSO in 1948, mandated to monitor the borders between Israel and her Arab neighbours. According to Goulding (1993:452), UNTSO is officially regarded as the first UN peacekeeping operation. The third observer mission was the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) deployed in 1949 following a request from India. The UN responded with the dispatch of observers whose mission remains deployed up to this day after more than six decades of continuous deployment due to the volatility of the Kashmir region.

The first UN mission explicitly named “peacekeeping” was UNEF deployed to the Sinai Peninsula in response to the 1956 Suez Crisis (Durch 1993:7; MacQueen, 2006). The Suez crisis is considered to be perhaps the first significant step in the conceptual transformation of how the UN responded to international security crises.

Unable to invoke collective security in a situation where two members of the Security Council were embroiled in international conflict against a member state, and constrained by practical and ideological challenges of bipolarity, Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold and sympathetic middle powers devised a way to get the UN involved in the crisis – largely with the encouragement and blessing of the US (Aksu 2003:78). The mission was designed and deployed with utmost attention and emphasis placed on protecting the sovereignty of state parties to the conflict as well as respecting fully host state sovereignty implying upholding the UN principle of non-intervention (*Ibid*).

UNEF 1 was the first ever armed UN peacekeeping mission in the entire history of the world body and it helped to define the three core principles of traditional peacekeeping namely: consent of conflict parties; impartiality; and use of force only for self-defence (Pelz and Lehmann 2007:2). These principles will be discussed in detail in Chapter III of this thesis. The mission was deployed in Egypt as a “face saving” initiative to cover the withdrawal from Egypt by Britain, France and Israel (Adebajo: 2011:25). Thus the primary mission of this deployment was not the safeguarding and protection of Egyptian sovereignty, but rather the protection of the international image of the invading powers and ensuring that Egypt remained firmly within the American sphere of influence in the face of growing Soviet influence among liberation movements and former colonies (Al Qaq 2009). The Egyptians welcomed the mission because its deployment saved the country from an embarrassing defeat by the three powerful invading countries namely Britain, France and Israel. It has been argued that Egypt agreed to the deployment of UNEF from a position of weakness since it had been invaded by three powerful armies hence its consent was not truly voluntary. Egypt, however, officially managed to portray the deployment of UN peacekeepers as a national victory against the invading foreign armies.

Unashamedly, following the launch of British and French invasion of Egypt on 31 October 1956, Pierson Dixon the British ambassador to the UN, made a passionate attempt to persuade the UN to allow the Anglo-French invasion force to fly the UN flag as peacekeepers (Louis and Owen 1989:683) as the USA had done in Korea in 1950. This mentality of labelling self-serving multilateral missions in small and weak countries as peacekeeping missions appears to

continue up to this day especially humanitarian peacekeeping interventions. Such missions will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

According to Urquhart (1987:133), UNEF served as a mid-wife towards the drafting of a set of principles that were to guide the conduct of UN peacekeeping missions for the next four decades. The guiding principles that were to govern the deployment and conduct of peacekeepers included the following:

- 1) Peacekeeping operations would be deployed with the consent of the nations/ parties to the dispute,<sup>8</sup>
- 2) Peacekeepers were allowed to use force only in self defence,
- 3) Peacekeepers were to be composed of troops voluntarily furnished by neutral countries,
- 4) Peacekeepers were expected to be impartial and
- 5) Peacekeeping operations were to be under the control and guidance of the Secretary General for their day- to-day activities.

UNEF's successful accomplishment of its mandate gave confidence to the UN that resulted in an unprecedented increase in UN peacekeeping missions worldwide, the majority of which were in former colonies in the Southern hemisphere. The deployment of peacekeepers also served to guarantee that newly independent countries on the periphery remained within the sphere of Western influence thus avoiding their drifting towards the socialist/communist camp led by the Soviet Union (Al Qaq, Op.Cit.). This success story led to the deployment of ONUC during 1960-1964, a more ambitious peacekeeping mission in a civil war setting.

At the height of the Cold War, the UN found little space to manoeuvre and deployed peacekeeping missions in intra-state conflicts as the permanent members of the Security Council jealously guarded their spheres of influence and strongly discouraged multilateral interventions in their client states' internal affairs (Aksu 2003:80). Examples include the British preference of deploying Commonwealth peacekeepers in Zimbabwe at independence as opposed to UN peacekeepers as this was a former British colony. In French West Africa, France preferred the deployment of own troops or French speaking allies in former French colonies.

---

<sup>8</sup>During the Cold War era, the most important consent considered by the UNSC was that of the host government as deployment of UN peacekeepers could not be successfully implemented without the express approval of the host government. In this regard, as happened in Congo, the non-approval for UN deployment by the secessionists was of little consequence regarding the deployment of peacekeepers. However failure to secure the consent of all parties to the conflict means UN peacekeepers would be operating in a hostile environment where they are most likely to suffer casualties as they would be considered as an invading force.

This was all in an endeavour to protect and perpetuate neo-colonialism that benefitted the former colonial masters as well as keeping other powers outside that sphere of influence.

Where both superpowers were willing to accommodate and tolerate UN peacekeeping outside of their spheres of influence, the Soviet Union in particular insisted that deployed UN peacekeepers should endeavour to protect the host state's sovereignty and not intervene in its domestic affairs (*Ibid*). During the first armed UN peacekeeping mission in Egypt, the Soviet Union made an effort to minimise peacekeepers' interference with internal politics of the host country. The Soviets maintained the same attitude during the Congo mission as evidenced by the clashes between the superpowers over the UN handling of the Congo crisis of the early 1960s as will be discussed in detail in chapter three of this thesis. Third World aligned or non-aligned countries, shared strong anti-colonial sentiments hence they called for increased UN involvement in settling conflicts in the South as they fought against colonialism (Al-Qaq Op.Cit.). Significantly, both superpowers supported the de-colonization process as they sought to win client states, fill the vacuum left by departing colonial powers and guaranteeing own access to natural resources in newly independent states. In this regard, it was the North–South conflict that gave meaning, impetus and content to the de-colonization process as well as the most crucial factor that made possible the deployment of peacekeepers in the few intra-state peacekeeping missions of this era (*Ibid*).

A total of thirteen pre-1988 Cold War peacekeeping operations were launched by the UN and these were classified as "largely military in composition and their tasks were to monitor cease-fires, control buffer zones, investigate alleged arms flows, and prevent a resumption of hostilities" (Boutros-Ghali 1992). In other words, they were to maintain calm on the front lines and give time for the peacemakers and diplomats to negotiate a settlement of the dispute that had led to the conflict in the first place (Karns and Mingst 1995:80). Although many of the political negotiations failed, nonetheless, the UN peacekeeping forces prevented the expansion of many conflicts. An important ethical characteristic of the first generation or classical peacekeeping operations is that they involved the post-truce interposition of a peacekeeping force with the consent of the parties to the conflict thus reflecting some degree of respect for host state sovereignty, a practice that was watered down during second and third generation peacekeeping operations.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> During the first generation of UN peacekeeping operations, peacekeepers were deployed along the demilitarised zones as happened between India and Pakistan, Greece and Turkey in Cyprus, Israel and

### 2.5.2 UN second generation peacekeeping

The second generation of UN peacekeeping started after 1988 when peacekeeping went through a radical transformation as a direct result of the Soviet Union's adoption of "glasnost and perestroika." It ushered in a new phase of less mutual suspicion between the superpowers and unprecedented co-operation among the five permanent members of the Security Council (Osmançavuşoğlu 2000). Since the end of the Cold War, several attempts were made to redefine peacekeeping operations spawning a host of new classifications such as 'multi-dimensional peacekeeping', 'second generation peacekeeping' and 'peace enforcement'. These terms reflected a significant departure from traditional/classic peacekeeping as well as signalling the arrival of multi-faceted tasks that UN peacekeepers were expected to undertake (Schmidl 2000:18). The evolution of peacekeeping operations during this period reflects growing acceptance that conflict resolution prospects could be enhanced by direct and at times unethical UN involvement in internal affairs of affected countries thus eroding and trampling on host state sovereignty.

A critical analysis of the new terms of peacekeeping reflects that what they have in common is their occupation of an ethically sound moral high ground that appeals to the much desired peace whilst portraying a commitment towards attending to the suffering populations in conflict situations through humanitarianism widely acknowledged and approved as an ethical response to the suffering populations (Pugh 2007:47-48). In this regard 'peace support' operations are portrayed as a positive undertaking that signifies the UN Security Council's moral concern for international order and human security in the international states system.

Peacekeeping missions of this era became multi-dimensional in scope, lacked explicit consent of the host countries and were more intrusive in the host state domestic affairs as humanitarian and human security issues were being given more prominence over state security. Supporters of liberal internationalism such as (Anderson and Rieff, 2005) argue that the protection of human rights and enhancement of human security requires the reconstruction of sovereign states whilst acknowledging at the same time that this process involves violating national

---

Syria/Egypt in the Middle East and many more. The deployment of armed peacekeepers inside one of the belligerents' country started with UNEF when Egypt agreed to host peacekeepers on its soil yet Israel refused to have UN peacekeepers stationed in its country. There after the next mission to have UN peacekeepers fully deployed in a country was in Congo during ONUC, a mission that resembled in every respect the characteristics of second generations UN peacekeeping operations that interfere with host state internal affairs. This practice is now rampant across the African continent.

sovereignty in order to create a liberal political order. In war-ravaged societies hosting UN peace-building missions, “political entrepreneurs” have taken advantage of the situation to impose neoliberal processes, such as privatization of the economy, in order to promote their “narrow patrimonial interests” (Sorensen 2002). It follows therefore that liberalism views the evolution of traditional peacekeeping missions to peace enforcement as “a positive development in the international system” as it entrenches capitalist practices in host countries on the periphery (*Ibid.*).

The former UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali a staunch advocate for human rights and a strong proponent of the promotion and safeguarding of human security argued that innocent civilians were more threatened by lack of basic human needs, weak economies, disease, environmental degradation, and political instability than by invading foreign armies. He further observed that states were often not a source of protection but a source of harm to their populations in situations of internal tension and conflict (Boutros-Ghali 1992). What is of great significance to this study is that Boutros-Ghali advocated for UN intervention in conflict countries primarily to bolster human security, arguing that it was not interference in domestic affairs of member states. In doing so he acknowledged that contemporary peacekeeping missions could not always adhere to traditional norms and principles of observing host state consent, impartiality and use of force only in self-defence that aimed at respecting host state sovereignty. He also identified “peace-building” as a legitimate UNSC undertaking whose activities were meant to identify and support national structures that helped in strengthening and solidifying national peace and harmony hence contributing to the avoidance of a relapse into national conflict among the belligerents (*Ibid.*). An examination of peace-building activities reveals that they are very intrusive in domestic affairs of targeted states. The ultimate goal of these peace-building activities is to successfully manipulate the power and political dynamics in those countries so that institutions created through peace-building are in sync with neo-liberal norms and values advocated by the western powers, to serve western interests and not those of the local populations.

Anne Orford (2003) examined Australian led peace-building operations in East Timor and concluded that such UN sponsored interventions constructed an international order in which some powerful states manipulate and control the local political system by taking advantage of discourses of failed states. Peace-building missions allow elites from the UN and other international organizations to step in and govern political communities, developments which led Bain (2003) to point out to the similarities of these UN led peace making interventions as

evidence of a “neo-trusteeship” emerging in the evolving international order. The evolving international order has also been influential in the evolving trends of peacekeeping operations in that peacekeepers under this generation were mandated to carry out new tasks such as elections monitoring through electoral assistance and evaluations, human rights monitoring in host countries, resettlement and management of refugees, re-training of civilian police as part of security sector reforms, protection and distribution of humanitarian relief efforts, and disarmament and demobilization of armed forces as well as integrating some of them in the newly established security system (Boutros-Ghali 1992). These missions were overly ambitious considering the resource base constraints that characterized UN peacekeeping missions. Thus the transitional period from the Cold War to the post-Cold War witnessed many experiments aimed at enhancing the role of the UN in its endeavours to maintain international peace and security, taking advantage of the unprecedented cooperation among the permanent members of the Security Council. The transformation and evolution of peacekeeping during this era was made possible by the fundamental geo-political changes in world politics brought about by the end of the Cold War that ushered in a new phase of veto wielding powers’ cooperation within the Security Council (Sanderson 1998). This development gave the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (UNDPKO) an opportunity to experiment with intrusive types of UN peacekeeping that were not common during the Cold War period.

According to Frederking (2007:44) most common peace-building tasks include the following: internal security activities to maintain law and order; disarming and reintegrating former combatants; assisting in the management and return of refugees and displaced populations; democratization, electoral assistance and institutions building; security sector reforms through reforming the military, police, and judiciary; economic development along neo-liberal value systems; promotion of human rights; conflict management and dispute resolution training; de-mining; and continued humanitarian assistance. Buoyed by the successes of this generation, the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the UN peacekeepers for their “decisive contribution toward the initiation of actual peace negotiations.” The general view was that, “further development of the principles and practices would allow the UN to serve as an effective instrument to reduce violent conflict within the international system” (Berdal, 1993:3). Not surprisingly, the enthusiasm was short lived as the peacekeeping missions in Bosnia, Somalia and Rwanda during the early 1990s went terribly wrong leading to a significant lull in UN peacekeeping activities as the organization carried out extensive introspections regarding peacekeeping operations.

The deployment of second generation peacekeeping missions, in ongoing civil war situations increasingly complicated and violated the norms of host state consent and sovereignty. At times peacekeepers were viewed with suspicion as some rebel groups felt peacekeeping troops were deployed to protect the government at their expense. In situations where multiple warring parties existed, it became extremely difficult to obtain consent from each protagonist group thereby creating dangerous and unpredictable operating environments not conducive for classical and traditional peacekeeping settings. Mandates for this generation of peacekeeping missions often included enforcement of ceasefires as opposed to monitoring ceasefire agreements. This made the missions more likely to be involved in unethical coercive operations in violation of peacekeeping norms of consent, neutrality, and use of force only in self-defence.

The emerging norm of human security was given greater priority and importance over state sovereignty. As a result, it challenged the norm of the inviolability of state sovereignty, resulting in increasingly complex peacekeeping missions that undermined host state sovereignty (Hampson and Malone 2002). Based on this development, second-generation peacekeeping operations were routinely mandated to carryout tasks such as maintaining internal security, ensuring the delivery of humanitarian aid, protecting civilian populations, helping repatriate refugees, and monitoring human rights abuses; tasks that increased the probability of peacekeeping troops violating the traditional principles of impartiality and the use of force only in self-defence particularly in situations where there were no ceasefire agreements to monitor (Frederking Op.Cit.:44). Missions mandated to maintain internal security, a traditional preserve of the host state, had to violate the norm of use of force in self-defence when the combatants fired on each other in a bid to stop the fighting. Missions mandated to protect human rights violated the norm of neutrality/impartiality when one side started killing innocent civilians (*Ibid*). Based on the facts above, it is evident that second generation peacekeeping designed to promote human security often trumped traditional peacekeeping norms, a practice that was further enhanced during the third generation of UN peacekeeping operations.

### 2.5.3 UN third generation peacekeeping operations

The third era of UN peacekeeping evolution is again characterized by the increasing scope of UN Security Council mandates: increasing willingness to use coercive military measures and radical re-interpretation as well as transformation of traditional peacekeeping principles to facilitate more intrusive activities that have little respect for state sovereignty of host countries (Frederking Op.Cit.:41-42). Third generation peacekeeping has witnessed a significant shift

towards coercive political and military re-engineering of host countries by dominant states armed with a moral and ethical design to safeguard human rights. Big powers have attuned their peace support doctrines to the discourses of ethics, humanitarianism, justice and what they term the ‘will of the international community’ (Pugh Op.Cit.:48). In this case the international community is synonymous with the Western world that comprises the US and her Western allies.

Contemporary UN peace-building operations seek to preside over political and socio-economic transformation from one form of politico-economic system to the neo-liberal system that primarily serves the interests of the western powers. Al Qaq (2009) observed that UN peacekeeping operations are “a deeply political project in that they represent a particular minority vision of what the UN should be preoccupied with” especially in the aftermath of the rapid disintegration of organised Third World resistance through the Non-Aligned Movement at the UN. The twin disaster of the dissolution of the Soviet Union and weakening of the Non-Aligned Movement jointly exposed the weak and vulnerable Third World countries to increased manipulation by Western neo-liberal forces. This was done in the name of promoting democracy and market economies.

During the current period of “third-generation” peacekeeping missions, the Security Council is pre-occupied with “peace-building” activities that, in theory, include protecting civilians from violent conflict in pursuit of the human security agenda. This has been given impetus by a “slowly building consensus that the UN has a responsibility to protect civilian populations” in situations where the respective governments would have failed or are deemed unwilling to protect own citizens (Frederking Op.Cit.:41-42). Western sponsored regimes can indeed invite their powerful backers as has been happening with French speaking countries in West Africa and they may even invite the UN to come to their rescue when they are not popularly elected by the majority population. This indeed raises a dilemma on how to handle such cases. Like the second era of peacekeeping evolution, the third generation is again characterized by the increasing scope of the mandates and a radical transformation of traditional peacekeeping principles to embrace interventionist characteristics that grossly undermine the principle of host state sovereignty. A distinction between the third generation of UN peacekeeping and second generation is a willingness to use coercive measures to attain the ambitious and increasingly intrusive UN mandates that violate host state sovereignty (Ibid: 45). A close scrutiny of these ambitious mandates reveals that they are meant to serve the self-interests of the big powers at the expense of the local population as demonstrated in the “humanitarian”

Libyan mission that was launched under the umbrella of responsibility to protect doctrine and mandate, yet the true objective was regime change in that country.

In a situation where a Western sponsored puppet government appeals to the UN for protection through deployment of peacekeepers, its request of likely to be granted or a coalition of willing Western countries can be assembled to intervene to protect that regime as happened in Libya where a small minority appealed for outside intervention to protect them from Gaddafi received overwhelming support from NATO allies.

The 21st century has already seen a burgeoning of different forms of outside interferences and interventions by a range of state (and non-state) actors and for many different purposes, such as humanitarian intervention, responsibility to protect, rebuilding failed states, and development interventions (Leurdijk 1997). Indeed, intervention by ‘outsiders’ in the affairs of ‘insiders,’ has become a routine and disturbing structural characteristic of today’s global politics that undermines and violates the sovereignty of weak states by powerful states through the use of UN peacekeepers. As a result, there has been intense discussion about the ethical, legal and political dilemmas involved in humanitarian intervention, particularly when respect for state sovereignty conflicts with the protection of human rights (Holzgrefe and Keohane 2003).

Advocates for the doctrine of R2P include the former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan who challenged: “If humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to Rwanda, to Srebrenica – to gross and systematic violations of human rights that offend every precept of our common humanity” (Annan 2000:48). Annan’s famous quotation highlights the central ethical problem confronting the debate on humanitarian intervention namely “the challenge of reconciling two competing norms in international law: sovereignty and human rights (Badescu 2011:19). The ethical challenge is that on the one hand, state sovereignty inhibits foreign intervention into the internal affairs of states, and on the other hand, there is growing concern that the international community should react to massive and systematic violations of human rights by any state (*ibid*). Fernando Tesón (2006) further clarifies the ethical challenge of humanitarian intervention versus sovereignty when he states that: “... either we intervene to end massacres, and so we are liable to violate the prohibition of war and respect for sovereignty, or we do not intervene, which means we tolerate the violation of the prohibition of gross human rights abuses.” This is indeed an ethical dilemma associated with humanitarian interventions. Thus the continuing tension between these two sets

of international norms rests at the heart of the humanitarian intervention debate which has taken the evolution of peacekeeping operations to new controversial heights. This tension further highlights the ethical dilemmas associated with humanitarian interventions that continue to trigger debate on this important subject. The adoption of the humanitarian agenda serves several purposes that in some cases promote Western neo-liberal value systems without addressing the root causes of conflict in the periphery.

According to Duffield (2001) the representational rhetoric about humanitarianism serves to promote moral values and the spread of a superior liberal ideology whilst avoiding addressing the societal structural injustices that constitute the root causes of conflict and instabilities in the system. This approach takes place despite having acknowledged that poverty and under-development are security challenges that lead to conflict if they continue unchecked. Use of humanitarian rhetoric also serves in some cases as an ethical smoke screen to camouflage real self-interests of the big powers sanctioning the humanitarian peacekeeping interventions (Mayall 2000:326) and (Gibbs 2000:41-55). Given the above, it can be concluded that “rational, civilized, humanitarian” peacekeeping interventions appear to be part of a strategic packaging of Western sponsored moral initiatives in which “Western security culture, self-perception and self-interest are wrapped” (Pugh 2007:50).

The prevailing phenomenon where the Security Council increasingly invokes enforcement provisions of Chapter VII of the UN Charter mandating the use of force to achieve tasks such as the protection of the civilians under immediate danger of physical violence has witnessed a radical transformation of the idea of peacekeeping into an idea of peace enforcement, a more aggressive form of peacekeeping (Lang 2010:330). Peacekeepers are now able to use force to protect civilians to achieve their mandate and if necessary, to force aid through to the starving populations, to repulse attacks on civilians, to forcibly disarm troublemakers and to arrest war criminals (Farrell 1995). Additional tasks that peacekeepers engage in include the following broad undertakings: “...maintaining law and order; monitoring or verifying ceasefire or disengagement agreements; supervising the disarmament or demobilization of combatants; the protection of civilians and protecting humanitarian assistance” (Mullenbach 2005:529). These additional tasks have drastically changed the dynamics of UN peacekeeping in the post-Cold War era as the missions are expected to militarily engage human rights violators. In the process of implementing these additional tasks, peacekeeping activities have come into conflict with host state sovereignty as they intrude into spheres of domestic sovereignty once considered to be outside the jurisdiction of the UN activities (Doyle and Sambanis 2006).

The magnitude and nature of interference differs from one mission to another however, as will be discussed and demonstrated in subsequent chapters, the meddling in internal politics of host countries has reached in some cases, proportions where the elimination of local leaders is sanctioned by UN peacekeepers as happened in Congo (Adebajo and Landsberg 2007). In Somalia, the elimination of the most powerful warlord General Farah Aideed was pursued overtly by US forces under the umbrella of UN mandates (Peterson 1992). In Rwanda, the assassination of the Rwandan President and his Burundian counterpart took place after UN peacekeepers had closed one of the runways of the airport thus channelling approaching aircraft to one lane (Black 2014). This decision was made without consulting Rwandan authorities in violation of host state sovereignty. The Bruguiere Report (2006) highlights the degree of UN peacekeepers' complicity in the preparation for the downfall of the Rwandan government. This will be addressed in detail in chapter five of this thesis.

The concept of state sovereignty has been viewed as a fundamental pillar of the international states system: "the basic norm" upon which the society of states is anchored, the "cardinal principle" of international law, the "cornerstone" of the UN Charter, and "the global covenant" that must be abided with by all peace loving states (Ayoob 2002). It is therefore disheartening that the new multidimensional tasks being authorized by UN Security Council indeed violate state sovereignty as they seek to promote neo-liberal and neo-colonial agendas of the big powers in the name of protecting civilian populations yet in practice the outcomes of these missions are not primarily in the interests of the host population. The case studies in subsequent chapters will demonstrate the magnitude of UN peacekeepers' violation of host state sovereignty as each mission is examined in greater detail.

## **2.6 Conclusion**

This chapter has demonstrated that there were no institutionalized peacekeeping operations as we now know them, prior to the establishment of the UN Organization. There were however prototypes of peacekeeping initiatives that evolved and developed through a nonlinear progressive fashion to reach the current stage. The chapter established that the logic of adopting peacekeeping operations in the early years of the UN was a process of managing the violent consequences of the dismantlement of formal colonial empires through decolonization and entrenching the replacing US hegemony in the process. This is evidenced by the nature of peacekeeping operations in the Golan Heights, Cyprus, Kashmir, the Suez Crisis in Egypt and in Congo where the US effectively replaced departed colonial powers through the employment of UN peacekeeping missions (Al Qaq 2009).

Peacekeeping was invented as an improvisation of proxy military operations by the UN following the failure of collective security arrangements as enshrined in the Charter (Diehl 1994:28-29). Through evolution, the objectives of peacekeeping intervention have generally transformed from managing inter-state conflicts to ostensibly getting embroiled in internal conflicts where peacekeeping activities are now much more widely utilized as a form of global governance. UN peacekeeping and peace-building interventions in the countries under study have evolved into intrusive mechanisms for regulating post-colonial affairs, and they often reflect in their design and implementation, a wider political agenda set outside the continent. The functions performed by peacekeepers have evolved from the traditional and limited military tasks such as patrolling border areas to such complicated assignments such as facilitating ‘national reconciliation’ or setting up a ‘temporary authority’, functions that require not only complex networking along the military–civilian and technical–political spectra as detailed in comprehensive peace accords, but also a higher degree of UN involvement in ‘domestic affairs’ of host nations, as exemplified by direct UN responsibility in ‘conducting’ elections (Aksu 2003:92).

This chapter has also demonstrated that UN peacekeeping operations have evolved from being facilitators in the institutionalization and transmission of various visions of liberal modernity on the periphery of the world system, the buffering of nation-states, to the policing of the international political economy and lately participation in sensitive and intrusive intricate restructuring of state-society relations to suit the neo-liberal market oriented agenda that guarantee the supply of raw materials to developed economies as designed by former colonial masters. Viewed from a critical theory perspective, peacekeeping operations and humanitarian missions illustrate the disempowering effects of statist sovereignty through globalization. Rich and powerful states and their institutions are the sources of key decisions about policing and riot control in the periphery where the root causes of conflict would have been aggravated by global capitalism since conflicts in the developing world are a manifestation of stresses in the international system for which corporations, states, and the international financial institutions are largely responsible. These global trends have seen the erosion of the requirement of host state consent especially in those cases where ‘humanitarian interventions’ accompanied peacekeeping missions.

Based on the discussion above, it has been argued that the evolution of peacekeeping operations has served to reinforce the structure of the world system as preferred by developed Western powerful nations particularly the US. The merger of peacekeeping operations with

humanitarianism has provided an ethical platform and justification for “riot control” like operations in “rogue” countries and “failed states” whilst promoting the globalization of a particular ideology of “good governance” and the “liberal peace” without necessarily addressing the root causes of conflict in countries on the periphery.

The case studies that follow attempt to establish the extent to which UN peacekeepers meddled in the political power dynamics of host countries in order to influence the final outcomes of the conflict in favour of the chief sponsors of UN peacekeeping missions. The next chapter examines and highlights the unethical conduct of UN peacekeepers in Congo during the early 1960s and how that mission condemned that country to perpetual dependency on foreign troops to address its internal political problems.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **Ethical Challenges to United Nations Peacekeeping Mission in the Republic of Congo with reference to the period (1960-1964)**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

The aim of this chapter is two-fold. Firstly, it is to place the Congo crisis in its wider geopolitical context that enables a critical examination of why Congo, in its early years of independence (1960-1964) failed to offer its own citizens peace and security despite the deployment of UN peacekeepers in the country. Secondly, it is to highlight unethical manipulation of the internal political power dynamics in Congo by some senior UN officials in violation of Congo's sovereignty which resulted in the mission failing to accomplish desired objectives of bringing about durable peace and security in the Congo.

The UN peacekeeping mission in Congo (ONUC) served as a proxy force to legitimize a regime change agenda that culminated in the installation of a pro-Western government that did not serve the interests of the Congolese population (Al Qaq 2009; Bellamy, Williams and Griffin 2010). ONUC was originally deployed to preserve the sovereignty of the country following Belgian military intervention. It succeeded in securing the withdrawal of the invading Belgian forces and it also succeeded in reversing the disintegration of Congo into fiefdoms. However, it dismally failed to restore the nascent democracy in Congo and equally failed to bring about long term self-determination, political and economic stability in the host country (Collins 1993).

The significance of starting with ONUC in this comparative case study rests on four major factors. First, as observed by Durch (1993), ONUC was the first multilateral UN peacekeeping operation with attributes of “peace-building and peace enforcement” that were clearly manifested well before these terms were incorporated into UN peacekeeping (post-Cold War) vocabulary. According to Al Qaq (2009) ONUC was by far the largest peacekeeping mission to be deployed during the Cold War period and it was the first mission to have non-military members tasked with the responsibility of re-building and administering key aspects of a host country’s public institutions inclusive of security sector reform, activities that interfered with the sovereignty of Congo. Moreover, it was the first UN peacekeeping mission to be authorised to use force to facilitate the execution of its mandate (Findlay 2002). Second, the mission was the most advanced and sophisticated experiment in international cooperation ever attempted

by the world (Lippmann 1961). Third, ONUC was the most complex and most controversial mission because it violated all the rules and principles of peacekeeping especially the “holy trinity” of UN peacekeeping namely: consent of host nation, impartiality and non-use of force except in self-defence that applied to previous peacekeeping missions (Abi-Saab 1978:17-18). Fourth, ONUC served as a “watershed” peacekeeping operation in UN interference in internal affairs of a sovereign member state in violation of the UN Charter. ONUC overwhelmingly demonstrated the extent to which the UN through its Secretary General and his advisers, could determine the course of political events in the host country without paying due attention to the wishes, interests and aspirations of citizens of the host nation. Considering its size, cost and controversy in mandate interpretation, ONUC was a precursor to the peacekeeping missions that were to be undertaken by the world body in the post-Cold War era hence it was indeed “a watershed in the development of international peacekeeping” (James 1996:25).

This chapter consists of six sections that follow the operational and political phases of ONUC deployment. Section 1 is the introduction to the chapter. Section 2 covers the background knowledge of activities that led to ONUC deployment. Section 3 highlights unethical deployment of pro-Western troops and civilian close advisers to the Secretary General in violation of existing agreed principles of selecting troop contributing countries. Section 4 covers ONUC’s mishandling of the Congo Constitutional Crisis and the assassination of Patrice Lumumba. Section 5 addresses the use of force by ONUC to end the secession of Katanga Province in a demonstration of double standards by UN officials as they had earlier refused to use force when requested to do so by Patrice Lumumba. The section also briefly covers the legitimization of a pro-Western non-elected government amenable to the US. Section 6 is the conclusion that summarises the chapter.

A brief background account of events leading to the Congo crisis which is essential to the overall understanding of unethical practices by UN peacekeepers that undermined Congo’s sovereignty is covered in the next section.

### **3.2 Background to the 1960-64 Congo crisis**

This section briefly explores events that contributed to the 1960 -1964 Congo crisis. It is important to contextualise the circumstances and environment in which ONUC was deployed and operated. However, no attempt will be made to give a detailed historical account of all events related to this crisis as this is outside the scope of this chapter.

The Republic of Congo (now Democratic Republic of Congo), was reluctantly granted independence from Belgium on 30 June 1960, following a hasty transfer of power that soon resulted in a power vacuum caused by lack of capacity to centrally control and administer the country (Gibbs 2000:361). In his independence speech Patrice Lumumba the then Prime Minister of Congo denounced Belgium for its racist colonial rule and lamented that law and order in an independent Congo was to remain the responsibility of Force Publique, the Congolese Army under 1 000 Belgian officers left behind by the former colonial master based on the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation which was never ratified by the Congolese Government and did not grant Belgium the right to intervene without the express request or concurrence of the Congolese Government (Abi-Saab 1978:8; Durch 1993:317).

Five days after independence the new National Congolese Army (ANC) mutinied against continued presents of Belgian officers in the national army of independent Congo. The mutiny by black Congolese troops started because they remained under command of Belgian officers in an independent Congo and were subjected to appalling conditions of service compared to their Belgian counterparts in Force Publique in a similar arrangement to the apartheid system in South Africa. On realisation that they were subjected to continued harsh treatment and poor conditions of service under Belgian officership in a free Congo, a country-wide mutiny ensued (Krasno 2004:233). The mutinous soldiers supported by excited mobs attacked Belgian officers and other foreigners, looting, raping and harassing civilians across the country (Sitkowski 2006:64). The rumours that Belgian officers were planning to disarm black Congolese troops in preparation for the landing of Belgian metropolitan paratroopers to selected military garrisons in Congo, were interpreted as an attempt at re-colonization of the Congo, and this aggravated an already volatile situation (Higgins 1980:12).

Belgium responded to the country wide chaos with military deployments of its metropolitan paratroopers in what it termed a “humanitarian operation” to protect foreigners and its white population that were being harassed by mutinous soldiers and civilian mobs (Durch 1993). The classification of Belgian aggression of a sovereign state as “humanitarian intervention” was supported by Western countries while the Soviet Union and former colonies vehemently challenged this characterisation preferring to call it an aggression that warranted international “collective measures” to evict, (forcefully if necessary), the invading foreign troops (Al Qaq 2009). This researcher shares the views of the Soviet Union and former colonies in that the mutinous behaviour of Congolese troops was triggered by Belgian plans to invade Congo, a move that was interpreted as re-colonisation of the country. The unruly behaviour of Congolese

troops was totally unacceptable, however it was imperative that the root cause for the mutinous behaviour be removed to restore calm in the country. Unfortunately this was not to be the case. Lack of consensus in the classification of Belgian invasion of Congo would later lead to sharp differences in the interpretation of UN Security Council Resolutions and the implementation of the mandate. Ultimately this lack of consensus formed the basis of bitter misunderstandings between the two Cold War camps at the UN and their sympathisers in Congo.

Moise Tshombe (the self-appointed President of Katanga Province) on July 11, 1960 declared Katanga an independent state. Tshombe received enormous political and economic support from Belgium as well as the services of the Belgian military and civilian personnel. All operational and administrative expenses for the illegal Katanga administration were catered for by massive financial support from the Union Minière du Haut-Katanga, the Belgian Mining conglomerate in Katanga Province (De Witte 2001). Tshombe's government received approximately forty million dollars (USD\$ 40 000 000) annually from the mining company in Katanga Province depriving the Congolese Central Government of vital financial resources to administer the nation (UN Doc. Dated 23.01.63 and UN Doc. Dated 23October 1961). Such massive financial support would have been enough proof to dispel the myth that the Katanga rebellion was an internal power struggle between the Congolese Central Government and the secessionist authorities in Katanga Province (Abi-Saab 1978). Faced with a fast deteriorating situation across the country, characterised by a fragile state with mutinous soldiers, foreign aggression from Belgium, hired mercenaries and a secessionist province, the central government in Leopoldville had to appeal for external assistance to re-establish legitimate control over the chaotic and disintegrating state.

The Congo government, led by bitter rivalries President Joseph Kasa Vubu and Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba on 12 July 1960, appealed for UN assistance to deal with foreign mercenaries and invading Belgian forces (UN Document S/4382:125). Assuming that the UN would act in sympathy and defence of the victim country, the original purpose for seeking UN intervention was to preserve Congo's sovereignty from foreign interventions through the withdrawal of Belgian forces and the defeat of foreign mercenaries in the country (Adebajo 2011:69). However, this was not to happen as anticipated as will be explained in subsequent sections. An understanding of the factors that caused the deployment of ONUC would help for one to appreciate the different interpretations of the mandate for the peacekeepers.

Gibbs (2000:361) on one hand identified the factors that contributed to UN' involvement in the Congo crisis as: state fragility, lack of a strong central government, and ethnic and regional fragmentation. This view is in sync with what Kissinger (1994:808) termed “the destabilising effects of ethnic groups single minded pursuing their accumulated rivalries and ancient hatreds”. It is unfortunately a proven fact that Africans are too ethnocentric and tribalistic to the extent of fiercely resisting the accommodation of other minority groups in the decision making of running the affairs of a country to the satisfaction of all tribal groupings and these divisions are taken advantage of by outsiders to fuel armed conflict in African countries to their benefit and disadvantage of the local population. On the other hand, Hoskyns (1961:7) observed three critical developments that contributed to the Congo crisis: (1) the country-wide mutiny by Congolese soldiers immediately after independence; (2) the secession of the mineral rich Katanga Province and (3) the Belgian military intervention in support of Katanga's secessionism. Both views are correct as they place different emphasis on similar factors expressed differently. These factors will be assessed in depth in the sections below.

The next section examines the nature of the Congolese government request for UN peacekeepers and the controversial interpretation of UN Security Council Resolutions that authorised the deployment of ONUC. The controversy arose from undiplomatic and disrespectful manner in which ONUC officials dealt with the Congolese Government, particularly the Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba.

### 3.2.1 Congolese Government Request for UN military assistance

This section highlights the sources and nature of the misunderstandings between the legitimately elected Prime Minister of Congo and the UN Secretary General that significantly contributed to the constitutional crisis and the ultimate failure of the overall peacekeeping mission. To fully appreciate the controversial interpretation of UN Security Council Resolutions by the Secretary General and his close advisers, it is necessary first to have an in-depth understanding of the nature of military assistance requested by Congolese Central Government to the UN Secretary General.

On 12July 1960 President Kasa Vubu and Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba jointly sent an appeal to the UN Secretary General urgently requesting for military assistance to deal with the invading Belgian forces. The Congolese appeal was very succinct and unambiguous as it stated that, “the purpose of the requested military aid was to protect the national territory of the Congo against the present external aggression which was a threat to international peace” (UN Doc.

S/4382, 13 July 1960). President Kasa Vubu and Prime Minister Lumumba jointly dispatched another cable to the Secretary General correcting the erroneous message sent earlier by their three ministers while they were out of the capital Leopoldville. According to (UN Doc. S/4382 dated 13 July 1960) the follow up message to the UN by the central government was meant to further clarify and elaborate the exact nature of the urgent request in order to remove any ambiguities. Essential aspects of the message were as follows:

- ... (1) the purpose of the aid requested is not to restore the internal situation in Congo but rather to protect the national territory against acts of aggression posed by Belgian metropolitan troops.
- (2) The request for assistance relates only to a UN force consisting of military personnel of neutral countries and not of US as reported by certain radio stations.
- (3) If requested assistance is not received without delay the Republic of the Congo will be obliged to appeal to the Bandung Treaty Powers.
- (4) The aid has been requested by the Republic of the Congo in the exercise of its sovereign rights and not in agreement with Belgium as reported,

It is crystal clear that the Congolese central government wanted military assistance to effectively engage the invading Belgian troops and ensure their withdrawal from Congo as a precondition for the restoration of status quo ante. Considering that the US had declined a request for military assistance from the same Congolese government, the legitimate government of Congo sought to cast their net wider by approaching the Soviet Union for military assistance in the event that there was no speedy response from the UN to their request for military assistance.

Hoskyns (1961:127-8) observed that the two Congolese leaders concurrently dispatched a cable to the Soviet leader requesting him to be on standby while closely monitoring the developments in the Congo. The request for Soviet assistance was sent on 14 July, the day the Security Council authorised the deployment of ONUC through Security Council Resolution 145 dated 14 June 1960 (Higgins 1980). Abi-Saab (1978:9) is of the view that the request made to the Soviet Union was probably an initiative “conceived as a lever inciting the UN and the Western powers to exert pressure on Belgium to withdraw.” This view cannot be substantiated however it is important to note that it was well within the powers of the Congolese leadership to invite international assistance to bolster the country’s self-defence when faced by foreign military aggression. Equally, it cannot be ruled out that the invitation extended to the Soviet Union was a desperate attempt at influencing the Western powers to speedily influence their NATO counterpart (Belgium) to withdraw from Congo. ONUC officials, sadly interpreted the initiative differently as they believed this was enough proof that Lumumba was pro-Soviet and that he wanted to set the two super powers against each other, a development they resolved to

thwart at all costs. The viewing of Lumumba as a pro-Soviet revolutionary significantly influenced the decision making process of the Secretary General and his close advisers that were predominantly American citizens (O'Brien 1962; Collins 1992).

Grovogui (2002:332) argues that the US, Belgium and their Western allies wanted to preserve their access to Congo's strategic and rare minerals and other natural resources to offset Soviet advantages in access to raw materials. Thus the need to explicitly reverse the unilateral intervention by Belgian troops, the fear of Soviet involvement in Congo, and the determination to deny the Soviets access to strategic minerals as well as depriving them any pretext for unilateral or covert involvement in the Congo influenced the deployment of ONUC (Collins 1992). The purpose of deploying UN peacekeepers was therefore not necessarily to assist the Congolese re-assert their independence and sovereignty as requested by central government following external aggression by Belgian troops and foreign mercenaries. It was rather to facilitate the smooth withdrawal of Belgian metropolitan troops that were to be replaced by peacekeepers that had come to guarantee the safety of the Congolese white population and other foreigners (*Ibid*). The full strategic implications of deploying peacekeepers in Congo were not apparent to the Soviet Union that voted in favour of the deployment in Congo while Britain and France abstained.

James (1990:291) is of the view that the idea of deploying UN peacekeepers in Congo was widely embraced "although its implications were less than fully understood" by the majority of nations that believed such missions were meant to truly address international crises in an impartial manner. Taking advantage of the wisdom of hind sight, it is now apparent that the Secretary General and his American dominated advisory team (as will be explained later) had sinister and malicious strategic designs to ensure that Western interests were preserved and promoted at the expense of the well-being of the Congolese population and government as long as Western interests, particularly American interests were safeguarded.

The Congolese initial request for "technical assistance" from the UN was with a view "to reorganizing and retraining the Congolese National Army" (Urquhart 1987:393), as a component of security sector reform that was meant to be part of the larger scheme of peace-building measures advocated by the Secretary General. Important to note is that the Congolese Government's appeal for UN assistance came after the US had declined a similar request from three Cabinet Ministers namely Gizenga, Bamboko and Nyembo (Hoskyns 1961:114) at a time when the President and the Prime Minister were away touring the country. The US advised the

Congolese authorities to approach the UN for assistance as they publicly declared that it was “undesirable” for any country to unilaterally come to the aid of Congo (Higgins 1980:264).

Ball (1961:6-7) argues that on receipt of the Congolese request for military assistance, the US considered three options for their response namely: to do nothing; it could agree to the Congolese request for American troops, or it could encourage the Congolese to approach the UN. The US authorities were afraid that the Soviets would influence the Congolese leadership towards adopting communism in a “from chaos to communism syndrome.” As such, the US opted to use the UN peacekeepers as an “umbrella” for its anti-communist policy in Congo that would achieve desired results at a far less cost compared to direct military involvement (Housen 2002). American strategic interests in Africa were driven by a desire to secure valuable natural resources and political influence that would guarantee the longevity of America’s capitalist system, Military Industrial Complex (MIC), and global economic superiority while denying the same to the Soviet Union (*Ibid.*).

It is therefore apparent that the Americans suggested the channelling of the Congolese Government request to the UN because of two reasons. Firstly, they wanted to keep the Soviets out of the Central African region hence they ensured that the Soviets would not have any plausible pretext for unilateral intervention in Congo once international peacekeepers were in the country performing their tasks. Secondly, the US knew fully well that American national strategic interests would be safeguarded by the American dominated UN peacekeeping political structure without its direct involvement. This view is supported by the composition of the UN Security Council in 1960 when Taiwan held the Chinese seat in the Security Council and the domination of the General Assembly by the pro-Western Latin American countries as explained below.

Weissman (1974:60) observed that during the early 1960s, the UN acted as a satisfactory vehicle for the promotion of American policy through its domination of key and strategic organs of the world body. In the Security Council the West had four out of five permanent seats with the power of veto (Taiwan represented China) and three out of six of the elected seats. In the General Assembly, the Western and Latin American states only needed 12 Afro-Asian votes to secure the two-thirds majority. A high percentage of staff that manned the Secretariat was basically Western in orientation and outlook in a situation where Americans, British and French staff members held 49 of the 102 senior appointments (*Ibid.*). Weissman highlights the fact that the closest advisors to the Secretary General Hammarskjold were all Americans

namely; Ralph Bunche; Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs, Andrew; Executive Assistant and Heinz Wieschoff; Bunche's deputy and the Secretariat's African expert (*Ibid*). This point is critical in that critical strategic decisions made regarding ONUC were handled by the Secretary General and his close American advisers.

During the early 1960s before most colonies attained independence, the UN membership had a predominantly pro-Western bias. Added to this scenario was the fact that the Secretary General had an American dominated advisory team for peacekeeping in Congo. It is therefore prudent to conclude that the drafting of the mandate and controversial interpretation of Security Council resolutions on the Congo crisis were influenced by the pro-Western bias of critical institutions of the UN to the detriment of the Congolese people and Government thereby rendering the Congolese Government ineffective and incapable to serve the interests of its citizens.

### 3.2.2 UNSC authorization of ONUC

This section aims to highlight the Secretary General's cunning presentation of the Congolese crisis to the Security Council that led to the authorization of a peacekeeping mission to facilitate the withdrawal of invading Belgian troops as opposed to what the Congolese Government had requested for-military action against invading foreign forces and secessionist elements in Katanga Province.

On receipt of the Congolese government request for military assistance to evict the invading Belgian troops, the Secretary General presented the crisis to the Security Council in a manner that ensured that Belgium's intervention was not characterized as an aggression as this would have meant condemnation of Belgium by fellow NATO powers as well as calling for collective measures against it as provided for by Article 39 of the Charter of which Belgian allies were not prepared to do (Abi-Saab 1978:11). The Secretary General packaged and characterized the Congo crisis in such a manner as to nudge the Security Council to respond to the crisis without either taking military action to forcefully evict the invading troops nor taking action that would condemn their illegality (*Ibid*:13).

ONUC was established by Resolution S/4387 of 14 July 1960 which referred to the "request for military assistance" made by the President and Prime Minister of Congo and authorised the Secretary General to "provide military assistance until the national security forces could meet their tasks". The exact UN Charter basis for the establishment of ONUC was not very clear however, it was assumed that the basis was predicated on Article 40 in Chapter VII though

there was no formal determination under Article 39 of a “threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression” (Higgins 1980:54). The Security Council Resolution was crafted in such a manner that it did not formally condemn the Belgian act of aggression which was indeed a violation of international law and the UN Charter. In the view of the Western powers who dominated the Security Council as outlined above, Belgium was fulfilling a necessary function of protecting the lives of threatened foreigners in Congo. The Secretary General Hammarskjold referred the crisis in Congo as “the situation in Congo” as opposed to using such terms as the “dispute” or “conflict” in Congo, a deliberate move to avoid expressions that would lead to the condemnation of Belgian intervention by the Security Council (Al Qaq 2009).

It has been argued that the Secretary General’s presentation to the Security Council was designed to avoid a veto and ensure support from the two colonial powers in the Security Council namely Britain and France (Abi-Saab 1978:11). Given this scenario, Secretary General Hammarskjold opted to avoid the use of the term “aggression” in order to save a fellow Western nation from condemnation and embarrassment (*Ibid.*). The interests of the Congolese people were not a priority in the Secretary General’s priorities as there was no mention of the plight of the Congolese population whatsoever. The use of peacekeepers as a face saving strategy for big powers was also used during the Suez Crisis of 1956 when the same Secretary General crafted UNEF 1’s mandate to facilitate and ensure a face saving withdrawal of foreign aggressor nations, Britain, France and Israel as they withdrew from Egypt (Urquhart 1987:132).

The Secretary General’s deliberate failure to condemn Belgian intervention in Congo as a violation of Congo’s sovereignty resulted in bitter exchanges between him and Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba (Abi Saab 1978). This also led to serious misunderstandings on the interpretation of the Security Council’s resolutions and the role of ONUC specifically on dealing with the invading Belgian troops and the rebellious Katangese troops supporting the secessionist regime of Tshombe.

Security Council Resolution 143 of 14 July 1960 (*UN SC Res S/4387, 14 July 1960*)authorized the deployment of ONUC to facilitate a smooth withdrawal of Belgian troops that had invaded Congo and not to evict the invading foreign troops as requested by the host government (O’Neill and Rees 2005:46). The Security Council Resolution authorized the Secretary General:

...to take the necessary steps, in consultation with the Government of the Republic of Congo, to provide the Government with such military assistance as may be necessary until, through the

efforts of the Congolese Government with the technical assistance of the United Nations, the national security forces may be able, in the opinion of the Government, to meet fully their tasks... (UN Doc. (S/4387); Abi-Saab (1978:16) and The Blue Helmets (1990:219).

The Secretary General's perspective was that the Congo mission was not initially deployed to resolve an internal conflict in that country but to contain the conflict that could possibly have otherwise drawn in the great powers and to assist in the decolonization process (Fortuna 2004:271). Here lies the initial source of UN peacekeeping mission failure in Congo. The mandate's failure to prioritize and address the root causes of the conflict in Congo became a bitter source of acrimonious friction between Prime Minister Lumumba and the Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold.

Important to note is the fact that the mandate envisaged a strong collaboration between the peacekeeping mission in Congo and the Congolese government in order to "provide the Government with such military assistance as may be necessary until...the national security forces... meet fully their tasks" (UN SC Res. 143 of 1960). The wording of the mandate was a compromise among Security Council members who were pursuing different agendas through the deployment of the peacekeepers. The two superpowers supported the deployment of UN peacekeepers to rescue a failing decolonization gamble that was fast spiralling out of control as a result of manipulation by foreign powers.

They were each jostling for the friendship of this rich and strategically important new African state (James 1990:291). Cognisant of the strategic importance of the Congo in terms of its vital mineral resources and its strategic locations in the heart of Africa, the US and the Soviet Union agreed to the deployment of a UN peacekeeping force (Adebajo and Landsberg 2007:165) hoping that this would avert direct or indirect rivalry between the two Cold War ideological camps (James 1990:291). Unfortunately this was not to be the case as tensions between the Congolese government and ONUC officials took a nasty twist as a direct result of the Secretary General's mishandling of the crisis.

A close examination of differing interpretations of the mandates would shed some light on the magnitude and intensity of the conflict of interests between the host government's priorities and those of the Secretary General and his close advisers and further exposes the hypocritical interpretation of the Security Council Resolutions to serve US interests.

### 3.2.3 Interpretation of the Security Council Resolutions by the UNSG and Prime Minister of Congo

This section highlights the magnitude and intensity of the enmity and suspicion that developed between the secretary General Hammarskjold and the Prime Minister Lumumba as a direct result of different interpretations of the UN mandate for ONUC. This is critical as it forms the crux of the problem that complicated the Congo crisis ultimately leading to the assassination of Patrice Lumumba and mission overall failure to bring lasting peace and security to Congo.

The Security Council resolution authorizing the deployment of ONUC did not outline the exact objectives of the mission and did not define what tasks were to be carried out by the Congolese security forces in cooperation with the peacekeepers until the mission was declared a success. This lack of detailed tasks to ensure mission success partly contributed to mission failure as it became not only difficult but controversial to determine what peacekeeping mission success could be defined as under prevailing circumstances.

According to Abi-Saab (1978:17), Secretary General Hammarskjold interpreted ONUC's mission in Congo as having "no direct functions in relation to withdrawal of Belgian troops" in the Congo but rather indirectly in that the Belgians would withdraw after law and order had been re-established. Accordingly, this meant that the mission was designed to facilitate a way out, a face saving and a decent withdrawal of Belgian troops from the Congo without any embarrassment whatsoever. In addition, the Secretary General in a report to the Security Council made a firm statement that ONUC was "neither to become a party to any internal dispute nor to resort to force except in self-defence" (James 1990:292). This approach was in sharp contrast with Lumumba's view, that ONUC's primary mission was to effectively engage and deal with the invading Belgian forces first and later the secessionist forces to end Katanga's claim of independence.

Despite the requests jointly submitted to the UN by Lumumba and Kasa Vubu for military assistance to effectively deal with the Belgian invasion of Congo, the ambiguous Security Council resolution was interpreted by Secretary General Hammarskjold as implying that ONUC was not legally mandated to engage in military action against the invading Belgian troops although Belgium's military invasion was the main trigger for ONUC deployment. Thus ONUC's main mission was to assist the Congolese government to maintain law and order. Once this was achieved, it was assumed the Belgians would then withdraw after realizing that the Europeans in Congo were safe and did not need Belgian troops for their protection

(Akehurst 1984:189). The ambiguity regarding the peacekeeping mission and its obscure objectives formed a bitter source of conflict between Lumumba and the UN Secretary General.

O'Neill and Rees (2005) have argued that ambiguous mandates were meant to give the Secretary General enough room to manoeuvre where the circumstances were not legally binding and left room for flexibility in deciding what mandate the peacekeepers would have. Prime Minister Lumumba could be forgiven for having interpreted the deployment of ONUC as “the government’s right arm” since that was what the Congolese government had requested for, as a reinforcement to their efforts to get rid of the invading Belgian troops and foreign mercenaries (O'Neill and Rees 2005:56). The UN role was tacitly but clearly predicated on the assumption that it was willing and capable of helping the new Congolese Government exert total and effective control over all its national territory and effectively neutralize and ultimately defeat the secessionists (Ekpebu 1989:31-38).

Prime Minister Lumumba questioned the impartiality of Secretary General Hammarskjold in his interpretation of the resolution as well as his initiatives to engage in negotiations with Katangese authorities behind the government’s back. Lumumba wrote to the Hammarskjold a scathing letter convinced that the 14 July UN resolution firmly stated that “in its intervention in the Congo the UN is not to act as a neutral organization but rather that the Security Council was to place all its resources at the disposal of my government” (Abi-Saab 1978:46). Lumumba castigated and challenged Hammarskjold’s initiative to engage in “secretive” negotiations with Tshombe the secessionist leader without prior consultation with the Central Government. He made his views clear that he considered Hammarskjold to be interfering in Congo’s internal affairs between his government and secessionist Katanga using the UN peacekeepers “to influence its outcome which is formally prohibited by the very paragraph which you invoked” (Ibid.:46-47). This in Lumumba’s view was in violation of the UN Charter as well as Congo’s sovereignty. On his part, Hammarskjold insisted that his actions were part of “quiet diplomacy” essential for securing an agreement from secessionist leader Moise Tshombe to comply with the demands from ONUC. The sharp contrast in the interpretation of the mandate which continued to sour relations between the Secretary General and the Prime Minister can be discerned from detailed tasks given to General Carl von Horn by the Secretary General’s Special Representative in Congo.

Briefing General Carl von Horn the substantive commander of ONUC on his arrival in Congo, Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs Ralph Bunche interpreted the Security Council

resolution loosely as follows: ONUC was to replace the Belgians in key strategic areas and once this was achieved, the Belgians would withdraw followed by ONUC's replacement of the unreliable Congolese National Army (ANC) troops, curb the unruly behaviour and activities of the local army and gradually transform them into a more reliable and professional force. Bunche further emphasised that General Von Horn was expected to secure ONUC's freedom of movement across the length and breadth of Congo and was to ensure that he prevented any unilateral interference by the Soviets following the request for assistance made by Lumumba. Bunche made it clear to General von Horn that his mission was to effectively "take over the responsibility for law and order maintenance in the country both from the Belgians and the rebellious Congolese troops posing as the Congolese Army" (Sitkowski 2006:66). This interpretation of the mandate literally implied that ONUC was the "de-facto security force" of an independent Congo whose operations were not obliged to respect the sovereignty of the host country. The legitimacy of this interpretation of the Security Council Resolution raises an ethical dilemma considering that the Congolese Army was rebellious and harassing innocent civilians and the other troops in the country were the invading Belgian troops. In such a situation the UN peacekeepers appeared to be the only legitimate force available to bring about law and order in the country.

The tasks outlined by Bunche to General von Horn could not have been successfully accomplished without serious and controversial interference in the internal affairs of the host country. Higgins (1980:40) observed that it was extremely difficult not to interfere in Congo's domestic affairs, considering that the mission had been tasked with the responsibility to maintain law and order and territorial integrity of the host country in an attempt to prevent an outbreak of civil war. In addition he is of the view that overseeing Belgian troop withdrawal was to prove increasingly challenging considering that the UN had "a clear bias towards the central government and its juridical sovereignty (*Ibid.*)."<sup>1</sup> Important to note is the fact that there was no serious emphasis given for cooperation with the Congolese Army or authorities in the law and order maintenance instructions given to General von Horn by Bunche. Moreover the interpretation of the Security Council Resolution posed a dilemma in that Bunche's interpretation also served as an alternative legitimate interpretation. However, lack of emphasis on cooperation with Congolese political leadership served as a clear demonstration of contempt of Congolese authorities in violation of that country's sovereignty.

Hammarskjold and Bunche's interpretation of the Security Council resolution angered Lumumba who argued that the UN forces were in the Congo on the invitation of the Congolese

Government specifically to deal with the invading Belgian troops. Moreover, Lumumba argued that the Katanga secessionist movement was not an authentic secessionist movement but rather “a mere façade for foreign intervention” without which the whole attempt to secede would have collapsed much earlier (Hoskyns 1961:173). The Secretary General Hammarskjold remained adamant and insisted that the Katanga problem was an internal crisis which the UN would remain neutral and impartial, a strategy meant to buy time for the consolidation of the Katangese authorities that was designed to make the Katanga secession appear less directly dependent on Belgian troops and foreign mercenaries (*Ibid*).

Tshombe welcomed the Secretary General’s interpretation of the UN resolution and his proposed terms of introducing ONUC troops in Katanga as this served his strategic designs to hypocritically enter into an unexplained relationship with Central Government while buying time to consolidate the foundations of his illegitimate independence (Abi-Saab 1978:45). In the interim, the CIA, the Secretary General and his inner core advisers were working out a plan to immobilize, neutralize and ultimately eliminate Lumumba from Congo’s political scene in blatant violation of Congo’s national sovereignty (Collins 1993).

Lumumba, sensing the conspiracy, made five requests to the Secretary General: “(a) to send exclusively African and Congolese troops immediately to Katanga; (b) to withdraw all non-African troops there from; (c) to provide UN planes for the transport of Congolese civil and military personnel to Katanga; (d) to seize all arms and ammunitions distributed by the Belgians in Katanga and give them to the Central Government; and (e) to entrust the guarding of all airfields exclusively to Congolese army and police instead of UN troops” (UN Doc. S/4417/Add. 7/II). Secretary General Hammarskjold in a demonstration of contempt for the Prime Minister refused to respond to the substance of Lumumba’s demands but promised to forward them for discussion in the next Security Council meeting where both the Secretary General and Lumumba would have an opportunity to defend their positions and views (*Ibid*.). The Secretary General remained adamant that ONUC would remain “impartial” yet covertly it was working towards promoting Western interests in Congo as will be explained in detail in subsequent paragraphs below.

The ambiguity of the mandate and competing interpretations of the mandate created irreconcilable enmity and mistrust between the Secretary General Hammarskjold and Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba. The suspicion battle between these two influential individuals played out prominently after the deployment of ONUC as their inter-personal conflicts further

complicated an already complex situation that served to undermine the ability of the host government to protect its population in fulfilment of its mandate to safeguard the well-being of the Congolese population.

### **3.3 Unethical deployment of pro-western troops and US civilians in Congo**

This section sets the stage for a deeper understanding of why the UN peacekeeping mission in Congo was accused by non-Western countries of having been reduced to a proxy military force for the advancement of US foreign policy manoeuvres and not as a conflict resolution agent of the UN Security Council (Bellamy, Williams and Griffin 2010:87). The section further highlights ONUC's failure to tackle the crisis triggering challenges that the Congolese Government had requested the UN military force to deal with. During the first year of its deployment in Congo, ONUC did not engage itself in any robust diplomatic and military offensive operations to evict the foreign invading forces (Al Qaq 2009). Instead, the leadership of ONUC became embroiled in the power politics of Congo that resulted in the assassination of Lumumba with ONUC connivance. Ultimately ONUC became the legitimizing force of an unelected and undemocratic dictatorial regime that was installed to serve Western interests and not the self-determination aspirations of the Congolese people (Saksena 1974).

During the first few weeks of deployment ONUC failed to immediately engage the invading Belgian troops and secessionist Katangese troops, as requested by the Congolese authorities. As a result of this failure the UN force was harassed and rebuked rather than being assisted by the Congolese Government as tribal and ideological considerations fuelled by outside forces were tearing the Congolese government apart (James 1990:295). The role of outside military and political forces in transforming ONUC into a US proxy force is fully explained by the selection and appointment of key decision makers in the affairs of ONUC which is covered in detail below. In an interview with an AU diplomat in Addis Ababa, he stated that this should not have come as a surprise as UN peacekeeping missions were designed as political games that are played at the grand strategic level among the competing world powers with little consideration paid to the ultimate effects on the local population (Mwanasali September 2015).

The first UN guiding principle in the selection of troop contributing countries for ONUC was that no military units or staff officers from any of the permanent members of the Security Council were to participate "given the potential...to escalate rather than reduce cold War rivalries (Annan 2012:33). The second principle was that the concept of regionalism in the resolution of international conflicts was to be upheld hence the appeal to African leaders to

provide the bulk of the peacekeeping troops (Simmonds 1968:137). These principles were both violated at the onset of the operation. The appointment of a Special Representative of the Secretary General to Congo, Ralph Bunche a seasoned American diplomat who was also the overall commander of ONUC in the field during the early days of its deployment was in violation of the first principle that prohibited staff officers and troops from permanent members of the Security Council from participating in UN peacekeeping operations. It also contributed to the violation of the peacekeeping principle of “impartiality”, which for the sake of this study is defined as follows: “peacekeepers will be expected to serve universalistic interests … and must not serve the parochial interests of specific foreign powers, which seek to project their influence into the conflict in question” (Gibbs 2000:360). The critical importance of impartiality has been emphasised by several scholars such as James (1990: 106); Ramsbotham and Woodhouse and Ramsbottom (1996:125) and Goulding (1993:454). James (1996:211) emphasises that “it is impartiality which gives peacekeepers its distinctiveness … is the lifeblood of peacekeeping.”

The Secretary General’s initiative to deploy a seasoned and “prestigious internationally known” American diplomat in Congo to “provide overall supervision for the operation” raises serious ethical and moral concerns regarding the Secretary General’s impartiality and neutrality in dealing with the two superpowers. The UN peacekeeping mission had “the preponderance of American personnel” in charge of the planning in New York and execution in the Congo (Gibbs 2000:364). Members of the Eastern Bloc countries were excluded from key decision sessions and “care was taken to see that no member of Secretariat, who was a citizen of a communist state, saw the Congo telegrams” (O’Brien 1962:55-66). Bunche’s deployment to Congo gave far reaching advantages to the US and her allies at the expense of the Soviet Union and her allies and the host country since both superpowers were jostling to establish friendship with this mineral rich and strategically located central African state (James 1990:291).

The deployment of senior US officials in peacekeeping operations was a way of facilitating the entrenchment of US influence in post-colonial countries to replace the vacuum left behind by the weakened and withdrawing former colonial masters (Al Qaq 2009). Bunche worked closely with the US Ambassador to Congo to the extent that the US Embassy saw some of his cables dispatched to the UN Headquarters in New York and at some point relied on US Embassy communication facilities to link up with his Secretary General (Urquhart 1993:312). To make matters worse, the first two military commanders of ONUC were from NATO member states,

further giving the Western countries unrivalled advantage over their Soviet counterparts since the top leadership of ONUC was effectively under Western oriented practitioners.

General Alexander, a Briton, was ONUC's first military commander followed by Swedish General Carl von Horn. At the start of ONUC operations, the two most senior UN officials in Congo were an American, Ralph Bunche and a Briton, General Alexander thus heavily tilting the geo-strategic and geo-political balance in favour of Western interests. British General Alexander was later succeeded by "a fierce anti-communist" Swedish General Carl von Horn (Dayal 1976) which guaranteed a further entrenchment of Western interests in Congo. The decision of appointing a known "fierce anti-communist" Swedish General to command ONUC could hardly be coincidental given the deliberate efforts to deny the Soviets access to Congo's strategic minerals and natural resources. At the UN headquarters in New York, the set-up was such that decisions made were to guarantee the promotion and safeguarding of Western interests in the Congo with little regard to the implications on the local population and the host government.

According to (Al-Qaq 2009:155) at the beginning of ONUC operations in Congo, three prominent American citizens namely-Ralph Bunche, Andrew Cordier and Heinz Wieschof were virtually running the show regarding the planning and execution of ONUC operations. The Secretary General Hammarskjold had an inner secretive cabinet, the so called 'Congo Club' that exclusively consisted of himself and Americans and an outer layer of neutrals mainly Afro-Asians (O'Brien 1962:56). This goes to demonstrate that the top command and administrative hierarchy of ONUC was set up in an unprofessional and unethical fashion. The Secretary General Hammarskjold went to the extent of insisting that the overall military command authority for ONUC was vested in himself as he created a command structure that was predominantly civilian resulting in sustained civilian-military friction from the beginning of the operation (O'Neill and Rees 2005:64). This strange command arrangement led Simmonds (1968:161) to lament that "the wisdom of charging the Secretary-General with "command authority" for ONUC operations is one that cannot readily be accepted." To buttress the preponderance of American influence over ONUC affairs, Saksena (1974:272) observed that: "...from beginning to the end the shadow of the greatest Power on earth, the US loomed large in the UN operations in Congo...The result was that they could not help becoming an instrument to achieve US policy goals."

It is therefore apparent that Secretary General Hammarskjold and his “inner cabinet” made maximum use of this command and administrative arrangement to successfully influence operations in the field to suit Western political and strategic designs. This assertion buttresses the argument that ONUC, through the machinations of the UN Secretary General and his close associates in New York and UN officials in Congo deliberately undermined the authority of the Congolese Government, further weakening the government’s ability to take charge of events in the country by hand picking their preferred leaders loyal their western masters.

American financial assistance to ONUC amounted to approximately 42 per cent of all total expenses incurred during entire operation (Lefever and Joshua 1966:154-155). Had the US withdrawn this massive financial support, the operation could have been brought to a grinding halt considering that France and the Soviet Union had declined to pay their dues arguing that the mission was serving American and not UN interests. Considering the operating environment prevailing within the UN Headquarters, O’Brien (1962:56) is of the view that, “it is almost certainly true to say that any Secretary General who lost the confidence of Washington would have to resign.” The predominance of Western influence was extended to field troops in Congo, a situation that was unsuccessfully challenged by the Eastern Bloc.

The Soviet Union queried Canada’s involvement in the peacekeeping operation arguing that Canada was an ally of Belgium in NATO hence its participation was incompatible with the obligations of a UN international military service constituted by non-interested member countries (Simmonds 1968:139). Canada was even given a sensitive responsibility of providing communication resources to all peacekeepers deployed in Congo, an opportunity that was later taken advantage of when a Canadian officer tracked Lumumba’s movements in an unethical conspiracy to facilitate his arrest and subsequent assassination by Katangese authorities(Spooner 2009:109). Swedish troops were first introduced into Katanga Province several months before African peacekeepers could be allowed in the Province. This was said to be a confidence building initiative by the Secretary General to calm the white foreigners in this secessionist province, a development that infuriated Lumumba and further compounded their mutual suspicion and mistrust (Al Qaq 2009). Not surprisingly therefore, many complaints were later raised at various stages of the operation sharply critical of the employment of non-African troops in the Congo operation.

This section has demonstrated the degree to which ONUC decision making hierarchy was Western biased and predominantly American. It has been articulated that major decisions

regarding the composition of ONUC leadership were meant not to advance UN and Congolese interests but rather American geo-strategic self-interests in its Cold War competition with the Soviet Union and its endeavour to fill the vacuum left by departing former colonial powers. Whereas the US was ahead of the Soviet Union in scheming its strategic moves in Congo, Prime Minister Lumumba was equally busy with counter moves designed to secure Soviet involvement in the Congo crisis; an initiative that ultimately aggravated western hatred against the Prime Minister as he was seen as trying to introduce communist influence in this region considered a preserve of Western influence.

### 3.3.1 Implications of Soviet military assistance to Lumumba

This section attempts to illustrate how the predominantly American decision making ONUC hierarchy misinterpreted Lumumba's motivation in requesting for Soviet military assistance. It also evaluates the implications for Lumumba's deployment of government troops to fight secessionists in Kasai Province that had followed the lead taken by Katanga Province.

Having failed to convince Secretary General Hammarskjold to militarily engage invading Belgian troops and foreign mercenaries, Lumumba requested and received military assistance from the Soviet Union. This was in conformity with the provisions of the UN Charter that authorises foreign military assistance for the sake of self-defence in the case of military aggression. Congo thus became the first independent African country to receive military aid from the Soviet Union and this infuriated the Hammarskjold who vowed to "under-cut Lumumba" (Arnold 1999:94).

In connivance with his American close advisers, the Secretary General sought to ensure that decolonised Congo remained within the Western powers' sphere of influence and not to depart too far from the colonial path of paternalism that existed during the Belgian colonial era. The Secretary General and his advisors believed that Lumumba had raised the pitch of the crisis to Cold War super power confrontation level. They interpreted Lumumba's use of Soviet military equipment as an initiative to establish a communist foothold in the Southern African region primarily designed to scuttle Western strategic interests in that part of Africa. This misunderstanding was a clear manifestation of a conflict characterised by mistrust between the UN senior officials and the Prime Minister of Congo and his followers. Instead of creating a harmonious and constructive working relationship between the UN mission and the host government, serious friction and pursuit of conflicting agendas ensued as a result of irreconcilable interpretation of the mandate issued by the UN Security Council Resolutions and

failure to agree on priority tasks for ONUC. The misunderstanding between the Prime Minister and the Secretary General deteriorated to such levels where UN officials began to explore ways of removing Lumumba from the political stage in Congo in preference of a more moderate pro-Western Congolese leader; initiatives that were directly in conflict with the principle of host state sovereignty.

In a demonstration of double standards by ONUC officials who had earlier violently opposed Lumumba's military request from the Soviet Union, President Kasa Vubu was later allowed to appeal for external forces to deal with Katangese rebels and mercenaries well after the death of Lumumba. This action was condoned by ONUC officials because the Congolese government was firmly under pro-Western leaders (UN Doc. S/4630 of 16 Jan. 1961).

The next section examines the handling of the constitutional crisis in Congo that aggravated an already precarious situation; a direct result of ONUC officials' meddling in the internal affairs of the host nation.

### **3.4 Mishandling of the Congo constitutional crisis by ONUC officials**

This section aims to expose the magnitude of unethical meddling in Congolese political power dynamics by senior members of ONUC in violation of the principal of impartiality.

Ralph Bunche, the first UN Special Representative to Congo unceremoniously left the country as a result of his political clashes with Prime Minister Lumumba. He was replaced by another American diplomat Andrew Cordier. The arrival of Andrew Cordier coincided with a serious constitutional crisis in which President Joseph Kasa Vubu and Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba engaged in reciprocal efforts to dismiss each other from office (Collins 1993:10). Cordier's controversial and unethical decisions in his capacity as the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General effectively threw UN political support behind the moderate and pro-Western Kasa Vubu. In doing so he reinforced US and Belgian efforts to oust the radical and pro-Eastern Lumumba - seriously compromising the UN principles of neutrality and impartiality (*Ibid*: 10-11).

Cordier's first strategic move was to authorise the use of ONUC budgeted funds to purchase food and payment of outstanding salaries to the mutinous Congolese soldiers which became a very important factor in the maintenance of the soldiers' "neutrality" during and after the constitutional crisis (Dayal 1976:34). He took this decision acting on the understanding that ONUC was responsible for the maintenance of law and order and fearing the possible arrival

of Lumumba's reinforcements and supporters in the capital city. This action was neither taken in good faith nor was it neutral. It was designed to consolidate the newly promoted Colonel Mobutu's authority and popularity among the Congolese soldiers who had not been paid their salaries for months. Cordier's initiative was meant to buy the soldiers' loyalty for Mobutu and prepare the ground for his coup attempt a few days later (Kalb 1982:96). Thereafter, Cordier made several key decisions that effectively aligned the UN with Kasa Vubu in his dispute with Lumumba.

Following the dismissal of Lumumba from office Cordier made his most important and strategic decisions that completely changed the political landscape and power dynamics in Congo. He ordered UN troops to close the major airports and to seize the national radio station in the capital under the false pretence to ostensibly keep the crisis within bounds and especially to avoid bloody civil outbreaks (Dayal 1976:37). This illegal and unethical act in violation of Congolese sovereignty had far reaching implications as it primarily hurt Lumumba's political plans and ambitions and tilted the political power balance in favour of Kasa Vubu.

Prior arrangements had been made for Kasa Vubu to have access to radio facilities in neighbouring Congo (Brazzaville) while Lumumba was denied a platform to appeal to his national political followers (Weissman 1974:91-2). Similarly, Kasa Vubu's political allies were allowed to use the ostensibly closed airport to travel into the Congolese interior to mobilize support for the president while Lumumba's supporters were grounded(O'Brien:1962).Both actions served to entrench Kasa Vubu's control of the capital while silencing his charismatic rival Lumumba.

Cordier did not bother to consult or inform the newly appointed UN Special Representative who was already in Leopoldville before issuing such far reaching instructions that violated Congo's sovereignty. Urquhart observed that Dayal the newly posted Special Representative was "taken aback by Cordier's decisions," to the extent that, "for a moment he considered resigning" (Urquhart 1987:446). Cordier's failure to inform Dayal about his controversial decisions would suggest that he knew that Dayal would not endorse such unethical decisions that openly favoured one party in the Congo crisis against the other.

The political decisions taken by Cordier, a UN senior diplomat in Leopoldville were a strategic master-stroke that eventually led to the downfall and subsequent arrest and assassination of Lumumba. Al-Qaq (2009:31) concludes that this equally demonstrated the futility of considering UN peacekeeping activities as "impartial, neutral and disinterested." The rationale

of deploying senior American diplomats as Special Representatives of the Secretary General appear to have paid dividends towards fulfilment of a deliberately well calculated strategic plan to influence events in Congo in the direction preferred by the American government.

Cordier, in his acting capacity succeeded in "immobilizing" the Congolese Army to such an extent that it could not be used by Lumumba who had been placed under virtual house arrest. His unethical and illegal actions served to deepen the Congolese crisis and enhanced greater chances of Congolese civil war as some tribes felt deliberately short changed by the UN peacekeeping mission through biased interference in the country's internal affairs. This view is supported by Dayal (1976) who stated that at worst Cordier inadvertently abetted an anti-Lumumba plot conceived and directed by Western embassies. O'Brien (1968:93-94) who was the UN representative in Katanga in 1961, believes that Cordier deliberately helped Washington plot Lumumba's ouster, and may have done so with Secretary General Hammarskjold's plausibly deniable approval. This researcher shares O'Brien's version considering that Secretary General Hammarskjold and Cordier strongly believed that Congolese internal squabbles and bickering were of less significance in international politics compared to the potential of East-West conflict arising from the Congo crisis.

The facilitation of Mobutu's coup d'état and immediate closure of Soviet and Eastern countries' embassies in Congo culminating in the assassination of Lumumba, were meant to ensure that the communist bloc, was effectively denied a possibility of having meaningful influence in post-independence Congo (Collins 1993). In trying to ensure the success of the UN mission as they conceived it in the Congo, Cordier and other top UN leaders took steps which constituted de facto intervention in internal Congolese affairs. In effect, they played kingmaker, albeit within certain constraints of deniability (*Ibid.*). ONUC officials made a deliberate choice of their preferred Congolese leaders and gave them full support in complete disregard of the wishes of the majority of Congolese people and parliament. In so doing Cordier's actions compromised the UN professed principles of neutrality, impartiality and non-interference in internal affairs of member countries. It is therefore not surprising that many Africans, Non-Aligned Members as well as the Eastern bloc countries expressed their indignation at the manner in which ONUC handled the crisis and equally questioned the UN allegedly neutral role in the Congo (Al Qaq 2009).

The next section examines the role played by some accomplice peacekeepers in the assassination of Patrice Lumumba. This is important as it buttresses the point that ONUC was

not primarily deployed to serve the interests of the Congolese population but rather, those of Western powers.

### 3.4.1 The Assassination of Patrice Lumumba

This section exposes the unethical practices by ONUC officials that contributed to the assassination of the elected Prime Minister of Congo Patrice Lumumba who was killed in January 1961.

Lumumba was arrested following the constitutional crisis. He escaped from detention and was tracked, captured, tortured and eventually assassinated through the coordinated efforts of Mobutu, Kasa Vubu, Tshombe and the CIA agents (Weissman 1974:88-90. A Canadian Lieutenant Colonel Berthiaume, who continuously monitored Lumumba's movements over the UN communication system supplied and manned by the Canadian contingent, passed up-to-date information to Mobutu of Lumumba's whereabouts who then arranged the capture of Lumumba (Spooner 2009:109). Berthiaume was known to be "sympathetic to the aims, if not always the methods of the Kasa Vubu-Mobutu elements in the Congo" and was therefore an accomplice in the capture and subsequent assassination of Lumumba (*Ibid.*).

On the night of 27-28 November 1960, Lumumba escaped arrest from Leopoldville where he was under the protection of the UN troops (Sitkowski 2006:69). As the legally elected Prime Minister, Lumumba later requested for a protection unit from ONUC when he was moving from Port Francqui to Mweka but this was declined by ONUC officials after having consulted Secretary General Hammarskjold, thus deliberately exposing him to danger (*Ibid.*). He was later captured by pro-Mobutu soldiers and subjected to harsh treatment. A Ghanaian platoon commander who witnessed Lumumba being kicked and slapped, tried to intervene to stop the beating without realizing that this could be misconstrued as interference in internal Congolese political affairs (*Ibid* :69-70).

The Ghanaian attempts to secure UN authority to take Lumumba into safe custody were again declined by ONUC officials after consultation with UN headquarters. Challenged in York to explain why ONUC had not protected Lumumba once he was seen being beaten by Congolese troops, Secretary General Hammarskjold replied that it would have necessitated the use of force by ONUC, "an initiative which lay beyond their mandate and was in violation of the principle of the non-use of force" (Abi-Saab 1978:90). The UN assessed that getting Lumumba into their custody and protecting him from his enemies would amount to interference in internal affairs of the Congo as Lumumba was pursuing his political aims in the Province of Kasai where he

was apprehended by Mobutu loyalists. Ultimately Lumumba was handed over to Katanga authorities, where he was later assassinated. His death was announced over the Katanga radio by Godefroid Munongo, Katanga's Interior Minister on 13 February 1961 to the astonishment of the progressive world (Abi Saab 1978).

This political and moral disaster drew sharp criticisms from across the globe with the Soviets accusing the Secretary General Hammarskjold and his ONUC command in Congo of complicity in surrendering Lumumba to Katanga authorities. Indonesia and UAR immediately withdrew their military contingents from ONUC in protest (Sitkowski Op.cit.:70). African members of the “radical Casablanca group” namely Egypt, Morocco and Guinea also withdrew their troops resulting in the UN suffering tremendous reputational damage as a result of the unethical mishandling of this mission by senior ONUC officials (Adebajo and Landsberg 2007:165).

The circumstances surrounding the downfall and elimination of Lumumba reflected serious unethical practices by the UN officials as they connived with Western backed authorities to oust a legitimately elected national leader of the host country, in violation of Congo’s national sovereignty. ONUC officials also denied him protection when he needed it most. The denial of Ghanaian officers to protect Lumumba was a demonstration of utmost contempt of the legitimate host government of Congo by ONUC officials. The fact that the new Congolese authorities handed Lumumba to Katangese officials suggests that there was some prior communication going on between the secessionist leaders and the newly installed Congolese government a situation that explains why Lumumba was not satisfied with Hammarskjöld’s handling of the crisis through his ‘secret diplomacy’ meetings with Tshombe.

Once the US had achieved its strategic goal of eliminating Lumumba from the Congo political scene and the elevation of General Joseph Mobutu to the helm of power, “Washington eventually devised the military plan to end the secession in Katanga” as this marked the first UN peace enforcement mission that not only entrenched US hegemony in Congo but also seriously violated Congo’s national sovereignty (James 1994:44-58).

The use of force by ONUC to incorporate Katanga back into the unified Congo is not part of this study as it was properly constituted through legitimate authorization by the Security Council. However, of major concern is the fact that UN peacekeeping offensive operations in Congo were primarily meant to consolidate the power base of the imposed, unelected and

unconstitutional government in Leopoldville a development that did not serve the self-determination national interests of the Congolese population.

### **3.5 Termination of secession in Katanga Province**

This section serves to highlight the double standards in the use of force exhibited by the UN mission to Congo. It focuses only on the key issues that amplify unethical practices by the UN peacekeepers in the use of force to further subjugate the host population in violation of its national sovereignty.

After the elimination of Lumumba from the Congolese political stage, ONUC became embroiled in what Trevor Findlay (1999), has called the “UN peacekeeping’s first war” in which peacekeepers actively participated in armed conflict with one of the parties to the conflict. This was in sharp contrast with what the Secretary General Hammarskjold argued very strongly against the use of force by ONUC. In a deliberate effort to mislead the international community about the true intentions of the US and the Secretary General, UN officials in Congo working closely with the secret cabinet in New York, embarked on “organised hypocrisy” activities to camouflage their unethical activities in Congo. The SG strongly argued that peacekeepers could not be used to settle internal political problems in Congo of whatever nature including ending the Katanga problem as it clearly “had an internal dimension” yet the same organization was deliberately seeking a military solution to a political problem in order to guarantee the end result that satisfied the geo-political interests of the US and its western allies.

Tshombe failed to get international recognition of his separatist Katanga Province as an independent country (UN Blue Berets 1990:239). The Security Council granted ONUC authority to militarily engage the secessionist rebels in Katanga. The UN was forced to resort to more coercive measures to bring Katanga under the control of Congo Central Government because of Tshombe’s intransigence coupled with repeated attacks on ONUC by Katangese rebel troops led by non-Congolese officers (Ibid :245).

The Security Council in Resolution 169 of November 1961 authorised the Secretary General to use force to complete the removal of mercenaries from Katanga Province (James 1990:295). This was achieved by 21 January 1963 when ONUC took full control of key installations previously held by Katangese rebel troops and mercenaries thereby consolidating the authority of the foreign imposed and un-elected government in Congo. Thereafter there were no controversial or unethical decisions taken by ONUC officials because Congolese Central

Government was now in the hands of the preferred politicians whose coming to power was facilitated by ONUC officials in violation of Congo's sovereignty.

Ultimately the UN peacekeeping mission had succeeded in safeguarding social, economic and political interests and privileges of white settlers across the Southern African sub-region (Al Qaq 2009:161). This view is shared by Stockwell (1978:137) who concluded that "the US went to the extent of manipulating rival Congolese factions and their supporters as well as the United Nations itself... as it mounted an extensive public diplomacy to camouflage its covert operations....ultimately making Congolese politics more complex and fluid." The extent to which ONUC violated Congo's national sovereignty had never been witnessed in previous UN missions. It signalled future US manipulation of UN missions to advance its own self-interests and those of its western allies at the expense of the host populations.

### **3.6 Conclusion**

This chapter has managed to place ONUC, the first UN peacekeeping mission in sub-Saharan Africa in its wider geo-political and geo-strategic context which determined the fate of the peacekeeping mission as a failed attempt to bring about lasting peace and security to the population of Congo. The chapter highlighted unethical political manipulations of Congo's internal politics by some high ranking ONUC officials that significantly contributed to the host government's failure to exercise its sovereignty towards advancing the aspirations of its people as UN officials promoted American and Allied Powers' interests at the expense of the Congolese people as argued in Section 3.4 above.

The Congo crisis (1960-64) marked a significant "watershed" in the evolution of peacekeeping. For the first time ever, the UN got embroiled in domestic affairs of the host country thus setting a major precedent on future UN interventions in domestic affairs of host countries as will be demonstrated in subsequent chapters. The ethical challenge in UN interventions in civil conflicts is that the world body risks becoming embroiled in internal conflicts thereby compromising its "ostensible role as a non-partisan mediator". The chapter has demonstrated that the UN intervention in Congo served as a "midwife to the arrival of the Cold War in Africa; and it inadvertently aborted ... Congo's transition from colonial to democratic rule" (Collins 1993). This abortion was a deliberate and successful attempt to promote American interests during the Cold War at the expense of Congolese wishes and aspirations for political and economic self-determination that were thwarted in favour of promoting western neo-liberal political and economic interests.

This chapter has demonstrated that it is false to argue that peacekeeping operations are primarily designed to bring about peace and tranquillity to the host nation state. The UN mission in Congo was meant to facilitate the introduction and entrenchment of American hegemony in Central and Southern Africa in replacement of the departing colonial powers during decolonization. This view is confirmed by Wedgwood (1995:632) who noted that the US likes peacekeeping operations because they are “the denouement, the winding down of old battles for influence in the Third World between strategic opponents” in which the American hegemony replaces departed colonial powers. This is what transpired in Congo where the peacekeeping mission was used to effect a well calculated and executed regime change agenda. This chapter has therefore convincingly argued that the UN peacekeepers deployed in Congo during the early 1960s did not serve the interests of the Congolese people they purported to have gone to serve and protect. The peacekeepers were used as a proxy force to advance geo-strategic interests of the US and her Western allies.

The next chapter attempts to un-package the UN humanitarian intervention in Somalia and determine to what extent the mission violated Somalia’s sovereignty and whether the deployment was truly motivated by purely humanitarian justifications to help suffering Somalis.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **Ethical challenges to UN and US “humanitarian” interventions in Somalia: from peacekeeping to peace-enforcement (1992-1995)**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

Peacekeeping missions are essentially self-interested responses by the international security system designed to contain conflicts that would otherwise threaten the normal fabric of the system if left unchecked (MacQueen 2006: xiii). Since these missions are authorized by the UNSC on behalf of the world community, it is assumed that they are “inherently good” and therefore expected to produce positive outcomes such as durable peace and stability, re-building war-torn societies, generating respect for the rule of law, and promotion of human rights and democratic principles (Aoi 2011:8). Sadly in reality, this is not always the case since some humanitarian peace enforcement missions result in improved levels of human security, while others lead to greater conflict and human insecurity, as well as prolonging the conflict as happened in Somalia during the early 1990s.

The underlying ethical humanitarian challenge as exemplified in Somalia is that when powerful states agree to intervene in a target country in pursuit of human security, such interventions do not always take cognizance of the political needs and interests of those whom interventions are being undertaken (Lang 2002). Moreover these interventions pay little attention towards respecting the sovereignty of the host country. The recurrent failure to prioritize the genuine wishes of the local population has led to advocacy for stronger modes of peace enforcement in situations where some local actors may not accept the presence of foreign troops on their soil as happened in the Congo during the early 1960s and in Somalia in the early 1990s. To effectively deal with elements resisting the presence of foreign troops, the UN peacekeepers have been increasingly resorting to the use of military force to enhance human security of affected populations without a thorough study of underlying causes of the problems that triggered the conflict in the first place hence this is a matter of trying to impose a military solution to political problems. Unfortunately, the increased UN propensity to resort to the use of force was embraced by Western liberalism as a positive evolution in the international security system (Bell 2010:330). The US-led military “humanitarian” intervention in Somalia is a classic example of UN failure to identify the real causes of the conflict and seek solutions that identify with the wishes of the local population. Ignoring the Somali traditional ways of

solving ethnic problems served to undermine the national sovereignty of the Somali people despite the fact that there was no central government to run the country at the time of the intervention (Nyambuya 13 October 2015). There are a number of reasons that make this chapter important for the current study.

First, the UN and US-led military intervention in Somalia was the first “humanitarian” mission authorized by the Security Council to take military action “without the consent of a sovereign government” and that the mission was undertaken for “explicitly humanitarian reasons” (Wheeler 2000:172). Second, the absence of a central government enabled more experimental intrusive peace-building initiatives and activities that were undertaken by foreign actors in violation of Somalia’s state sovereignty (Greig and Diehl 2005). Third, Atack (2002:279) observed that the US led military “humanitarian intervention” highlights major reasons for ethical objections to such interventions because of “the violation of national sovereignty” of the target state and “the use of armed force with the concomitant loss of life and human suffering.” Fourth, the intervention served as a platform through which the US government usurped control of the “humanitarian mission” from the UN secretariat and later abandoned the world body after setting it up for a dramatic political embarrassment and dismal operational failure (Kapteijns 2013:435). These aspects will be examined further in subsequent paragraphs in order to unravel the true motivational factors that led the UN and US to launch a massive military campaign under the auspices of waging a humanitarian intervention.

This chapter aims to critically examine the underlying motives for military “humanitarian intervention” and the unethical conduct of military operations that not only violated Somalia’s sovereignty but also resulted in the deaths of thousands of ordinary Somali civilians whose hopes had been earlier raised by the arrival of foreign troops to save them from conflict and famine. The main thrust of the chapter is to demonstrate that the joint UN/US military “humanitarian intervention” in Somalia was not driven by purely humanitarian motives and that the use of force by UNOSOM II overwhelmed and undermined the humanitarian concerns for the well-being of ordinary Somalis (Ibid.:422). In doing so, the UN/US military intervention was violating Somalia’s national sovereignty hence the primary objective of this chapter is to determine the extent to which UN/US military adventures violated Somalia’s national sovereignty and the principles of peacekeeping operations.

The chapter is divided into five sections. The first section is a brief historical background to the events that contributed towards the “humanitarian” intervention in Somalia. Section two

explores the non-humanitarian motivations that influenced the UN to deploy a peace enforcement mission in Somalia. Section three is an analysis of non-humanitarian factors that influenced the US to offer the UN 28 000 troops out of a total of 37 000 for intervention in Somalia and how the intervention violated Somalia's national sovereignty. Section four explores the extent to which principles of UN peacekeeping operations were violated by the intervening forces. Section five is the conclusion that summarises major discussions of the chapter.

#### **4.2 Background to the “humanitarian intervention” in Somalia**

This section highlights the post-Cold War security and political environment that led to the “humanitarian intervention” in Somalia by the UN and US peace enforcement forces. Orford (2003:2) observed that following the demise of the Soviet Union, a new kind of international law and internationalist spirit appeared to have been ushered in the conduct of international relations as world conditions were no longer constrained by the ideological struggle between communism and capitalism. This international environment led Douzinas (2003) to argue that the demise of the Soviet Union ushered in a “new moral order … which sees individual human rights being promoted at the expense of state sovereignty” as exemplified in the Somalia crisis where humanitarian interveners paid little attention towards respecting Somalia's state sovereignty.

Humanitarian intervention has been defined as "the justifiable use of force for the purpose of protecting the inhabitants of another state from treatment so arbitrary and persistently abusive as to exceed the limits within which the sovereign is presumed to act with reason and justice (Fonteyne 1974:304). In the case of Somalia, there was no central government to blame for the plight of the suffering Somalis. There were however, two powerful warlords contesting for the control of the capital and parts of Southern Somalia who were running quasi-government militia organizations whose struggle and competition for power exacerbated the famine that ravaged Somalia in 1991-1992.

##### **4.2.1 A Brief historical background to the crisis**

Somalia is a country that is ethnically, religiously and linguistically unified though it is however divided along clan loyalties (Hirsch and Oakley 1995:3). The origins of the humanitarian crisis in Somalia can be traced back to the war between Somalia and Ethiopia (1977-78) over the Somali dominated Ogaden region in which Somalia was defeated and left impoverished (De Waal 1997). This conflict ruined the Somali economy and burdened it with

the challenge of supporting approximately 2 million refugees from Ethiopia a situation where Somalia ended up having the highest ratio of refugees to indigenous population in the entire world; a burden it could not sustain on its own (Furley and May 1998:144). War torn Somalia thus became an important market for the disposal of other countries' surplus agricultural produce including from the US as donor agencies scrambled for opportunities to participate in the lucrative humanitarian business where the UN High Commission for Refugees was spending an average of US\$ 70 million per annum (Sitkowski 2006). Prior to the demise of President Siyad Barre's oppressive regime, food aid was systematically abused as a tool for rewarding allies and keeping them loyal to him, as well as punishing opponents by depriving them access to the food aid a situation that continued unabated up to the last day of his rule.

President Siyad Barre's rule ended in January 1991 following a civil war in which the most powerful opponent to his rule was General Farah Aideed. A political vacuum resulted from the ousting of President Siyad Barre as there was no single political/military faction powerful enough to form a central government in Mogadishu. The fall of President Siyad Barre was immediately followed by the country's implosion and deconstruction of the state leading to chaos and anarchy that was a direct result of 'the unravelling of the country's densely knit structure of clans and kinship networks (Annan and Mousavizadeh 2012:39). Following the downfall of Siyad Barre's regime the Somali civil war worsened as the two most powerful factions led by interim President Ali Mahdi Mohammed and General Mohammed Farah Aideed fought for the control of the capital, Mogadishu (Adam 1995:69-78). The post-Barre political and security environment threatened the highly lucrative international humanitarian aid industry that had worked relatively smoothly under Siyad Barre's regime as the regime "created and exaggerated food emergencies," a situation that favoured aid agencies (De Waal, 1997:163-178). This meant that aid agencies were conniving with the Siyad Barre regime to exaggerate food aid required in order to profiteer from the excess food donations.

The civil war that ensued crystallized around sub-clan divisions which made it difficult for humanitarian organizations to effectively distribute relief aid because of high levels of banditry that looted food aid and even threatened the lives of the aid workers, a situation that qualified Somalia to join the list of "failed states" following the collapse of its central government (Adebajo and Landsberg 2007:170). The fall of the repressive Siyad Barre regime, instead of ushering in peace and stability, triggered and unleashed more conflict and bloodshed as the "liberators began fighting for spoils of the war and for the new loot" leading to a situation where there was nothing else left to loot from Mogadishu except the foreign donations by

foreign humanitarian organizations hence fighting in Mogadishu was predominantly over the control of foreign relief supplies (Durch 1996:317-318). Some international aid agencies began to view military intervention for the protection of international humanitarian aid as the only viable and just solution to the Somali crisis hence they began to lobby UN and US officials for a “humanitarian” military intervention.

What makes this appeal suspicious is the observation that there were no similar calls for military humanitarian intervention in similar cases on the African continent, involving countries stricken by war and famine. Sitkowski (2006) observed that in Sudan where an estimated 250 000 people died of starvation in 1988 alone, there were no calls made by aid agencies for UN peacekeepers to launch a humanitarian mission to rescue the dying Sudanese population. This discrepancy led him to conclude that Somalia was targeted for military intervention because of its smaller size compared to Sudan and that it was more easily accessible by sea and air, hence it was an ideal and more feasible target for an experimental large scale military humanitarian intervention to distribute food aid (*Ibid.*). Added to this, Somalia neither had a strong ally among the P-5 in the Security Council nor a formidable centralized military establishment the size of the Sudanese military apparatus that could effectively resist any foreign, uninvited military “humanitarian intervention” on its territory.

#### 4.2.2 UN/US opportunity to experiment with new concepts of peacekeeping

The Somali humanitarian crisis presented the UN Secretariat and the US military leadership with an ideal opportunity to experiment with new concepts and doctrines of second generation peacekeeping operations that included operational innovations in military humanitarian missions in troubled countries on the periphery (Al Qaq Op.Cit.). The Somalia crisis came at an opportune time when the world body was embarking on more intrusive peace-building missions designed to establish liberal democracies in rogue countries unhindered by the Cold War politics (Francis 2006:101). The argument for peace-building interventions was that post-Cold War internal conflicts were global problems that called for multilateral responses by the world community (Sisk 2001). The argument goes further to state that internal conflicts had direct and indirect implications for neighbouring states through spill overs such as refugees or small arms proliferation as well as indirect implications for the entire international community that included violation of international norms on crimes against humanity, or through the creation of humanitarian emergencies manifested through acute food insecurity, lack of water or housing, and basic safety for affected populations (Hazem, Huth, and Russett 2003). In order to operationalize the new peace-building concept of peacekeeping, a military humanitarian

intervention plan for Somalia was therefore hatched by the UN Secretary General with the full backing of the US military leadership right from its conception.

Former US ambassador Oakley acknowledges that the Bush administration wanted to partner with a more globally active UN “... with greater US support and participation, particularly in peacekeeping and nation building” (Hirsch and Oakley 1995:152). Such partnering with a more globally active UN would suggest that the US was trying to maximize on the opportunity availed by the end of the Cold War to assert itself as the dominant remaining power through the manipulation of the UN and other multilateral institutions in an attempt to spread Western liberal value systems across the Third World countries on the periphery. Maren (1997:221) observed that the active partnering of the US and the UN immediately after the Cold War where the UN received “...greater US support and participation, particularly in peacekeeping and nation building” resulted in the US going to the extent of drafting Somalia’s unrealistic humanitarian mandates for peacekeeping and peace enforcement resolutions on behalf of the UN Secretariat. He highlights that the humanitarian mandates for Somalia were drafted in the office of the US Chief of Staff, General Colin Powell (*Ibid.*). Haass (1994:73) concurs and further posits that all the major Security Council resolutions on Somalia during the early 1990s, including the “nation-building resolutions” were authored by US officials, mainly in the Pentagon, and handed to the UN as *faits accomplis*. Haass adds that only after the disastrous October 3, 1993 fire fight did the US try to exonerate itself from the operation that it had started, sponsored, commanded and almost entirely directed after having usurped the powers of the Secretary General and the Secretariat that are normally charged with the overall responsibility of controlling and giving direction to peacekeeping operations.<sup>10</sup> Haass (1994) noted that one international civil servant remarked that the UN was seduced and hoodwinked ultimately resulting in its eventual abandonment by the US to clean up the Somali political and military mess when the humanitarian adventure operations disastrously went wrong.

It is evident that the US/UN military adventure in Somalia that was launched without the express approval by the Somalis was part of a well calculated grand strategy of the “noble

---

<sup>10</sup> The Director of Africa Centre at Great Zimbabwe University Dr. R. Uriga is of the view that the interest shown by the US in trying to create a new central government in Somalia through a military humanitarian intervention appears to suggest that the US could have fuelled the conflict in Somalia in order to avail itself and the UN an opportunity to intervene so that a completely new regime accountable to the US was left in power after the withdrawal of peacekeepers. He added that as part of the US efforts to create a New World Order after the demise of the Soviet Union, it is not surprising that most of the conflicts in Africa were externally engineered and sponsored in order to create crises that called for UN peacekeeping intervention yet African leaders ended up inviting the very sponsors of conflict on the continent to come as peacekeepers to solve the problems they created.

Leviathan” world-wide design to protect the developed world and some parts of the international society from “rogue states and truculent warlords.” The second generation humanitarian peacekeeping missions in Africa that started with the Somali peacekeeping experiment were deliberately designed to deeply embroil UN peacekeepers and peace-builders in the internal affairs of sovereign states. The creation of a New World Order through the cooperation between the UN and the US was expected to usher in a new dispensation that would replace power politics in international relations with “moral and ethical” considerations implemented by the “newly non-polarized UN” and where necessary, coercively imposed by the Security Council that was free from bi-polar balance of power politics. The humanitarian argument of the 1990s portrayed a scenario where both ethical considerations and international law were converging towards defining an international obligation to intervene and interfere across national borders for humanitarian reasons in situations where serious human rights violations where seen to have been perpetrated by the government of the society in question or in cases where the government was seen to be failing to contain such violations (Johnson 2006:115). It was under this dispensation that the UN and the US military operations were launched in Somalia which raises a requirement to establish the real motivating factors outside the alleged humanitarian justifications.

The next section examines the non-humanitarian motives that could have influenced the UN Secretary General and his Secretariat to champion the advocacy for launching a military “humanitarian intervention” in Somalia at a time when the famine and starvation crisis was subsiding.

#### **4.3 UN non-humanitarian motives for intervention in Somalia**

This section attempts to challenge the dominant narrative that the decision by the newly appointed Secretary General Boutros-Ghali to launch a military “humanitarian” mission was based on purely humanitarian concerns of facilitating effective distribution of food aid to starving Somalis. Secretary General Boutros-Ghali for some reason, adopted an extremely proactive position in advancing the military humanitarian option as the only solution to the crisis in Somalia before exhaustion of other non-violent options (Al Qaq 2009:72) suggesting that there could have been other non-humanitarian motivating factors for the military intervention that was deliberately going to violate Somalia’s national sovereignty. The section highlights the extent to which Somalia’s national sovereignty was violated during a historical period when the ethical norms of state sovereignty and prohibition of foreign intervention in domestic disputes were being reconsidered in international and regional debates. At the time

of UN/US intervention in Somalia, it was clear that humanitarian considerations had taken precedence over state sovereignty (Keller 1995:3) as will be demonstrated in subsequent paragraphs.

Available literature and interviews conducted during this research point towards a pre-determined mind-set by Secretary General Boutros-Ghali to use Somalia as a laboratory to experiment with new concepts of “assertive peace enforcement” operations. In his *Agenda for Peace* document, Secretary General Boutros-Ghali unveiled and proposed multiple approaches towards rejuvenating the UN in its pursuit of peace in the post-Cold War period through prevention, peace-making, peace enforcement, peacekeeping, and peace-building operations sponsored by the world body (Boutros-Ghali 1992). The Secretary General and his team of advisors at the UN headquarters were strong advocates for new and radical changes in the “on-going evolution of liberal forms of intervention in the South that would culminate, at its apogee with ‘humanitarian’ military intervention” (Al Qaq 2009:54). The Secretary General’s willingness to experiment with UN peacekeeping operations in the post-Cold War era coincided with the determination by the US to experiment with its concept of “multilateral assertiveness” in dealing with rogue states and destabilizing regions on the periphery (*Ibid.*). Moreover the US was exploiting every available opportunity to take over regions and countries that had been abandoned by the Soviet Union following its demise at the end of the Cold War.

President Bush, was in the process of attempting to operationalize his “New World Order” vision that he announced in 1991 following the spectacular military operations of the American led UN coalition in the liberation of Kuwait and an absence of constraints from superpower rivalry (Adebajo and Landsberg 2007:166). The US was at the same time exploiting every opportunity to demonstrate that it was the triumphant remaining super power determined to promote the “New World Order” through the spread of Western liberal values of democracy and the capitalist economic system. The humanitarian and political crisis in Somalia availed such an opportunity where the UN and the US could jointly experiment with novel concepts of peace enforcement operations that had little or no respect for national sovereignty of the host country. Prior to deploying UN peacekeepers in Somalia, there was an ethical and legal requirement to secure Somalia’s consent to the deployment of UN troops in that country yet there existed no central government in Mogadishu the Somali capital.

To satisfy the requirement for host state consent in a situation where there was no central government to bring forward the Somali crisis for discussion, Secretary General Boutros-Ghali,

at the unethical instigation of some Security Council members constructed what has been termed a “legal fiction” in an effort to legalize UN direct involvement and deployment in Somalia’s civil war (Jonah 2012). The Secretary General and his team manufactured a solution that violated Somalia’s sovereignty and which was ostensibly against the wishes of the OAU members who had not taken up the Crisis in Somalia for discussion at the UN.<sup>11</sup> The Secretariat, acting in place of the non-existing central government in Somalia took the initiative to appoint a country representative at the UN Headquarters to make a request for UN intervention in Somalia without consulting the leading warlords in Somalia.

#### 4.3.1 Unethical circumventing of the requirement for host state consent

Following the departure of Somalia’s substantive permanent representative Abdillahi Said Osman, the UN Secretariat elevated Fatun Hassan the second counsellor in Somalia’s permanent mission to the UN to the position of head of mission who was then asked to formally request the Security Council to intervene in Somalia yet he did not represent any of the major factions in the Somali civil war (Hirsh and Oakley 1995). This initiative marked the beginning of UN violation of Somalia’s state sovereignty with the birth of a peacekeeping operation launched in that country without appropriate host state consent. There is no consensus on whether the act of invitation performed by Fatun Hassan amounted to lawful granting of host state consent for the deployment of UNOSOM I a traditional peacekeeping mission since there was no central government in Mogadishu.

Christine Gray (2008:244) argues that the Security Council secured the consent of the Somali government, through the Fatun Hassan initiative even though there was no central government in Mogadishu with effective control over the whole Somali territory. Ottaway and Lacina (2003:73) argue that when there is no real government or central authority in a sovereign country like Somalia, “the notion that intervention constitutes a violation of sovereignty unless requested by the government *appears outright absurd.*” It would appear that in the view of these authors, the absence of a central government translates to an absence of a state in which national sovereignty is insignificant and of no consequences. The counter argument to this line

---

<sup>11</sup> In an interview with a retired African diplomat who was based in Addis Ababa at the time of the UN decision to launch a humanitarian mission in Somalia, he emphasised that the majority of African states were opposed to UN intervention in a sovereign country without a proper invitation to deploy foreign troops in that country. To make matters worse, the OAU had not appealed to the world organization to intervene as African leaders considered the Somali civil war to be an internal matter that was to be resolved among the belligerents in that country hence it came as a big surprise that a UN peacekeeping mission was to be deployed in Somalia without a formal invitation.

of thinking which this researcher agrees with was articulated by Teson (1995:353) who argued that the absence of a central government does not constitute an absence of the state whose sovereignty deserves respect. If indeed the primary motive for intervention was humanitarian, there was no justification for circumventing the OAU and the powerful warlords in Somalia to secure a properly constituted invitation for UN peacekeepers.

The Chinese delegate at the UN Security Council queried whether the handling of the Somali crisis was setting a precedent that would be followed in future humanitarian cases. He pointed out that “... as we understand it, according to the recommendations of the Secretary-General, the military operation authorized by the draft resolution is an exceptional action in view of the unique situation in Somalia” (UN doc. S/PV.3145 1992:541). What made this Somali case unique, diplomats argued, was the lack of a responsible government that could act as an interlocutor at the UN for the purposes of permitting a military action designed to facilitate delivery and distribution of humanitarian assistance.<sup>12</sup> This initiative was novel and unethical as it disregarded the authority and relevance of the most powerful warlords in Somalia who were not consulted on the appointment of Fatun Hassan a development that led Lewis and Mayall (1996:114) to observe that this initiative had practically established an unprecedented level of UN intervention in a sovereign state’s internal affairs. In the view of this researcher, the two major warring factions in Somalia should have been consulted on the matter of elevating Fatun Hassan as the two powerful Somali factions were retrospectively invited to New York to sign a ceasefire agreement to facilitate the deployment of UN peacekeepers. Understandably, the warlords were not invited to sanction the deployment of UN/US military offensive peace enforcement missions launched by the Security Council considering that peace enforcement missions are authorised by the UN Security Council without the consent of the target country.

The UN Secretary General did not make a serious effort to secure the consent of all parties involved in the conflict. Instead he fired his Special Representative Ambassador Sahoun who was painstakingly making an effort to secure the consent of all militia factions involved. Boutros-Ghali, under pressure from the US, ignored the fact that it was politically prudent to secure the consent of all parties to the conflict because host state consent enhances the

---

<sup>12</sup> In an interview with former foreign minister during the Somalia crisis, he lamented the demise of the Soviet Union and the weak Chinese response to the clear violation of Somalia’s sovereignty by a UN/US initiative and conspiracy to attempt at creating a Somalia that suited their vision of a New World Order through a process that disregarded the wishes of the Somali population.

legitimacy and acceptance of the mission by the parties to the conflict. When the first UN peacekeeping mission to Somalia (UNOSOM I) was deployed, only two factions were belatedly invited to consent to UN peacekeepers' deployment in Somalia leaving out the smaller groups. This marked a preferential treatment of some of the factions that ultimately precipitated the failure of the entire peacekeeping effort in Somalia (Tsagourias 2006:10). Important to note is the fact that the deployment of UNOSOM I did not have the full blessings of Aideed who felt threatened by the presence of UN peacekeepers in Somalia as he felt his faction had an upper hand over his main rival Mahdi Mohammed (Murphy 2007:51). Based on the suspicion that UN peacekeepers had a hidden agenda in Somalia, opposition to their deployment ensued since there was no broad based consent among the belligerents a situation that was aggravated by deliberate preferential treatment of some of the factions at the expense of others. This leads this study to the question why the Secretary General appeared to be in a rush to deploy robust peace enforcement troops.

**4.3.2 An ethical analysis of non-humanitarian motives for military intervention in Somalia**  
The UN Secretariat under the leadership of Boutros-Ghali appear to have had grand ideas of making Somalia an example of how the UN would deal with countries and regions of instability in the post-Cold War era. Diehl (1994:186) observed that Somalia was supposed to have been the UN benchmark mission for peace-building in the post-Cold War era. Proactive actions adopted by the Secretariat were partly in response to severe pressure emanating from the US which dictated to the Secretariat to either "reform or die" hence the Secretary General had to revitalize the UN post-Cold War peace and security role in conformity with the US dictates and wishes which served as a precondition for guaranteed access to US financial support for the world organization (Solomon 1996:6). The argument that humanitarian considerations were the main driving force for military intervention in Somalia has been challenged by several political analysts and academics.

De Waal and others have queried whether humanitarian concerns centered on Somalis' starvation were indeed the major motivating factors for the UN/US intervention in Somalia. Their argument is mainly centered on the fact that at the time of deploying UN peacekeepers in Somalia, the bigger challenge in that country was death from diseases possibly caused by malnutrition and not famine induced starvation (De Waal 1994:152). Some humanitarian and human rights organizations that were against the military humanitarian intervention in Somalia included Save the Children Fund, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the American Friends Service Committee. Their anti-military humanitarian intervention argument

was based on the fact that “more limited alternative options had not been exhausted and that the intervention was based on false information about the Somali situation and (that the military option) would not solve the political crisis in Somalia” (De Waal 1996:296). Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that were deployed in the country together with the Secretary General’s Special Representative to Somalia who was directly ceased with the crisis did not believe that time was ripe for a military humanitarian intervention yet the UN under pressure from the US decided on the contrary to proceed with military deployments before all alternative peaceful options had been exhausted. Such observations and sentiments justify the search for unethical non-humanitarian motives that influenced the launch of military peace enforcement operations when the assessment of some of the donors on the ground was that the military intervention was not only unnecessary but also that it was not going to produce positive results, a view that was ultimately vindicated less than a year later.

#### 4.3.3 An ethical analysis of the relationship between Boutros-Ghali and Farah Aideed

The New World Order that was anticipated at the end of the Cold War did not immediately materialise as disorder and violent internal conflicts across the globe characterised international affairs to the dismay of the proponents of the envisioned ideal world and doctrine (Utley 2006). In line with this ideology, Boutros-Ghali was a strong advocate for military humanitarian peace enforcement missions as he formulated a plan in conjunction with US officials at the Pentagon, towards the deployment of a humanitarian peacekeeping mission in Somalia. Not surprisingly, the Somalis, especially General Farah Aideed and his followers were suspicious of Boutros-Ghali’s ulterior motives for intervention in Somalia as they did not believe that he and the UN he represented had good intentions in intervening in the domestic affairs of Somalia. This view is shared by Hirsch and Oakley (1995:19) who noted that General Aideed and his militias maintained old animosities towards Secretary General Boutros-Ghali.

Prior to becoming Secretary General of the UN, Boutros-Ghali served as Minister of State for Foreign Affairs in Egypt. During that period, Egypt strongly supported the rule of President Siyad Barre, the man who had imprisoned and tortured Aideed for more than five years, which General Aideed now held against the Secretary General (*Ibid.*). The feeling that Boutros-Ghali had found an opportunity to effectively deal with Aideed cannot be ruled out as the Secretary General rushed to embrace the military offensive option before exhausting other non-coercive measures that were being pursued by Sahnoun, his special representative whose approach was respected by the warlords and traditional leaders in Somalia. As a result, the powerful mutual feelings of animosity between the Secretary General and Farah Aideed played a critical role in

the promotion of difficulties encountered by the UN/US mission in Somalia (*Ibid.*). In this regard, it can be considered rational to conclude that one of the contributing factors for Secretary General Boutros-Ghali's enthusiasm for military intervention in Somalia that violated that country's national sovereignty was the pursuit of the military defeat of his arch enemy General Farah Aideed as reflected in one of the Secretary General's public address.

Addressing an American Conference on Global Development at the Carter Centre, Secretary General Boutros-Ghali revealed his ambitious goal in Somalia when he stated that after the food distribution in Somalia, the militia gangs would completely disappear following United Nations aggressive peace negotiations with the Somali warring clans. What this implied was that the warlords like General Aideed were to "disappear" and be replaced by preferred leaders after the elimination and disappearance of the militia gangs. This was confirmed by comments made by one senior UN official who stated that, "...the factions will be weakened by this military intervention, so the creation of a new force—with United Nations assistance—might work" (Peterson 1992). All these ambitious targets aimed at reconstructing and politically re-engineering Somalia were being planned for execution without any input or participation of the Somalis in clear violation of that country's sovereignty and self-determination. In that regard, General Farah Aideed and his militias were justified in harbouring suspicions regarding the true motives of the UN/US military intervention in Somalia.

Suspicious of the true intentions of the UN military involvement in their country, Somali spokesmen representing various warlords opposed to peacekeepers' deployment warned Boutros-Ghali that the UN force would be resisted if deployed as they were considered to be an invading foreign force (Wheeler and Roberts 2012:13-14). Secretary Bolton, who was serving in the Bush Administration warned that it was not advisable to deploy any foreign troops in Somalia arguing that it was '*premature until there is an effective ceasefire.*' His advice was not taken heed of by both the UN Secretary General and the Bush administration. Bolton's advice was based on a warning made to him by an aide to General Aideed who warned that "*...if the UN sent in 50 military observers, they might as well send in 50 coffins too*" (Moffett III:1992) a warning that was not taken seriously considering the operational handling of General Aideed's faction during the course of the operation. Such warnings clearly demonstrated that the UN troops were not welcome at all in Somalia hence the fabricated consent in New York was considered invalid. True to their word, the Somalis were determined not to succumb to a foreign imposed military solution to their internal political and security crisis as they intensified their resistance to UN sponsored foreign military invasion.

Mohamed Sahnoun, the former UN Special Representative to Somalia, once remarked that UNOSOM's military heavy handedness and its "heavy military presence" led the Somalis to perceive the peacekeepers' presence as an occupation force trying to impose an alien political solution without the full participation of the Somali people (Thakur 1994:399). The UN sponsored "humanitarian" intervention in Somalia was not an ordinary military intervention to help the suffering population in that impoverished country. Richard Haass (1994:26-27) observed the difference between standard humanitarian interventions aimed at "providing protection and other basic needs," and much more complex endeavours, such as nation-building, which envision "recasting the institutions of the society" and he concluded that the Somalia humanitarian mission was widened to include nation building because "policymakers got ambitious." The ambitious and aggressive conduct of UN operations in Somalia tended to suggest that the Secretary General had other ulterior motives in the outcome of the Somali operation.

According to (Kapteijns 2013:437), during the course of the peacekeeping operations in Somalia, the military dimension overwhelmed and cancelled out the humanitarian one leading to serious violation of Somali people's human rights and the country's national sovereignty. Kapteijns adds that the "humanitarian label" placed on the military campaign in Somalia, helped to camouflage the true UN and US highly subjective political preferences in Somalia (Ibid.). Such subjective preferences could only be attained through the violation of Somalia's national sovereignty by the invading UN sponsored forces. The dilemma faced by the peacekeepers in Somalia was therefore whether to appease those with power, the warlords on the ground or oppose them with force and face the consequences (Mayall 1996:109), a dilemma that found a solution in the excessive use of force against the most powerful warlord General Farah Aideed in which thousands of innocent civilians were killed in cold blood.

Considering the fact that the initiative to launch a military "humanitarian" mission in Somalia was largely that of Boutros-Ghali backed by the Bush Administration, it is prudent that the chapter now focuses on examining the non-humanitarian motivations that influenced the US to deploy a massive military force in Somalia; the United Task Force (UNITAF) at a time when the effects of the famine were already in decline.

#### **4.4 Ethical analysis of US motivations in launching of UNITAF**

This section aims to explore and identify non-humanitarian military, political and economic factors that influenced the US to offer and deploy 28 000 troops for the UN humanitarian

mission in Somalia. This is important in order to effectively challenge the official narrative, that US troops were primarily and solely deployed to help stabilize the Somali crisis, “in order to facilitate the delivery and distribution of humanitarian aid” to the neediest Somali citizens. The section argues that the US deployment was not driven by altruistic considerations but by geo-strategic self-interests of the post-Cold War US ambitions which had little bearing on humanitarian justifications.

The mantra about ethical and humanitarian justifications for the military operations served as a smoke screen to hide the organized hypocrisy that was being practiced by the UN and US planners.<sup>13</sup> In order to give credence to the altruistic justification for the military deployments in Somalia, there are strong allegations and suspicions that US officials connived with UN and some donor community officials in manipulating data and information emanating from Somalia to exaggerate the real humanitarian situation in Somalia in order to mislead the international community from the true motives of their military intervention as they were bent on achieving premeditated geo-political and geo-strategic outcomes favourable to the US and not the population of Somalia (De Waal 1996). This view is shared by Uriga (Interview August 2015) who observed that “donor agencies serve to destroy the cohesion of a country and that host government loses part of its sovereignty” if it becomes too dependent on donor support. The predetermined US policy position in Somalia was to impose an undeclared UN rule and trusteeship through military coercion in occupied Somalia in violation of the national sovereignty of a sovereign member of the UN, and re-build the country along neo-liberal capitalist value systems accountable to the US and not the Somali population (Al Qaq Op.Cit.:73-74). This observation goes to demonstrate that it is foolhardy for African populations to expect UN sponsored peacekeepers to genuinely come to risk their lives and treasure for purely altruistic reasons meant to rescue African populations from whatever conflict or crisis they may be facing. This is in line with the realist school of thought that argues that nation states should always find opportunities to maximize their national benefits and self-interests in their international engagements with other nations.

---

<sup>13</sup> In an interview with a retired army general who served with UNOSOM, he emphasized the fact that the US approach to the humanitarian crisis was markedly different from other contingents such as the Italian and Zimbabwean troops that preferred a painstakingly negotiated approach towards securing the cooperation of the warlords and their followers as opposed to a military imposed solution that did not have a buy-in of the local leadership and the population they controlled. He added that those contingents that preferred negotiations over military coercion enjoyed more local support from the population whilst the more aggressive contingents that believed in military might faced fierce resistance and suffered a lot of casualties further poisoning the operating environment to the detriment of the entire mission.

In this regard, the US offer of troops for deployment in Somalia came as a surprise to many because of the financial challenges faced by Russia and the US at the time of the Somali crisis. Murphy (2007:33) has argued that the financial position of Russia and the US during the early 1990s was such that none of them was interested in pro-active deployment of peacekeepers in Somalia because both countries were in arrears on their peacekeeping payments hence they would rather have deferred deployments of non-strategically important missions. More specifically, the US was publicly against the deployment of a large peacekeeping mission to Somalia because it feared that it would end up bearing the financial burden of the mission a situation worsened by other tactical and logistic constraints that militated against the deployment of a large force in the war torn country (Ramsbotham and Woodhouse 1996:203). Given this background, this chapter argues that “humanitarian” reasons alone could not have motivated US deployment of a large military force in Somalia. Tactical and logistical limitations together with other geo-political constraints could have led the US leadership to prefer a multilateral intervention force in Somalia as a way of minimizing and spreading the peacekeeping risks and costs. Moreover, this approach also aimed at building domestic political support for such missions (*Ibid.*). As a result, the UN sponsored intervention force had other countries co-opted to give an impression that the mission was indeed a UN multinational intervention as opposed to a US invasion.

#### 4.4.1 The influence of the donor agencies

There is a strong school of thought that suggests that the donor community strongly lobbied for US military “humanitarian intervention” in Somalia to serve some of their own selfish economic interests. Finnemore (2003) an advocate for the humanitarian motive, argues that the absence of geo-strategic or economic advantages to be gained by the US reflects that the intervention can only be explained by reference to humanitarian norms. Mayall (1996) also supports the humanitarian motive thesis as he argues that the “humanitarian” disaster was the primary reason for the US intervention in Somalia. Bjørn Møller (2009:19) equally supports the narrative that the US mounted a military “humanitarian intervention” in Somalia, officially mandated as a peacekeeping operation, even though there was no peace to keep. The mission has been referred to as a “humanitarian intervention” in an attempt at “saving strangers” (Wheeler 2000). However some analysts have queried whether humanitarian concerns centered on Somalis’ starvation was indeed the major motivating factor for US intervention in Somalia especially when the famine crisis had significantly subsided.

As noted above, De Waal (1994:152) argued that by the time UNITAF arrived in Somalia, the bigger problem in Somalia was death from diseases and not starvation as the draught season had already ended or significantly improved. The intensive lobbying for a US military intervention by the director of CARE, a US based humanitarian relief organizations (HRO) already working in Somalia had a significant impact on the decision by US authorities to intervene in Somalia (De Waal 1997:181). This support for a military humanitarian intervention sponsored by CARE raised eyebrows considering that other international humanitarian donor agencies operating in Somalia were strongly opposed to military deployments as they saw no justification for the militarization of the humanitarian crisis that was already significantly improving and that military operations were bound to complicate the operating environment already infested with multiple militia groups with competing political allegiances.

Andrew Natsios, Director in the Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) was the main proponent of US military involvement as he led the strong campaign and advocacy for UN/US military deployments in Somalia when he declared in January 1992 that the famine in Somalia was 'the greatest humanitarian emergency in the world' (Clark 1993:212). This declaration triggered an international media campaign to paint a gloomy picture in Somalia where it was estimated that over 1,000 Somalis were dying weekly (Wheeler 2000:179). Natsios (1997:79) also claimed that starvation and malnutrition were the major sources of disease that was threatening the lives of 2 million Somalis in danger of dying, in a country facing food deficit that was driving food prices by up to 800–1,200 percent. The exaggerated media coverage brought the suffering of the civilian population to the attention of the proverbial "international community" with a primary aim of enticing the world community to intervene with humanitarian assistance.

Important to note is the fact that most of the food aid arrived after the famine had run its course, and that aid arguably exacerbated the local problems by contributing to the emergent "war economy", upon which the militias thrived (De Waal 1997). It cannot therefore be ruled out that the announcement by Natsios that the Somalia crisis was the "the greatest humanitarian emergency in the world" could have been a deliberate act to psych the international community to anticipate and ultimately sympathize and support a military "humanitarian intervention" in Somalia that had other non-altruistic ulterior motives. The fact that UNSC resolutions for Somalia were drafted and compiled at the Pentagon under the guidance of General Collin Powell suggests the existence of US military vested interests in the outcome of a post-conflict

Somalia that had to be within the geo-strategic influence of the sole superpower remaining. The direct involvement of the Pentagon in the framing of a case for a military intervention in Somalia and the unanticipated offer of massive troops for the mission by the US authorities raises suspicion as to what the true motive of the military intervention was in Somalia.

#### 4.4.2 Unethical and non-altruistic influence of the US military establishment

The UN/US Somalia military intervention mission was portrayed to the entire world as a credible and genuine humanitarian undertaking in which the US was alleged to have had no geo-strategic or economic interests in that country. To reinforce the official US narrative of not having vital self-serving interests in Somalia, a military investigation commissioned to study US involvement in Somalia highlighted that —the US involvement in Somalia was as a result of being the sole remaining world power and the leader of the new world order hence it was duty bound to respond to the humanitarian crisis for humanitarian purposes (Stewart 2003). The conclusion drawn by the investigating team implied that US new found status as the sole super power significantly influenced its decision to intervene in Somalia for the sake of demonstrating its benevolence as the sole superpower. UNITAF was perceived by many political and military leaders as a way to pioneering and championing a new kind of American “intervention policy,” based on “humanitarian” justifications (Al Qaq 2009). There were indeed more non-humanitarian motives that influenced the intervention.

Lowther (2007) identified four factors that initially militated against US deployment of ground troops in Somalia. First, was the nature of Somali guerrilla warfare type conflict “fuelled by age-old inter-clan rivalry” which did not suit the large scale open warfare the American troops were primarily trained to fight. Second the heavily armed militias whose survival was based on blending with the population making it difficult to distinguish the militias from the general population. This factor made it difficult to guarantee target identification and safeguarding American force protection despite their being heavily armed with the latest sophisticated weapon systems. Third, Somalia’s geographical terrain presented tactical and logistical challenges for American troops. Fourth, US military commanders were arguing that the US had no vital national interests at stake in Somalia to justify a massive military deployment hence there was no valid reason to risk American lives now that the Soviet Union had collapsed and the Soviet backed regime in Ethiopia was crumbling (Lowther 2007:107). These limitations were eventually overcome by stronger non-humanitarian motivating factors that the chapter now turns to examine.

One of the major motivating factors for US military deployment in Somalia was the immediate availability of a large number of American troops in the Gulf region that could have influenced the US decision to offer troops to the UN for the “humanitarian intervention.” Hoar (1993:56) observed that at the time of the US troop offer to the UN, the US military had just completed “a large scale training exercise simulating famine intervention in north-east Africa” a scenario that perfectly suited the Somalia crisis situation. The assumption that the US military leadership took advantage of the prevailing crisis in Somalia to put into practice what they had simulated and rehearsed during the famine relief field exercise sounds logical and plausible. It is difficult to imagine that the US training exercise in the Gulf region did not specifically have Somalia in mind at the time of planning the exercise considering that the situation in that country suited perfectly well the scenario painted in the simulated famine field exercise. Moreover the build-up to the US offer of troops for intervention was characterized by the Pentagon drafting UNSC mandates that would eventually suit US troop deployments in Somalia hence the “humanitarian” military intervention was not simply an urgent response to the humanitarian crisis in that war stricken and famine ravaged country but a deliberate decision arrived at after a thorough cost-benefit analysis by the US military authorities.

Different scenarios and options were presented to President Bush for consideration regarding the US response to the situation in Somalia. Surprisingly, the best response option selected by the presidential advisers “was not just a US-led, UN-approved military intervention but rather a military intervention that was twice as large as the largest option on the table,” a scenario that was labelled as not just “the sledgehammer option” but “a doubling in size for the sledgehammer option” (Menkhaus and Ortmayer 1995:7). Doubling the size of force that military planners had determined as adequate at a time when the US was in arrears with her UN peacekeeping contributions suggests that there were other ulterior motives beyond humanitarian justification for US involvement in Somalia. Such massive deployments in any country were bound to impact negatively on the sovereignty of the host state and its population and Somalia was no exception. Moreover all the military intervention options that were being considered did not have Somalia’s population consent as the intended and ultimate beneficiaries of the massive military intervention. To make matters worse, the massive military intervention options that were being considered were indeed against the informed advice from Ambassador Sahnoun, the Special Representative in Somalia who had been making steady but slow progress in trying to get a buy-in from all the warlords and militia groups about finding a common ground to a political solution to the political and humanitarian crisis. It is critically

important for this study to keep in mind the fact that at the time of the US military intervention in Somalia, the real threat of famine had significantly subsided. Hansch (1994:32) observed that the famine threat had significantly diminished to the extent that the majority of non-governmental organizations operating in Somalia vehemently opposed massive military deployments as they feared that their security and impartiality would be compromised by the massive military presence in their theatre of humanitarian operations. These observations serve to dispel or challenge the purely “humanitarian” justification for US military intervention in Somalia. It is equally important to keep in mind the fact that US military employment is strictly governed by the realist school of thought where US troops are deployed in situations that enhance the protection or advancement of US self-interests and not for altruistic reasons.

According to Wheeler and Roberts (2012:181), only the geographically and economically naive observers and analysts could believe the official and popular narrative that the US did not have strategic military and economic interests in Somalia that ultimately influenced its offer of military participation in Somalia. Wheeler and Roberts quote a 19<sup>th</sup> Century philosopher Mihael Bukhanin who remarked on the realistic and materialistic imperatives of the religious wars in Europe when he stated that: "No one at all interested in the study of history could have failed to see that there was always some great material interest at the bottom of the most abstract, the most sublime and idealistic, theological and religious struggles" (*Ibid.*). The argument being advanced by Wheeler and Roberts (2012) is that Somalia's geo-strategic location, despite its relative diminished importance following the end of the Cold War, was still vital to US regional strategic interests.<sup>14</sup> Specifically US presence in Somalia would allow rapid deployment of troops to critical areas of more significant national geo-strategic interests to the remaining superpower such as the oil rich Middle East as well as safeguarding the vital sea lanes through the Strait of Eden (*Ibid.*). Based on these observations and arguments, it is evident that there were indeed military strategic factors that influenced President Bush's decision to offer US troops to deploy in Somalia in violation of that country's national sovereignty under the false pretext of “humanitarian Intervention” to save starving Somalis. The military intervention mission was designed to implement a regime change agenda crafted at the Pentagon through dislodging the status quo in Somalia of fragmented militia ethnic

---

<sup>14</sup> In an interview on 12 March 2015 with a retired General who served in Somalia, he cited the fact that the only US military base on the African continent is in Djibouti following the refusal by the AU to grant the US Africa Command (Africom) a permanent military base in Africa. The significance of this base is strategic for it covers the vital and strategic sea route via the Gulf of Eden as well as operations in Somalia and Yemen.

groups and replacing them by an imposed puppet regime answerable to the dictates and wishes of the US and its allies.

#### 4.4.3 Unethical US political desire to operationalize the New World Order

Sorensen (2006) observed that since the end of the Cold War, the US participated in conflict-ridden areas where it heavily preferred UN-mandated peacekeeping operations as opposed to UN-commanded or controlled missions thus confirming US wish to avoid placing its troops under command and institutional control of UN-led peacekeeping operations. He added that the conduct of the US reveals that American peacekeepers were dispatched to regions it considers strategically or politically vital to its foreign policy and that the US sparingly used peacekeeping as a policy instrument for brief periods and only in areas that the US considered strategically important (*Ibid.115*). This view is in sync with the realist view point that such massive US troops are only deployed where their presence serve to advance or safeguard US strategic interests. In this regard, it is prudent to determine whether US participation in UN mandated intervention in Somalia had anything to do US strategic self-interests.

Considering the fact that President Bush offered US troops for deployment in Somalia after he had lost the Presidential elections to the incoming President Bill Clinton, some analysts have argued that he was eager to boost his legacy by participating in a “humanitarian military intervention” in Somalia but not Bosnia where the military situation was more challenging (Kapteijns 2013:424). In line with this argument, Blumenthal (1995:52-53) believes President Bush also wanted to operationalize his publicly articulated vision of a peaceful “New World Order” as well as getting a foothold in the attractive potential oil reserves in Somalia coupled with early concerns about Islamic fundamentalism. This researcher agrees with the potential oil reserves theory as one of the main motivating factors for US participation in the UN mission in Somalia.

To further buttress the view that humanitarian concerns were not the primary motivation for intervention, the National Security Adviser to President Bush, Brent Scott is quoted as having remarked that, “So if you look at Somalia, it’s Third World, it’s black, it’s Muslim...it had everything going for it in terms of making a judgment”(Rosegrant and Watkins 1996:10). Such a blunt and emotional statement, coming from one of the most senior officials in the Bush Administration appears to suggest that in the post-Cold War international world order, underdeveloped countries no longer enjoyed the protection of the Soviet Union hence African and Muslim countries on the periphery were rightfully susceptible to intervention when crises

emerged within their states. In that regard, post-Cold War versions of UN peacekeeping and peace enforcement missions were to be considered as forms of riot control directed against the unruly parts of the world to uphold the liberal peace ushered in by the end of the Cold War (Pugh 2007:41). An interpretation of Brent Scott's statement about Somalia being "*Third World, Black and Muslim*" and therefore an obvious and "legitimate target" for "riot control" by western powers, leads to the conclusion that the military "humanitarian intervention" argument had little to do with genuine humanitarian concerns about assisting starving Somalis or "saving strangers" purely for altruistic justifications. This point buttresses the view that humanitarian considerations were not the primary driving force for US military intervention in Somalia.

Several other scholars such as Chandler (2009); Duffield (2010); have queried the motives of Western liberal states that have developed a habit of using humanitarian reasons to justify violation of principles of national sovereignty and non-intervention in the sovereign affairs of other states. They have warned that the growing trend of humanitarian intervention serves as a strategy employed by Western liberal governments and institutions to "expand their influence and control over the illiberal regimes of the global borderlands ...that humanitarian intervention is part of a liberal technology of global governance"(Ibid). These views are shared by Third World countries that also believe economic considerations play a critical role in influencing foreign military interventions under the pretext of humanitarian interventions in peripheral developing countries as was the case in Somalia.

#### 4.4.4 Unethical economic factors that motivated US military intervention in Somalia

From an economic perspective, Wheeler and Roberts (Op.Cit.:181) argue that it is naive to believe that President Bush, who made his own personal fortune as a Texas oilman, was unaware of the favourable geological and seismic analyses regarding the oil and gas production potential in the undeveloped Somalian geological strata. Information based on American oil company reports of the late 1980's reflect that among unexplored regions with substantial oil reserves yet to be tapped across the entire world, "the region lying from the southern tip of the Arabian Peninsula, under the Red Sea, south through Somalia to the Kenyan border and off the coast represented potentially the world's second largest undeveloped oil and gas province after the Siberian region" (Ibid.). Under President Siyad Barre's rule, American multinational corporations were scrambling for exploration opportunities and rapidly building refineries, purchasing drilling leases, and engaging in exploration (Ibid.). These lucrative commercial activities were seriously disrupted by the demise of the US surrogate President Siyad Barre, a

scenario that could have triggered an interest not only to reverse the trend but also deny the Chinese and other interested powers access to the oil and gas reserves deposited under the Somalian geological strata.

This section has exposed and highlighted the non-humanitarian factors that contributed to the decision to launch the so called US military “humanitarian” intervention in Somalia and the extent to which Somalia’s national sovereignty was violated through these military interventions. Based on the ensuing discussion, it is evident that the much talked about “humanitarian” justification for intervention was simply a smoke screen for the pursuit of geo-strategic; geo-political and economic self-interests by western powers under the leadership of the US.

#### **4.5 An ethical analysis on application of UN peacekeeping principles in Somalia**

The UN/US missions in Somalia violated the three “fundamental principles” of UN peacekeeping operations. The peacekeeping “holy trinity” of consent, impartiality, and non-use of force was violated during all the three phases of military intervention in Somalia. The cardinal principles of UN peacekeeping were replaced by the “concept of campaign authority,” which was derived from the UN Security Council mandates that sanctioned the missions and not the legitimacy derived from observing the cardinal and normative peacekeeping principles (Aoi 2011:7). This was done in an effort to operationalise the “New World Order” concept coined by President Bush senior following the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991.

##### **4.5.1 Ethical violation of the principle of host state consent**

Mersiades (2006) observed the significance of securing host consent as well as that of the local non-state actors when he stated that “consent equates to an absence of active opposition, violent or otherwise, to the presence of peacekeepers in the country ... consent not only equates to a passive acceptance of peacekeeper authority, and it can also translate to active support” (Mersiades 2006:205). When deploying peacekeepers in circumstances of ongoing civil war, it is critical that mechanisms of obtaining consent from the dominant players are established and maintained if peacekeepers are to continuously get cooperation from the belligerents during the entire tour of deployment (*Ibid.*). Failure to do so ultimately result in non-consenting parties to the conflict seriously disrupting and frustrating peacekeepers’ efforts as happened to the UN mission in Congo.

In the case of Somalia, the process adopted by the UN Secretariat in securing host state consent was fraught with legal and ethical irregularities considering that the Secretariat had to

improvise and upgrade the most senior country representative at the UN to make a request for humanitarian peacekeeping intervention in Somalia as highlighted above. The second time the UN violated Somalia's national sovereignty was when it authorized the deployment of an additional 3000 troops on 28 August 1992 without consulting any of the warlords in Somalia, including the Special Representative of the Secretary General. Initiatives such as these demonstrated the organized hypocrisy of the UN peacekeeping operations. This is so in that if the troop increase was meant to address genuine and commonly agreed concerns in Somalia, at least the Special Representative and the two most powerful warlords should have been informed or consulted. The fact that they were not deliberately consulted implies that there was a hidden agenda behind the troop increase that naturally raised suspicion once it became public knowledge.

At the request of the Secretary General Boutros-Ghali the UN Security Council through Resolution 775 of 28 August 1992 authorized the expansion of UNOSOM I peacekeepers to 3,500, without notification of the warlords who were signatories to the initial ceasefire earlier signed in New York (Murphy 2007:54). To make matters worse and to demonstrate that there was organized hypocrisy and a hidden agenda about the entire mission, Ambassador Sahnoun, the Special Representative of the Secretary General in Somalia, was neither consulted nor informed of the decision in advance to increase the size of the peacekeepers. This error of omission served to undermine Ambassador Sahnoun's authority and credibility among the Somali warlords and portrayed him as duplicitous in the eyes of Aideed who was furious about the unexplained increase of UN troops. This development equally served to undermine Aideed's dominant military authority in the theatre of operations. Instead of insisting on finding ways of securing consent from the various warlords as Ambassador Sahnoun was doing, the Boutros-Ghali in collaboration with the US secured Security Council authorization to launch a peace enforcement mission to impose the will of the UN and the US on the Somali people in violation of that country's national sovereignty. The absence of a central government in Somalia gave the UN Secretary General and his team the impression that they could violate Somalia's sovereignty with impunity which was indeed unethical.

UNITAF later known as Operation Restore Hope was authorized through UNSC Resolution 794 of 1992 to 'use all necessary means to establish as soon as possible a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia'. The use of force by UNITAF was justified on the basis of the alleged 'magnitude of the human tragedy caused by the conflict in Somalia' (Welsh 2008:541) yet the magnitude of human suffering was on the decline as noted above.

Kapteijns (2013:424) observed that this mandate was not just unusual in its authorization of the use of all necessary means, but also that it disregarded Somalia's national sovereignty, as it was based on the argument that the crisis in Somalia, posed a threat to "international peace and security" as outlined in UNSC Resolution 794 of 1992. It is evident from this discussion that Somalia's national sovereignty was deliberately violated by UN/US intervention peacekeeping missions whose primary objectives have been erroneously portrayed as "humanitarian intervention" to save civilian lives in Somalia.

#### 4.5.2 Unethical violation of the principle of impartiality

The peacekeeping principle of impartiality was the biggest casualty right from the start of the UN/US operations in Somalia. Fox (2000:10) observed that the main aim of Operation Restore Hope/UNITAF was to alter the political-military environment in Somalia with the ultimate intention being to alter the balance of power in Somalia prior to the withdrawal of the US military, an environment that was viewed as allowing effective distribution of food aid by donor agencies. Important to note is the fact that the moment a UN peacekeeping mission aims to alter the status quo in the host country, it amounts to interference with the existing structures and systems of that country and ultimately violates the sovereignty of the host state. Approaches such as these by UN peacekeepers trigger local resistance by those elements whose survival and social status would be negatively altered by the presence of foreign troops in their country. This view is in sync with the argument presented by Gelot and Soderbaum (2012:240) that an intervention cannot be a neutral or impartial act because it introduces new political, social and economic opportunities and rewards for both interveners and intervened upon at various stages of the intervention especially when we consider that interventions often end up embroiled in local power struggles and dynamics. UNITAF and UNOSOM II increasingly became embroiled in Somali politics in order to alter the political-military situation in Somalia without the consent of the Somali people whilst at the same time the missions were clearly violating the principle of impartiality.

Offensive military operations mounted to disarm some factions in the Kismayu region and Mogadishu the capital, were clear evidence of UN favouritism which backfired as militias resisted disarmament leading to outright offensive action against the peacekeepers turned combatants. According to Chris Alden (1997:3) the official and public targeting of General Farah Aideed in which an offer of USD 25 000 was made for his capture or death destroyed any remaining perception of neutrality and impartiality, subsequently, resulting in the overall loss of credibility and legitimacy of the UN mission. UN troops were embroiled into the

factional fighting and ended up being both partisan and legitimate military targets of Somali militias as they had lost their international peacekeeping immunity.

The peacekeeping debacle in Somalia that resulted in the hasty withdrawal of US troops under UNOSOM II underlines the critical importance of impartiality in UN peacekeeping operations. According to Adebajo and Landsberg (2007:181) the Special Representative of the Secretary General during UNOSOM II's tour of duty Admiral Howe's handling of the situation in Somalia seriously undermined the mission's ability to positively influence events and served to worsen the operating environment in the theatre of operations. UNOSOM II relinquished and totally disregarded any pretences of neutrality or impartiality in handling critical and contentious issues involving some of the warlords in Somalia (Collison and Muggah 2010:290).

Walter Clarke and Jeffrey Herbst (1997:79) observed that the illusion that traditional peacekeeping methods emphasizing neutrality and impartiality were adequate to handle state failure in Somalia was finally swept aside when Aideed's forces ambushed a group of Pakistani soldiers on June 5, 1993, killing 24. What these authors fail to realize was that the militias had not consented to the massive deployment of foreign troops in their country and more so that the militias were responding to attempts at disarming them without their consent.

**4.5.3 Ethical challenges to the use of force for UN humanitarian peacekeeping missions**  
The ethical legitimacy for the use of armed force during humanitarian peacekeeping interventions was established after the Cold War. UN peacekeeping experiences of the early 1990s witnessed a growing frequency of the Security Council authorization of the use of force other than in self-defence during operations in Yugoslavia, Somalia and later Sierra Leone. In the case of Somalia, poor execution of the mandate through excessive use of force and violation of Somalia's national sovereignty compromised the international support for the mission casting doubt on the justifiability of humanitarian intervention.

UNOSOM II used force in defence of its mandate as well as offensively when trying to enforce disarmament of the militias, which also violated the principle of impartiality. Substantial offensive military force was used after the 5th of June 1993 incident when 24 Pakistani soldiers were killed by suspected Aideed's loyalists. This incident marked the beginning of continuous offensive operations in which the UN mission was preoccupied with the attempt to capture Aideed (Shawcross 2001:100), who was suspected to have authorized the attack on Pakistani soldiers. The continuous military offensive operations marked a significant shift in the conduct

of the humanitarian mission, “as it involved, for the first time since the Cold War, the deployment of UN military troops to go after a specified enemy” (*Ibid.*).

Futile attempts at capturing or killing Aideed and his senior subordinates resulted in the most violent offensive military operations launched by US troops, in what was clear excessive use of force. Wheeler (2000:116) noted that during the UN-sanctioned US operations in Somalia, “it is estimated that 6,000–8,000 Somali citizens were killed as the US employed force indiscriminately” in complete violation of the principle of the use of force and that of impartiality. The most brutal offensive operations launched at the Olympic Hotel were initiated and conducted by US Special forces acting outside the UN chain of command (Fink 1995:192). The outcome of this offensive operation was shocking. Chesterman (2001:143) estimates that “at least 500 and as many as 1,000 Somalis – many of them civilians – were killed in the fire fight.” There was clearly no sense of proportionality or self-restraint in the use of deadly force by American soldiers as they massacred mainly civilian Somalis, a situation that came to haunt them three months later when 18 American Special Forces were killed on 3<sup>rd</sup> October 1993. Wheeler and Roberts (2012) state that a total of forty-three American Soldiers and Marines were killed in Somalia, within a period of only four months. This demonstrates the degree of resistance to the presence of unwelcome foreign troops in Somalia.

Armed with a Chapter VII mandate that authorized the use of force, the UNOSOM II peacekeepers aggressively attempted to disarm the Somali population and bring the entire country under the direct control of the UN in direct violation of Somalia’s national sovereignty. Adekanye (1997) observed that “the method for disarming the Somali war-lords soon changed to that of weapons confiscation, without any compensating offer or guarantees of security to the warring clan leaders. The attempt at pacifying the Somali population was meant to create a conducive environment for the reconstruction of central government following a comprehensive security sector reform that would have guaranteed the establishment of a liberal capitalist system of government without the popular approval of the Somali population (Al Qaq Op.Cit.:72).

Stung by its own experiences when eighteen American troops were killed in October 1993 during a botched military mission, Washington withdrew her troops. The UN sponsored mission that was intended to sort out the “humanitarian” challenges faced by Somalia crumbled soon after the US panicked after losing eighteen troops in one battle encounter. The US withdrawal in March 1994 was followed within months by that of India, and the entire

enterprise was wound up in March 1995 (Dunbabin 2008:502). This left the Somali population in no better position than prior to the deployment of UN troops.

#### **4.6 Some views on ethical challenges to foreign humanitarian interventionism**

The peacekeepers deployed in Somalia were thrown into a hostile operating environment, in the middle of a civil war where violence was not only directed against civilians, but also against the UN peacekeepers themselves. The “failed state” status of Somalia and the “imbroglio of inter-tribal warfare” made attempts at immediate and fast tracked “political settlement illusory, any attempt at a cease-fire vain, and consequently, any traditional type of peacekeeping operation inconceivable” (Coulon and Liégeois 2010:13). This was aggravated by the existence of other agendas being pursued to satisfy the self-interests of both the UN and the US and its allies. In future, when faced with such cases, the UN Security Council should first establish an appropriate operating environment as was being attempted by Ambassador Sahnoun as there remains no moral or ethical justification for plunging UN peacekeepers into a civil war, causing extensive infrastructure damage and several thousands of civilian deaths in the name of humanitarian assistance and later on abandon the host population once the body bags started to rise on the interveners’ side.<sup>15</sup>

The key to sustainable peace in Somalia lay in the continuation of Mohamed Sahnoun’s political bottom up strategy that had achieved so much political progress in a relatively short term period, a development that was not appreciated by the proponents of a military humanitarian intervention solution instead of a political solution that was the original cause of the Somali crisis. Regrettably, the Secretary General and the US Administration were impatient with Sahnoun’s elaborate political process and opted for a forceful military intervention to impose their wishes on the Somali people. That approach unsurprisingly resulted in a spirited resistance to foreign imposed military solutions to local political problems without the full participation of local actors.

Peacekeeping does not always succeed and where it is successful, peacekeeping offers no lasting solutions to the root causes of war (Peou 2007:1). The Somali experience demonstrates that political usurpation of local powers by alienating key local players in an attempt at

---

<sup>15</sup>These were the views expressed by a retired Lieutenant General who served in Somalia during the climax of hostilities between intervention forces and the local militias loyal to General Farah Aideed. He further stressed that missions similar to that in Somalia would always be considered as trying to impose neo-colonialism on a population that had previously enjoyed independence, a development that would continue to face resistance from the local population despite their internal differences.

imposing settlements not acceptable to all warring parties can be counterproductive in the long term and can only work when supported by overwhelming enforcement effort which is not always sustainable for long durations (*Ibid.*). In the case of Somalia, UNITAF's mission was the first major post-Cold War UN military humanitarian intervention undertaken purportedly to protect delivery of aid and aid workers responsible for its distribution. Ironically, the mission had little or nothing to do with the protection of the poor and starving Somalis, the recipients of that food aid on whose behalf the military "humanitarian" interventions were launched. Sitkowski (2006:108) argues succinctly that, "humanitarianism was somehow reduced to feeding people while abstaining from protecting their lives" and in some cases the peacekeepers were acting as obstacles to the distribution process. Such negative observations contribute towards the suspicion that the suffering Somali masses were not the real prime target for rescue, but rather that the intervening forces had other ulterior motives for the so called "humanitarian intervention," namely to impose a regime amenable to the dictates of the US and the UN bureaucracy (*Ibid.*). Minear and Weiss (1993) observed that externally supplied donor assistance and relief aid often fuel further conflict among local belligerents, as combatants compete for rents and abuse the available funds to finance continued domestic conflict as was the case in Somalia.

The responsibility to launch armed struggle is predominantly a domestic affair and is based on a range of often very complex decisions. The same principle applies to end the armed struggle; it is a process which must be politically owned by local leadership and find broad based acceptance. The prolonged political crisis in Somalia is a case in point. The reconciliation and peace conferences as well as the establishment of the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) are externally initiated, donor financed processes, politically controlled by regional and international actors, and so far without tangible results. On the other hand the establishment of the government and public administration in Somaliland are locally driven and has so far neither received international recognition nor political support. The Somaliland administration is exclusively accountable to the local actors and population, represented by clan elders, organizations of youths, women, and professionals, such as lawyers, medical doctors and businessmen a situation where political processes are first of all locally driven events, where the acknowledgement of locally dictated conditions defines what is possible (Hirsi 2011).

On managing conflict and violence, Cousens (2001:12) believes that durable peace can be consolidated when belligerents within a given society develop non-violent conflict management mechanisms that prioritize prevention of renewed hostilities effective social,

political and legal strategies that fully address genuine and rival claims to power and competition over national resources. She goes further to argue that the “elements of positive peace that hold the most promise for peace-building include – effective public institutions, meaningful political inclusion, norms of fairness and access, legal protection for groups and individuals, … precisely those that create mechanisms for addressing grievances and resolving conflict” (*Ibid.* 13). Important to note is that for her, mechanisms for conflict management in post-war societies need not always take a liberal democratic form (*Ibid.*). The external imposition of liberal democracy on war-torn societies, others argue, can exacerbate existing violent conflicts or bring about further social and political disorder (Hobsbawm 2004:40–1). This was exactly the case in Somalia where the presence of UN peacekeepers aggravated the war economy thereby exacerbating the civil war to the detriment of the Somali population which the peacekeepers had purported to have come to their rescue. The departure of UN/US peacekeepers left the Somali population worse off compared to what the peacekeepers found on the ground as was the case in the Republic of Congo during the early 1960s following the deployment of ONUC.

#### **4.7 Conclusion**

The initial objective of the Somali humanitarian mission was to mitigate the impact of the humanitarian crisis aggravated by civil war and famine at the same time attempting to create an enabling environment suitable for encouraging and promoting diplomatic and political solutions to the crisis (Dandeker and Gow 1997:336). The combined US and UN peace enforcement mission was a typical second generation peacekeeping operation, as identified in Chapter Two of this thesis, in which peacekeepers or more appropriately peace enforcers make forceful attempts to fulfil their mandate amidst ongoing hostilities in which they end up being embroiled in fierce and deadly local fights (Coulon 2010:12). Predictably, the “humanitarian” mission in Somalia deviated from the original core objectives and resorted to the capture or defeat of one of the warlords, General Mohammed Farah Aideed an initiative that was resolutely resisted by the local militias causing thousands of innocent civilian casualties. The attempt to kill Aideed significantly contributed to the serious erosion of mission legitimacy in the eyes of the Somalis, as well as loss of international political and financial support necessary to achieve set objectives (Johansen (1996:62). The war fighting spirit that characterized the humanitarian mission in Somalia marked a significant departure from the conduct of Cold War peacekeeping missions that made attempts to uphold the cardinal normative principles of peacekeeping operations. The two missions UNITAF and UNOSOM II violated Somalia’s

state sovereignty and the norms of peacekeeping in total disregard of the wishes and aspirations of the Somali population. Hoffman (2002), points out that the actions taken by the international community especially the UN and the US after the collapse of the state of Somalia further aggravated the inability of the southern Somalis to reconcile themselves and find a common solution to their political problems as the humanitarian operations applied the principle of divide and rule through preferential treatment of some of the warlords. The joint humanitarian operations failed to effectively utilize traditional institutions of self-governance in an effort to consolidate peace and re-establish effective and just institutions of governance at the level of the state as interveners were determined to impose foreign solutions to local political problems. As a result, the peace-building phase of the operation never effectively took off the ground because of local resistance to alien solutions that were not in sync with the predominantly clan based system of governance.

The military intervention in Somalia demonstrated the practical and political limits of the US readiness to play the role of world policeman. It strengthened the argument against American military participation in UN interventions for the sake of preserving international stability, democracy or human rights (Holmes 1993:338). It also exposed the myth that military humanitarian interventions are launched primarily to rescue the suffering populations in target countries. The military intervention in Somalia was packaged and portrayed as if it was well intentioned yet it was designed to effectively interfere with Somali domestic politics in order to influence future political outcomes favourable to the interests of the US and its allies. The fact that the US offered to deploy 28 000 troops in Somalia under UNITAF after UNOSOM I had not fully exploited non-coercive options available to create a conducive environment for distribution of food aid suggests that the US had national self-interests in Somalia some of which have been highlighted above. After Operation Restore Hope had completed its tour of duty, the US offered to retain troops in Somalia under a different chain of command from that of the UN. This further suggests that the US had vested interests in the outcome of the Somali military and political experiment during the “humanitarian intervention” and nation building exercise.

What happened in Somalia serves to confirm what Ayoob (2002:86) observed that humanitarian peacekeeping and international politics appear, arguably, inextricably linked. His argument is based on the fact that the success of a “humanitarian peacekeeping” intervention, and the amount of resources and attention paid to a humanitarian disaster are dependent not on the level of suffering going on in the target country, but rather on whether there exists geo-

strategic and economic interests. This is further coupled with motivations for the intervening states implying that humanitarian intervention has become dependent, on the neo-imperialistic interests of the most powerful states (*Ibid.*).

On its completion, UNOSOM II, as happened with ONUC before it, left behind the host country in a worse situation than they found it as Islamic fundamentalism was bred out of hatred against US sponsored military intervention. Another negative outcome of the Somali mission was the determination by the UN and its main sponsors not to try again “military humanitarian interventions” in ongoing civil war environments, a policy position that influenced the embarrassing failure by the world community to respond effectively to the genocide that took place in Rwanda in 1994.

The next chapter examines the ethical challenges encountered by the UN in dealing with the Rwanda genocide in order to determine if there is a consistent pattern of behaviour by the world body and its peacekeepers.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### A case study of failed UN peacekeeping mission in Rwanda 1993-1995

#### 5.1 Introduction

It is widely accepted among scholars that the shooting down of the presidential airplane, carrying Hutu President Juvénal Habyarimana of Rwanda and Hutu President Cyprien Ntaryamire, of Burundi on 06 April 1994 triggered an orgy of violence that resulted in the Rwandan genocide.<sup>16</sup> Within a period of one hundred days, eight hundred thousand to a million lives were lost in what has been acknowledged as “the fastest genocide rate in recorded history” (Graybill 2002:86). The genocide took place when the United Nations had peacekeepers deployed in Rwanda who had warned the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) of the potential dangers of an impending genocide (Dallaire 2004). The failure by the Security Council to intervene during the genocide reflected the degree to which the organization is bedevilled with power politics (Arnold 2008).

Failure to effectively stop the genocide in Rwanda generated a lot of controversy which revolves around the issues of violation of state sovereignty and the use of force by UN peacekeepers for humanitarian purposes (Findlay 2002:276). The Security Council’s “shocking indifference” and selectivity that was manifested by “its sins of omission and its failure to try and stop the killing despite the fact that it had a peacekeeping operation on the ground” generated controversy regarding the ethical conduct of UN peacekeepers (Barnett 2014:1). The United Nations Secretariat acted unethically in trivializing the value of Rwandan lives as it prioritized the evacuation of foreign nationals from Rwanda; leaving behind gathered civilians to be butchered in their thousands by the genocidaries.

The Rwanda peacekeeping mission came soon after the disastrous and traumatic peacekeeping adventure in Somalia in 1992 and 1993 where the United Nations and the US orchestrated adventurous attempts at imposing a central government without the participation of Somalia’s population. The intervening forces in Somalia were trying to create peace where there was no

---

<sup>16</sup>Friend and Guralnik (1960:582) define genocide as “the systematic killing of, or program of action intended to destroy a whole national or ethnic group.” Melvern (2008) has classified the terrorist attack on the presidential plane as one of the greatest mysteries of the 20<sup>th</sup> century since the identity of the assassins remains unknown more than twenty years after the act.

peace to keep. This resulted in most UN member states not willing to participate in yet another potentially dangerous mission with a fragile peace to keep as the Rwandan mission was considered “a stepchild of the disaster in Mogadishu” (Doyle and Sambanis 2006:284). The Rwanda disaster and the Somali debacle reflected the degree of UN exposure to serious moral and ethical problems in peacekeeping cases where peacekeepers were increasingly embroiled in on-going “civil and ethnic wars, failed states, humanitarian crises and human rights disasters.” Furthermore, these conflicts were involving human security as opposed to classical inter-state peace and security challenges as envisioned in the UN Charter (Urquhart and Heisbourg1998:189-190).

The ethical challenge faced by the post-Cold War peacekeeping missions as observed by Roberts (1998:52) was that on one hand, if peacekeepers engaged in robust military action as happened in Somalia, they faced accusations of promoting neo-colonial agendas of powerful states and the “imposition of an unbearable burden” on troop contributing countries whose soldiers faced the danger of being killed or falling prey to hostage taking by spoilers. On the other hand, if the peacekeepers took little or no action as happened in Rwanda, they were accused of ineffectiveness, dereliction of duty to protect vulnerable civilians and “unjustifiable selectivity” in the choice of missions that deserved significant United Nations assistance.

This chapter aims to examine the ethical conduct of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Rwanda (UNAMIR) and how it impacted on Rwandan state sovereignty. The chapter argues that in line with the realist school of thought which emphasizes the prioritization of national self-interests above all else in international relations, the US resisted any suggestions of launching a military humanitarian operation to save Rwandan lives during the genocide. Ten years later, the US authorities publicly accused the Government of Sudan for deliberately orchestrating a well-planned genocide, a charge the US government refused to acknowledge when human slaughter was underway in Rwanda in 1994 (Rupp 1994:93). This was because the US together with her allies were more interested in serving their own national self-interests and not necessarily saving Rwandan civilians facing imminent danger of genocide. The Rwandan genocide led Grunfeld and Huijboom (2007: xi) to conclude that the big powers’ actions during the genocide were “more consonant with the petty interests of politics than the basic needs of humanity.” Lastly the chapter attempts to highlight the extent to which UNAMIR undermined host state sovereignty through the provision of a false sense of security for the host government and its population as the mission reneged on its duties to protect Rwandan government officials and civilians during the genocide.

The chapter is divided into six sections. Section one is a brief historical background to the genocide. Section two examines the Security Council mandates that authorized a weak and ineffective peacekeeping mission and further withdrew the bulk of peacekeepers at the peak of the genocide. Section three explores the ethical challenges faced by peacekeepers when dealing with state sovereignty versus human security. Section four scrutinizes the rationale and motives of Belgian participation in UNAMIR against prevailing peacekeeping norms that prohibited former colonial powers from participating in UN missions in their former colonies. Section five exposes UNAMIR's unethical intrusiveness in the internal affairs of Rwanda and how this served to undermine host state sovereignty. The last section is the conclusion that summarises the main arguments of the chapter.

## **5.2 Historical factors that contributed to the genocide in Rwanda**

This section covers a brief background history of Rwanda in order to appreciate the political and social dynamics that gave rise to the genocide. The political and ethnic tensions that culminated in the Rwandan genocide date back to the period of colonization by Germans in 1899 and later by the Belgians, after Germany lost her colonies in World War I (Destexhe 1995:40). The Rwandan population of seven million consists of two main ethnic groups, 85 percent Hutu and approximately 15 percent Tutsi (Jefferson, 1992). During the pre-colonial era, the terms 'Tutsi' and 'Hutu' were mainly depicting social and political status or categories, as opposed to being ethnic categorizations. In this regard, Tutsis were referred to as cattle owners, while the Hutus were considered to be cultivators (Gourevitch and Lamb, 1998). There are however conflicting views among historians and scholars regarding the exact origins of the Hutu/Tutsi ethnic conflicts.

According to Prunier (1997) the Hutu version is that the Tutsi were treacherous foreign conquerors who had oppressed the Hutu since time immemorial. The Tutsi version argues that the Hutu and Tutsi lived in harmony up to the time of colonization when artificial segregation and social divisions were created and nurtured; ultimately leading to the 1994 genocide. It is however generally agreed that the root causes of the Hutu-Tutsi conflicts revolved around the basic fundamental human needs for sustainable human life, namely: access to arable land, individual and group safety and human security, the need for tolerance of identity differences, respect for self-esteem and availability of unhindered opportunities for human development across all ethnic groups (*Ibid.*). Magnarella (2002:34) adds that the root causes of the Rwandan genocide were the disproportionate allocation of scarce agricultural land which led to fierce competition over the control of land resulting in food shortages and malnutrition due to periodic

famine. Magnarella (2002) also observed that Rwanda's Hutu leaders felt that land related problems could only be addressed through the elimination of the entire Tutsi population as well as Hutu political rivals. Diamond (2005) adds that a combination of unsustainable farming practices that resulted in inadequate food supplies, recurrent drought, and high population migration to cities coupled with a very high population growth served as catalysts towards the genocide. It can be concluded from this background that foreigners, especially former colonial masters institutionalised and magnified the social differences between the Hutu and the Tutsi.<sup>17</sup> The Germans introduced rivalries over ethnic and racial hierarchies that were based on the 'Hamitic' hypothesis that considered the Tutsi as a superior race to the subservient Hutu population (Watson 1992).

The "*Hamitic hypothesis*" argues that the Tutsi were off-springs from the superior "Caucasoid" race that originated from the Nile Valley and were considered more similar to the whites than the black *Bantu*, Hutu majority who had typical African features (Prunier 1997:6-9). Belgium took over the colonial responsibility over Rwanda after World War I and entrenched the ethnic divide to enhance its control over the indigenous population by introducing far reaching measures that reinforced minority Tutsi domination of the Hutu majority (Shawcross 2001). According to Destexhe (1995), Belgian administrative reforms drastically altered the Hutu-Tutsi political and social standing to the extent that identity cards were progressively introduced that reflected whether one was Tutsi or Hutu. Regrettably, the identity cards facilitated the identification of Tutsi targets for slaughter during the 1994 genocide (Prunier Op.Cit.).

At independence in 1961, the majority Hutu gained power over the Tutsi. A United Nations report of 1961 noted that an oppressive Hutu dominated system had replaced the previous Tutsi dominated political dispensation and that it was plausible to anticipate violent reactions and reprisals on the part of the Tutsi in the foreseeable future (Prunier 1997:53). This prediction was fulfilled in the early 1990s when the Rwanda Patriotic Front (RPF) launched a series of

---

<sup>17</sup>In an interview with Dr. Martha Mutisi on 15 July 2015, she emphasised the fact that for African states to offer effective security to their citizens and not rely on outsiders to bring peace to their countries, they need to prioritise the provision of soft security that includes the following: improved livelihoods of all sectors of the population; adoption of effective poverty reduction strategies; employment creation; guaranteeing human security through effective linkages between state security and human security, measures that reduce the likelihood of rebellions by the population. Failure to implement these soft security strategies result in conflicts that are taken advantage of by foreign powers whose Military Industrial Complexes are always on the lookout for opportunities to sell their military hardware to conflict areas.

incursions into Rwanda to force the Hutu dominated government to accommodate the Tutsi in the running of state affairs.

Unfortunately, the Hutu dominated Government of Rwanda (GoR) did not make any serious effort towards reconciliation with their Tutsi counterparts as they continued to widen their ethnic and social divisions at the same time blaming the Tutsi for political and economic problems facing the country during the years leading to the genocide (Hintjens 1999). The Hutu political elite indulged in Tutsi persecution and human rights violations resulting in approximately 100,000 Tutsis going into exile in neighbouring Congo, Burundi, Tanzania, and Uganda (*Ibid.*). Out of these refugees emerged a formidable guerrilla army under the political leadership of the Rwanda Patriotic Front (RPF) that mounted its first serious attempt at defeating the Hutu dominated Rwandan Government on 01 October 1990 from Uganda. Supported by Uganda, and her Western allies, the RPF launched military offensive operations into Rwanda in an attempt to force the Rwandan government to allow the exiled refugees to return and participate in political, economic, social and military activities of running the country (Doyle and Sambanis 2006:286). These military incursions into Rwanda culminated in the 1994 RPF “blitzkrieg style” military offensive operations that toppled the Hutu dominated government. This military success translated into the displacement of French influence from Rwanda by English speaking RPF government.

The assassination of the Rwandan president marked the launch of a deliberately planned “blitzkrieg style” RPF military assault to seize political and military power from the incumbent government (Davenport and Stam 2009). In less than a month, the RPF had overrun almost half of the country demonstrating long term deliberate and detailed strategic, logistical, and operational planning for the offensive military assault by the RPF whose military superiority had been proven during the February 1993 military invasion.<sup>18</sup> It is therefore critical to keep in mind the fact that the RPF entered the Arusha Peace negotiations with a superior military advantage over the GoR. In that regard, allowing the full implementation of the Arusha protocols would have meant that the RPF would become a minority political partner in the

---

<sup>18</sup> General Dallaire confirmed this in his cable to New York, MIR 829, dated April 24, 1994. The testimonies at the ICTR reveal extensive evidence of detailed advance military planning for offensive war by RPF between June 1993 and April 1994. In an interview with one of the senior commanders of the UN peacekeepers military contingents in Rwanda, he confirmed that they were aware of the meticulous and detailed military planning phases for the eventual takeover of the entire country by the RPF. This planning was proven by the efficient and effective execution of the rapid offensive operations in which the movement of advancing troops and logistical materiel demonstrated a very high degree of pre-planning of a military assault, that was a continuation of the February 1993 invasion that was stopped by the French military intervention.

post-transition government considering that the Tutsi constitute not more than 15 percent of the entire population. More importantly, the RPF would have given up its military superiority in a political environment where it was not guaranteed an outright majority at the polls scheduled after the transitional period (Valentino 2004:181).

Based on the discussion above, it is evident that whereas outsiders sowed the seeds of ethnic hatred and mistrust among the Rwandan population, poor management and distribution of resources, lust for absolute power and indifference to ethical practices in running the affairs of the state contributed to the lack of tolerant political practices in independent Rwanda<sup>19</sup>. In turn, this bred and nurtured the conflict between the majority Hutu and the minority Tutsi culminating into the genocide (Alozie 2007:223). Failure to accommodate and tolerate social and ethnic differences among African ethnic groups and failure to share power and national resources remain major sources of conflict in Africa as discussed in Chapter Four of this thesis on a case study of Somalia.

The next section examines the failure by the United Nations Security Council to authorise a peacekeeping mission strong enough to effectively deal with the volatile politico-security situation in Rwanda.

### **5.3 UNSC ethical challenges in handling the Rwanda crisis**

This section examines the ethical challenges that the UNSC had to grapple with in dealing with the Rwandan crisis and the rationale used to mandate a poorly manned and under-equipped UNAMIR that could hardly carry out its mandate. The main argument of this section is that the USA and the UK deliberately influenced the Security Council to deploy a weak UNAMIR. This is because such weakness would serve the interests of the UK and US sponsors of the RPF due to the fact that a weak mission would not effectively interfere with a pre-planned RPF military offensive operation to usurp power from the incumbent Rwandan government (Al Qaq 2009).

The UNSC authorised UNAMIR through Resolution 872 of 05 October 1993 and its primary mission was to monitor the ceasefire implementation by the belligerents, carrying out the

---

<sup>19</sup>Professor Madhuku concurs and adds that one of the major contributing factors to African states' failure to provide adequate security to their citizens is that they do not prioritise politics of inclusivity as they believe in the winner takes all political concept of keeping the losers who happen to be the minority groups completely outside the corridors of power. This political alienation cascades to economic resource distribution as well as marginalization of certain regions from infrastructure development, practices that breed discontent and resistance among the minority groups leading to armed conflict to bring their issues to the attention of central government.

disarmament process as agreed by the parties to the conflict and report any attempts at destabilizing the peace process and provision of human rights assistance (S.C. Res. 872, U.N. DOC. S/RES/872 dd. 5 Oct. 1993). Following the deterioration of the security situation in the country as the belligerents violated the terms of the ceasefire, UNAMIR was later given the task of negotiating as an intermediary between the belligerents in order to create a peaceful operating environment for the implementation of the Arusha peace process (Häussler 2007). Instead of reinforcing the mission to meet the changing security circumstances in Rwanda, the Security Council prioritized and emphasised on negotiations as opposed to adoption of more practical measures to deter the spoilers.

At the time UNAMIR deployed in Rwanda, low rate massacres were already taking place. Such a situation demanded a review of the mission with the intention of positively influencing the course of the political and security developments in Rwanda. This was not to be the case as the prevailing attitude among some key international players was that “Africans were savages capable of violent ethnic clashes and anarchy”, and that Rwanda was a tiny African country of little geo-strategic importance that contained no economic interests among the big powers (Prunier 2009:29). This perception influenced the formulation of UN mandates for the Rwandan mission and it also clearly demonstrated little respect and value for African lives. The authorised peacekeeping mission remained small, with a weak mandate and very few financial and material resources; limitations and conditions which reflected that UNAMIR was indeed equipped and geared for a minimalist mission. UNAMIR remained with no enforcement powers as it was simply expected to monitor a fragile peace agreement between the belligerents that had consented to the deployment of United Nations peacekeepers. According to the OAU International Panel of Eminent Personalities (IPEP), four issues enraged some African countries regarding the handling of the Rwandan crisis by UN planners.

Firstly, the signs and symptoms of not taking UNAMIR seriously were revealed when the mission was considered by UN planners as not to be “a particularly difficult mission.” This is reflected by the Security Council’s approval and deployment of a force that was “substantially weaker than the one the Arusha negotiators deemed necessary to implement the accords.” Secondly, the UNSC mandate was “wholly inadequate for the task at hand, denying the force the capacity to function effectively.” Thirdly, appeals for expansion and reinforcements for UNAMIR to match the operational exigencies and demands of the prevailing situation and realities in Rwanda were repeatedly denied as demonstrated by the fact that “no expansion of the mandate or capacity was approved until five weeks into the genocide, and by the time the

genocide ended, not one of the new soldiers assigned had arrived due to US deliberate procrastination in deploying UNAMIR II.” Lastly, the panel concluded that the “UN's insistent and utterly wrong-headed neutrality regarding the genocidaries and the RPF compromised its integrity and led it to concentrate on mediating an end to the civil war rather than saving the lives of innocent Rwandans” (*Ibid*:105). These observations serve to buttress the fact that UNAMIR was deliberately deployed as a very weak mission incapable of fulfilling its mandate reflecting unethical practice by the UNSC through deliberately deploying ineffective missions in African conflict situations. This was in addition to the fact that the OAU was denied the mandate to handle the Rwandan crisis despite its request to do so hence the continental body just watched hopelessly while Africans were butchering each other and the whole continent was awaiting for a solution to come from outside Africa, an experience that should serve as a wake-up call for the entire continent not to over rely on the benevolence of outsiders to come and resolve conflicts in Africa (Interview with Nyambuya 13 October 2015).

Dallaire and Poulin (1995) observed that UNAMIR was deployed without a budget and supporting logistical backup, such as fixed wing and rotary aircraft thus seriously undermining the effectiveness of the mission. They equally noted that some contingents of UNAMIR were deployed “with little or no ammunition and barely a third of the minimum operational equipment needed in the theatre of operations, and hardly any defence stores.” Water, food, fuels, spare parts and lubricants were all in short supply thus effectively rendering the mission useless as there were no skilled logisticians and mechanics to support the mission in the field. Thus poor logistic arrangements severely curtailed UNAMIR’s capacity to carry out any meaningful operational activities in support of the transitional process (Dallaire and Poulin 1995:14-15). Having noted the deteriorating security situation in Rwanda, UNAMIR commanders appealed for reinforcements under a new and expanded mandate but the Security Council, refused due to British and US influence (Branch 2005:115). The official narrative that attempts to explain why the Security Council deployed an ineffective peacekeeping mission in Rwanda argues that the world body was influenced by the traumatizing experience of the October 1993, Somalia debacle in which 18 US soldiers were killed in an attempt to capture or kill General Muhammad Farah Aideed and that the Presidential Policy Directive (PPD 25) of May 1994 curtailed and restrained both US peacekeeping activities as well as its support for other UN member states activities in peacekeeping missions (Power 2001; Kuperman 2004). According to this narrative, the US “tragically and erroneously” viewed the situation in Rwanda through tainted and distorted Somali lenses (Adebajo and Landsberg 2000:173).

The same narrative advances the argument that the Rwandan genocide was deliberately planned by the Presidential Guards elements together with the Hutu extremists who were afraid of the power sharing agreement arrived at in Arusha. The extremists, it is said, felt that the power-sharing arrangement was a betrayal and a serious threat to their political and economic privileges. Moreover, they feared that Tutsi participation in the integrated Rwandan Army would ultimately end up with a military coup d'état, fears linked to the Tutsi assassination of the Hutu President Melchior Ndadaye in neighbouring Burundi in October 1993 (Adebajo and Landsberg 2000:174).

The coincidence of the Somalia debacle in 1993 and the Rwanda genocide less than a year later served as a very convenient and effective smoke screen for what was actually happening behind the scenes at the grand-strategic level. Under the cover of political dust coming out of Somalia, the Anglo-American alliance was plotting the displacement of French influence from the Central African Great Lakes region through a military victory of their sponsored RPF rebel movement over the French speaking and French sponsored GoR.<sup>20</sup> According to the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative Report (CHRIR) Kagame had the powerful support of the USA and the UK, as well as the UN. The report states that this is best illustrated by the Gersony report (1994), which the Boutros-Ghali “ensured that the report was not published, and initiated the process of de-legitimising Gersony’s findings, with the approval of the US ... Kofi Annan...was instructed to follow up, and to ensure that the report was not made public” (CHRIR 2009:33). The assertion that the RPF was sponsored by the US and the UK further confirmed by the observation made by Bellamy and Wheeler (2007) who noted that the French President Francois Mitterrand was fearful of Anglo-American influence spreading into previously French-speaking Rwanda through a military victory of the English-speaking RPF. This partly explains why the French offered to intervene in Rwanda at the height of the genocide citing humanitarian concerns when in actual fact the primary purpose was to safeguard French national interests against spreading Anglo-American sphere of influence that was using Uganda and the RPF as the vehicle to achieve this strategic goal (Philpot 2005). The fact that the RPF was sponsored by the US and the UK is critical to this study because it forms

---

<sup>20</sup> In an interview with an African diplomat in Addis Ababa on 13 September 2015 who was based in Tanzania at the time of the genocide, he argued that US military support for the RPF was massive and it was extended not only to the training of the RPF military personnel by the US special forces but also during the RPF military offensive operations. He emphasised that the RPF did not wage a war to stop the genocide but rather it was “A War for Grabbing Power” as opposed to what the official narrative makes us believe. Adding that it was evident that the Rwandan Government Forces did not have the capacity to repel a determined RPF military onslaught and the RPF were aware of this reality.

the basis of understanding the unethical conduct of UNAMIR whose peacekeepers were meant to ensure that the RPF came to power in fulfilment of Anglo-American geo-strategic interests. This was to be realized through a regime change in Rwanda in clear violation of Rwanda's national sovereignty.

Black (2014:6) argues that for the role Kofi Annan played in promoting US strategic interests through peacekeeping operations, he was handpicked by the Clinton Administration for the post of Secretary General of the United Nations. In turn, he replaced Boutros-Ghali who was denied a second term in office due to his critical stance against US policies during the Rwandan genocide. Based on the ensuing discussion, it is evident that the US and Britain thwarted any attempts at strengthening UNAMIR as doing so would have jeopardised their long term geo-strategic plans for the Great Lakes region. Philpot (2005) emphasises the fact that the French and Nigerian efforts within the Security Council targeted at strengthening UNAMIR before and during the genocide were strongly resisted by the Americans and the British because doing so would have "scuttled plans for a decisive RPF victory, forced some form of power sharing and spoiled plans to remodel Central Africa." This view is shared by Del Ponte and Chuck (2011) who was fired from the International Criminal Tribunal on Rwanda (ICTR) for exposing RPF complicity in the assassination of the Rwandan President as a trigger for the genocide.

A trigger for a nation-wide pandemonium had to be found in order to justify the RPF blitzkrieg military offensive operation in the name of trying to stop the genocide and yet the real aim was to violently take over the reins of power in Kigali and avoid a power-sharing political arrangement as agreed in the Arusha Protocols. Assured of covert US military and financial support from the most powerful member of the Security Council, the USA; the RPF refused offers for a ceasefire from the government side as they were guaranteed of military victory over government forces. US sponsorship of the RPF military invasion of Rwanda in violation of the Arusha Peace Agreement explains why the US lobbied for a weak peacekeeping mission in the first place and later advocated for the withdrawal of most of the peacekeepers at the height of the genocide. The Security Council's failure to deploy a strong peacekeeping mission and its decision to further weaken the mission at the height of the genocide reflect insensitivity to the plight of the Rwandan population. These decisions were unethical and served the self-interests of the US and her allies whilst violating Rwanda's national sovereignty and undermining the national aspirations and self-determination of the Rwandan population.

### 5.3.1 UNSC unethical response to the genocide

When the Rwanda genocide broke out the US administration made concerted efforts to minimize the physical and financial involvement of the UN. This was in sharp contrast with what President Clinton had advocated for during his 1992 campaign trail to unseat President Bush Senior. President elect Bill Clinton had envisioned and publicly advocated for US-UN cooperation as the foremost vehicle for resolving crises that required international intervention (Tatum 2010:43). Once in office, this was not to be, as Ali Mazrui noted that a gap often exists between what one advocates and professes before entering public office and activities undertaken once one enters office. Before assuming office one champions and promulgates appealing policy goals however after assuming office the priority focuses on retaining power (Mazrui 1990:55-56). The Clinton administration sought to and succeeded in constraining UN involvement in the Rwandan crisis for reasons that best served US national self-interests in line with the realist school of thought which argues that morality has little space in international relations.

Bellamy and Wheeler (2007) argue that world leaders are still gripped by the realist theory of international relations mind-set that prioritizes national self-interests over humanitarian considerations. They argue that there was no intervention in Rwanda simply because no powerful countries with the military resources and capability to intervene were willing to sacrifice their troops and treasure to protect citizens of little known Rwanda. The international response limited to solidarity slogans, moral outrage and the provision of humanitarian aid well after the genocide had ended (Bellamy and Wheeler 2007). Whereas this observation could be having some merits, it misses the fact that the RPF was fighting a proxy war on behalf of the Anglo-American alliance; hence these two countries could have vetoed any Security Council resolution authorizing a coalition of the willing to intervene in Rwanda to stop the genocide. Any strong intervention in Rwanda could have seriously derailed the grand geo-strategic plan of avoiding a power sharing regime in Rwanda as agreed in the Arusha Peace Accord brokered by the OAU.

At the height of the genocide, Secretary General Boutros-Ghali proposed the deployment of 5 500 additional peacekeepers to reinforce UNAMIR and the US refused arguing "... that an expanded UN-led peacekeeping operation would need, but did not have, the consent of the Rwandan parties, and that a peace-enforcement operation without Rwandan consent would need, but did not have, a major power to undertake it" (Murphy 1996:245). The US emphasis on the need to respect Rwanda's sovereignty and consent was indeed hypocritical and was

therefore part of organized hypocrisy on the part of the Anglo-American allies in the Security Council considering that the same allies were sponsoring the RPF forces that were overrunning the country through a military invasion to topple a legitimate government that the US was falsely purporting to be respecting its sovereignty. This assertion is corroborated by the findings of the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative Report (CHRIR) that acknowledges that Kagame and the RPF indeed received military and diplomatic support from the Anglo-American allies and from some UN authorities (CHRIR 2009). The Security Council thus resorted to issuing resolutions that expressed outrage at the carnage in Rwanda without doing anything meaningful to come to the rescue of the Rwandan population that was experiencing genocide.

UN Security Council Resolution 912 of April 21 1994, adopted during the third week of the genocide, highlighted that the Security Council with the mandate to maintain world peace was appalled on learning about the large-scale violence in Rwanda that had resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians, including women and children. The Security Council was further appalled by the internal displacement the Rwandan population, including those who sought refuge with UNAMIR and outside the country resulting in a significant increase in refugees in neighbouring countries.

The UNSC under the influence of the US and Britain, deployed “a laughably small contingent of blue helmets” at the height of the genocide (United Nations 1996:268). The Security Council was aware of the deaths and wanton destruction in Rwanda, yet it proceeded with the irresponsible and unethical decision not to defend the innocent victims of these heinous and inhumane acts; leaving the Rwandan population to their own fate (Tatum 2010:45). This was a classic demonstration that African states and governments together with their populations should not put too much trust in the protection of the populations in conflict areas by UN peacekeepers. Uriga (2015) emphasised the fact that most African conflicts are planned and organized outside the continent yet to secure peace, the very sponsors of the conflicts are invited as peacekeepers to resolve the same conflicts they would have instigated.<sup>21</sup> In lobbying

---

<sup>21</sup>In an interview with Dr. R. Uriga on 10 March 2014at Great Zimbabwe University, he lamented the naiveté of African leaders who continue to entrust western powers that sponsor UN peacekeeping missions as benevolent gestures towards genuinely assisting Africans find long lasting solutions to their conflicts through UN missions. He highlighted that it was high time African leaders learnt from the outcomes of UN peacekeeping missions on the continent where sitting heads of state and government were either assassinated or removed from power under the watch of the UN missions as their presence facilitated regime change in line with the wishes of some foreign powers at the expense of the local populations. He also emphasised that Africans must prioritize dialogue instead of fighting each time there were serious issues under contention as foreign powers always try to take advantage

for the withdrawal of UN peacekeepers during the genocide, Britain and the US were arguing that they preferred an “African Solution” to the Rwandan crisis (Furley 1998:241) yet they were not only the instigators of the Rwandan crisis through their military sponsorship of the RPF, but also that they had spear-headed the refusal of the OAU to be in charge of the peacekeeping mission. Ironically, in a move that demonstrated UNSC double standards, Resolution 914 on April 27 1994 authorized a significant expansion of the UN peacekeeping mission in Bosnia, a country that was not experiencing the same gravity of humanitarian crisis as Rwanda. Surprisingly, a week earlier, the same UNSC had drastically reduced the size of UNAMIR in a country that was facing a worse humanitarian disaster than what was happening in Bosnia (OAU Panel of Experts Report 2000). This demonstrated George Orwell’s dictum that all animals are equal however some are more equal than others (*Ibid.*). The UN Independent Inquiry on Rwanda (1999:33) was unequivocal in its assessment of Security Council response to the genocide when it stated that adherence to the traditional norm of peacekeeping neutrality in a situation where hundreds of civilians were being killed in genocide was morally and ethically wrong.

The UN inquiry added that faced with unequivocal evidence of genocide, the UN was legally and morally obliged to abandon the original mediation role by UNAMIR since the original mandate for the peacekeepers had been overtaken by events. The report adds that UN peacekeepers’ resort to mediation was therefore inadequate as the situation demanded a more robust and assertive response to the ongoing genocide and that, there was no justification for being neutral in the case of a genocide (*Ibid.*). The response by the UNSC to the genocide in Rwanda reflected gross disrespect for African lives, compared to those of Europeans and other regions, a phenomenon that continues up to this day which must serve as a reminder that African countries should desist from paying lip service to the slogan “African Solutions for African Problems”. UN peacekeepers’ practices of undermining host state sovereignty continue to take place yet African countries remain dependent on the developed countries to come and finance their security programmes with little input from the African nations themselves yet in so doing, the collective sovereignty of African countries continues to be eroded.<sup>22</sup>

---

of the political fault lines emanating from tribalism and ethnic differences to advance their own geo-political agendas.

<sup>22</sup>Uriga further added that the IMF, World Bank and multinational corporations from developed countries are interested in the outcomes of UN peacekeeping missions hence the meddling in African political dynamics in

### 5.3.2 UNSC double standards in the use of force to stop the Rwandan genocide

When Secretary General Hammarskjold learnt about the alleged massacres of the Baluba tribe by Prime Minister Lumumba's forces fighting the separatists, he classified this conflict as an "incipient genocide." His reaction was very quick and unambiguous when he declared that: "Prohibition against intervention in internal conflicts cannot be considered to apply to the senseless slaughter of civilians or fighting arising from tribal hostilities" (Urquhart 1987:435, 438). Hammarskjold then directed his Special Representative in Congo, Cordier to UN troops in offensive military operations in order to stop the "incipient genocide." In doing so Hammarskjold did not seek Security Council approval before ordering a military offensive operation against Prime Minister Lumumba's government forces that were fighting to keep Congo united (Sitkowski 2006).

A united Congo under the leadership of Prime Minister Lumumba was against the geo-strategic interests of the US and its allies hence his troops had to be defeated by UN forces whilst plans were underway to assassinate the Prime Minister through active and deliberate participation of some UN officials in Congo as demonstrated in chapter three of this thesis. As directed, ONUC launched the military offensive operation and the alleged massacres were effectively stopped. This was followed by a relief operation for 250,000 Baluba refugees. Sitkowski further observes that Secretary General Hammarskjold's decisions and responses to the Kasai crisis reflected "a man of integrity, torn between deep moral convictions and professional diplomatic instincts" where "the moralist wanted to follow the ethic judgment without calculating political price, while the diplomat, estimating the price for preventing evil, resolved not to bear the costs" (*Ibid.*). The Balubas were indeed fortunate in that they were saved from the "on-going massacres" while the Tutsis and moderate Hutus were unlucky as they were killed in their hundreds of thousands in the presence of UN peacekeepers. In both cases the outcomes served the interests of foreign powers through the violation of host state sovereignty.

It proved easier for the UN peacekeepers to save thousands of people in Kasai Province from the "incipient genocide" than saving the life of Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba who had

---

order to advance their neo-colonial agendas. He suggested that Africans should desist from practicing politics based on "Late Comer Philosophy" where tribal/ethnic groups considered to have settled in certain parts of the continent are marginalised. Such late comer groups include the Ndebele in Zimbabwe; Tutsis in Rwanda and DRC. These ethnic divisions are blown out of proportions by foreign powers and their business interest groups leading to conflict that not only provide markets for their Military Industrial Complex but also give them an opportunity to come under the umbrella of UN peacekeeping to re-engineer the institutions of the affected countries along their preferred neo-liberal value systems.

invited the UN peacekeepers to Congo to assist in stabilizing a deteriorating situation that was instigated by illegal Belgian military intervention in matters that were purely within the Congolese jurisdiction. In Rwanda, just like the Patrice Lumumba assassination, the interim Prime Minister of the transitional government was murdered in the presence of UNAMIR troops “in a country that had invited them to keep the peace” (Sitkowski 2006:115). This failure by UNAMIR to protect the Prime Minister along with the failure to rescue the ten Belgian soldiers is an eloquent appraisal of the effectiveness of UNAMIR as a peacekeeping mission (Report of the UN Independent Inquiry 1999). This goes to demonstrate that the primary objective of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa is not necessarily the protection of African lives but to bring about the establishment of regimes that serve the interests of western powers at the expense of the local population.

It is important to note that ONUC peacekeepers were ordered to fight Lumumba’s forces under the pretext of stopping the alleged massacres of the Baluba population by government forces fighting to keep Congo united. The ethical excuse given was to save the Baluba population from advancing government troops. In actual fact, the moral justification for launching military offensive operations against the forces of a legitimate government trying to keep the country united was both a violation of host state sovereignty as well as a smoke screen for the real intentions and motives for mounting the offensive operations. ONUC offensive mission was a strategic masterstroke by UN peacekeepers to deny Prime Minister Lumumba military success in Kasai Province since the next target of his military offensive operations was the rebellious Katanga Province that had declared independence from Congo with Belgian and American support (Aksu 2003:109). A successful military offensive by Prime Minister Lumumba’s forces would have seriously scuttled Western geo-strategic designs of keeping Congo within the effective sphere of Western politico-economic influence at the height of the Cold War.

If indeed the Western powers cared about the well-being and human security of Rwandan civilians as they purported during the Congo crisis, they could have reinforced UNAMIR as opposed to withdrawing the bulk of the troops further exposing the population to the genocides. This observation reinforces the point of view that Western powers wanted minimum disruption of RPF military offensive operations in a bid to effectively take over the reins of government in Kigali without having to go through the tedious elections and power sharing process negotiated at Arusha (Del Ponte 2009; Branch 2005; Philpot 2005). In this regard, a strategy of having a weak UNAMIR or no peacekeepers at all was meant to create an ideal environment for unhindered successful RPF military offensive operations to topple the

incumbent central government hence the insistence of the US on initially having a weak UNAMIR and withdrawal of most of the UN troops once hostilities had started. There are a number of angles through which US negative influence on the Security Council can be explained from a realist theory perspective.

It can be argued that US involvement in a UN peacekeeping mission in Rwanda could have resulted in the downfall of the Clinton Administration as the Republicans were determined to limit Clinton's Presidency to one term only. This was certainly not a risk worth taking in an effort to save strangers whose value systems were considered inferior to those of the Western world (Interview with a retired Lieutenant General on 13 October 2015). He also emphasised that in their geo-strategic calculations, US and UK planners had to create a situation that facilitated an RPF military victory without outside interference in order to establish an undiluted pro Anglo-American regime in Rwanda a view that is shared by Philpot (2005). This therefore explains the Clinton Administration's insistence on its US officials at the UN not to classify the deaths in Rwanda as resulting from genocide (Jehl 1994). Classification of the massacres as genocide would have legally and morally obliged the US and the UN Security Council to act to stop the genocide in conformity with the provisions of the 1948 Geneva Conventions against genocide (*Ibid*).

In an unprecedented action of abandoning a host state in the midst of genocide the US Government strongly opposed any military intervention in Rwanda and even went to the extent of influencing the withdrawal of the bulk of the peacekeepers fearful of a repeat of the Somalia nightmare. Evans and Sahnoun (2002:101) have argued that the U.S. military authorities were avoiding involvement in a country of little strategic importance and of which the establishment did not have contingency plans for military intervention adding that the Rwandan situation resembled another Somalia. They added that the US military leadership was not keen to be embroiled in another failed mission in the name of humanitarian intervention (*Ibid*.). Evans and Sahnoun further noted that the Security Council under pressure from the US reneged on its international responsibility to protect human rights of endangered communities since it has an undisputed ethical "duty to protect communities from mass killings, women from systematic rape, and children from starvation" (*Ibid*.). The ethical implications of abandoning civilians facing imminent danger of genocide is that respect and integrity for UN peacekeeping missions was diminished, at the same time allowing the perpetrators of genocide to have a free rein in carrying out the atrocities, ethnic cleansing and civil war (Sitkowski 2006:116). In this regard, the physical presence of UNAMIR troops sent an implied, though misleading message of

civilian protection by the peacekeepers yet the deployment of an ineffective UN mission to Rwanda served the role of organized hypocrisy by the US and its allies.

Vulnerable civilians were left to congregating in large numbers at UNAMIR bases hoping for peacekeepers' protection yet they were ultimately exposed to the genocides as large visible easy targets demonstrating the false pretence of UN peacekeepers' protection of civilian population and complicity to mass murder (*Ibid.*). It has been observed that the presence of UN peacekeepers that are not willing or unable to effectively protect endangered civilians inhibits the local population from adopting the normal remedy of escaping from war because they will be hoping for protection from the peacekeepers. The delusion of a false sense of security makes the endangered population to stay put until it is too late to escape the life threatening danger from the perpetrators (Luttwak 1999) which is unethical. In an interview with retired Colonel Chimusoro (not real name) who was part of the UN mission at the time of the genocide, he explained the gruesome massacres of civilians that were abandoned by UN peacekeepers at the height of the genocide and he came to the conclusion that the UNSC had little or no respect for African lives. He further lamented the ongoing tragedy that Africans continue having faith in the protection of our populations by the same powers that have never demonstrated genuine respect for African lives since the period of slavery.<sup>23</sup>

Basing on the discussion above it is evident that the Security Council needs to develop effective mechanisms to intervene in situations where genuine genocide is detected since long term implications of non-intervention can be disastrous. In the same vain, the AU should give more priority towards operationalization of the slogan "African Solutions to African Problems" more so when there is growing evidence that UN peacekeepers do not prioritize the interests and sovereignty of the host population and government. The importance of implementing African Solutions to African problems was emphasised by Chiwenga (2015) when he gave the example of Botswana, Tanzania and Zimbabwe that came to the rescue of Mozambique during the 1980s civil war in that country that was sponsored by apartheid South Africa and some foreign Western powers. He highlighted that the regional countries assisted according to their military and resource capabilities where Botswana assisted with logistical support such as vehicles and combat supplies and Zimbabwe was fighting alongside the Mozambican army for ten years

---

<sup>23</sup>The retired colonel who had earlier served in Somalia argued that the butchering of Somali civilians by UNITAF and UNOSOM II was a clear demonstration that African lives were being used as cannon fodder as opposed to being genuine targets for protection by UN peacekeepers, a situation that should have galvanized African leaders to desist from relying too much on UN peacekeeping missions on the African continent.

(Ibid.). African countries that were supporting the Mozambique National Resistance Movement (RENAMO) were Malawi, Kenya and South Africa in a bid to remove from power the Marxist Government led by President Samora Machel (Ibid.). African solidarity that was demonstrated by countries that stood by the Mozambican Government is what is expected from African countries under the umbrella of the AU. The case of allowing genocide to unfold in an African country and waiting for outside powers to come to the rescue is retrogressive, counterproductive and outright irresponsible on the part of African statesmen who still look up to their former colonisers for political and humanitarian bail-outs.<sup>24</sup> Genocide is symptomatic of civil wars, failing and failed states, and it also triggers regional instability as genocide generates refugees that spill over into neighbouring countries as happened in Somalia and Rwanda where sanctuaries for the refugees ended up being “hotbeds for terrorism” (Frost 2012:101). On a cost comparative schedule deterring genocide is a lot cheaper than attempts at addressing the effects of the genocide since affected countries could become launching terrorist bases. This should give impetus to the AU to invest more resources in the early warning and preventive systems to avoid African countries degenerating into civil wars.

This section has demonstrated that the UN Security Council failed to provide timely authorization for a more forceful UNAMIR despite knowledge of on-going genocide, crimes against humanity as well as war crimes that were being perpetrated in Rwanda. The failure has been explained by the strong US lobby for a weak mission; as well as fear of the use of the veto power by the US that was strongly against any reinforcement of UNAMIR that could slow down the advancing RPF Army to defeat the Rwandan Government forces and usurp power through force of arms in clear violation of the host state’s national sovereignty (Kabau 2012:88). The entire UN Security Council demonstrated a profound lack of interest in authorizing forceful military intervention to protect and rescue millions of Tutsis and moderate Hutus that were threatened with mass slaughter during the Rwanda genocide, a development that seriously tarnished the integrity of the UN Security Council and its peacekeeping missions. The failure also demonstrated that the UN peacekeepers attach little importance to African lives

---

<sup>24</sup> Chiwenga gave other examples where African nations have demonstrated the resolve and ability to solve African crises without outside interference. The SADC intervention in Lesotho is one living example and SADC intervention in the DRC is yet another relevant example. Chiwenga further highlighted that foreign powers craft UN Security Council resolutions that promote divisions among AU member states and they exploit such divisions to promote their own self-interests following the divide and rule concept of subjugating African populations. Moreover, he added that foreign powers exaggerate the inability of African countries to find African Solutions to African Problems because they want to remain relevant in the search for solutions to African problems they would have helped create.

that are considered less valuable than their European counterparts as demonstrated by the double standards in the handling of the Bosnian and Rwandan crises.

#### **5.4 Ethical challenge of sovereignty and human security**

In the course of discharging UNSC mandates in peacekeeping missions, peacekeepers continue to face ethical problems and challenges related to respecting host state sovereignty on one hand and protection of human security on the other. What to prioritize in a given mission differs from one mission to another as the application of the principles of peacekeeping namely consent, impartiality and minimum use of force appear to be mission specific and not universally applied. The Rwandan mission, like many others during the early 1990s, raised many ethical questions regarding respect and safeguarding of host state sovereignty of a regime that was actively sponsoring and orchestrating genocide against a segment of its own population as opposed to safeguarding the safety of victims of the state sponsored genocide.

The Rwandan experience triggered serious policy and ethical debate on how to deal with the violation of a formerly well-established principle of non-interference in domestic matters when Secretary General Kofi Annan lamented that:

I also accept that the principles of sovereignty and non-interference offer vital protection to small and weak states. But to the critics I would pose this question: if humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to a Rwanda, to a Srebrenica—to gross and systematic violations of human rights that offend every precept of our common humanity? (Annan 2000:47-48).

In the case of Rwanda, the politics of racial discrimination, economic and political self-interests of the powerful states, especially the US and Britain, played a critical role in determining the conduct of UNAMIR before and during the genocide.<sup>25</sup>

Under the strong influence of the US the Security Council insisted on the deployment of a very weak mission in Rwanda and most importantly Americans insisted on non-intervention in the face of overwhelming evidence of mass atrocities, arguing that any change of the peacekeepers' mandate would require the consent of the belligerents (Murphy 1996:245). This was clearly

---

<sup>25</sup> In an interview with a former Foreign Minister in Harare, he emphasised the point that when it comes to UN peacekeeping missions in Africa, the “Them and Us Syndrome” comes into play as the US and her European allies will always treat African lives as less valuable, less precious than the lives of the white community” adding “look at how the UN Secretariat that is dominated by the American and EU staff officers prioritised the withdrawal of whites from Rwanda, after which they withdrew most of the peacekeepers from Rwanda in the hope of protecting the image of the UN as an organization as opposed to prioritizing the protection of vulnerable Rwandan civilians.

organized hypocrisy as there was no truth in the alleged respect for the need for consent from the warring parties. The two powerful members of the Security Council, the US and Britain effectively blocked any meaningful and effective intervention in Rwanda as 800,000 to a million civilians were slaughtered in a state sponsored genocide (Mgbeoji, 2003:104). Various reasons for the failure to come to the rescue of the Rwandan civilians facing imminent death fall into two broad categories.

Advocates for the first school of thought on this subject include (Melvern 2004; Power 2003; Prunier 1997) who argue that the reluctance to effectively respond to the genocide was a reflection of the tension that exists between the classic norm of respect for state sovereignty and the emerging norm of human security as well as a practical appreciation that intervening to stop a genocide or mass violation of human rights could be very difficult, dangerous and expensive in both human lives and treasure. The other school of thought however argues that the rhetoric about respecting Rwanda's sovereignty and explaining the violence in Rwanda as a civil war was designed to keep the world community outside Rwanda in order for the RPF to gain military victory uninterrupted by outside interference (Branch 2005 and Philpot 2005). The key dilemma was on one hand between respecting the territorial and political sovereignty of Rwanda, a state that was sponsoring genocide against its own population and on the other hand, the protection of human rights and security interests of the native population against gross human rights abuses (Harrington 2009:159). Sadly, the international community under the strong influence of the Anglo-American alliance opted to ignore the plight of the Rwandan population that was facing mass slaughter during one of the worst genocides of the twentieth-century. This goes to confirm that peacekeepers were predominantly not meant to be absolutely neutral in their operations and that their activities are designed to promote the interests of some powerful countries in any given mission as was the case in Congo during the early 1960s and Rwanda during the 1994 genocide. What is evident in UN peacekeeping operations is that there are multi-interest actors that try by all means to influence the outcome of peacekeeping missions to achieve their own selfish interests irrespective of the political and economic impact on the host population and government.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>These were the views expressed by a retired Lieutenant General Nyambuya on 15 October 2015. He highlighted that the self-interests of the big powers are manifested starting from the crafting of UNSC resolutions for peacekeeping missions as different interest groups attempt to outmaneuver each other well before the UN troops are deployed in the target country. As a result of such competing national self-interests, the world witnessed the dismal response to the Rwanda genocide as the French, Belgians, British and Americans were trying to maximize their national benefits from the symbolic presence or the absence of peacekeepers in that country without paying

Rieff (1995:155-62) argues that the evidence supporting the view that the US wanted a very weak peacekeeping mission deployed in Rwanda was available even before the finalization of the Arusha Accords. Firstly, the US applied its political muscle to insist that UNAMIR would have a very restricted mandate and operational capability basing on the argument that a weak mission with a consent-based mandate was non-threatening to the signatories of the agreement hence more acceptable to the parties to the conflict (*Ibid.*). Secondly, when the strength and composition of UNAMIR was deliberated in the Security Council, the US influenced the adoption of the least effective option thus ensuring a weak mission. Thirdly, the authorized mission, once in Rwanda, experienced serious operational, financial and logistical challenges due to the negative influence of the US whose budgeting considerations guaranteed that the critical resources for UNAMIR to be effective in discharging its mandate were not forthcoming (*Ibid.*). Existing literature on the deployment and conduct of UNAMIR acknowledges that the mission was very weak as it was poorly manned and grossly under equipped to the extent that the peacekeepers were unable and in some cases deemed unwilling to prevent and forestall the genocide in Rwanda (Power 2003:329-45).

The US and the UK adopted unethical policy positions that not only led to the deployment of a very weak UNAMIR but also to the withdrawal of the bulk of the peacekeepers at the peak of the genocide and in that regard, sabotaged any possibility of a humanitarian intervention as outlined in the Genocide Convention (Barnett 2002). Instead of advocating for reinforcements for UNAMIR when news of genocide first surfaced, the US under the influence of the Belgians and the British, not only prevented attempts at reinforcing the peacekeepers already in Rwanda but instead strongly advocated for the reduction of deployed peacekeepers, a role considered to be counterproductive and destructive as this act served to empower the genocidaries. Gourevitch and Lamb (1998:150) observed that "... the desertion of Rwanda by the UN force was Hutu Power's greatest diplomatic victory to date, and it can be credited almost single handedly to the US." The inference of this argument is that the UN abandoned Rwandans at the time of their greatest need and that a humanitarian intervention should have been launched to protect Rwandan civilians against their own government sponsored genocide, which could have reinforced precedents set by humanitarian interventions in Somalia, Bosnia and Kosovo (Al Qaq 2009:107). Indeed after the Rwandan genocide international debate on military

---

attention to the plight of the suffering population and the violation of Rwanda's national sovereignty that they were practicing.

humanitarian intervention intensified culminating in the adoption of the concept of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) by the UN General Assembly in 2005.

The next section examines Belgian participation in UNAMIR and the negative role it played towards undermining the outcome of that mission.

### **5.5 Unethical Belgian participation in UNAMIR**

This section examines the motive of having Belgian troops participating in UNAMIR a mission deployed in her former colony, a practice that was discouraged during the traditional peacekeeping missions launched during the Cold War. Understanding the motivation of Belgian participation in the mission would assist in unpacking the role played by the Belgian troops in undermining host state sovereignty through cooperation with the RPF as well as its lobby to have all UN peacekeepers withdrawn from Rwanda following the killing of the ten Belgian troops on suspicion of complicity in the assassination of the Rwandan president together with his Burundian counterpart.

During the first generation of peacekeeping missions, it was not permissible and very unusual that ex-colonial powers would contribute peacekeepers to UN missions in their former colonies. Melvern (2001) acknowledges that UN doctrine prohibits former colonial powers from participating in peace-keeping missions in their former colonies.<sup>27</sup> It is not clear whether Belgium offered to participate in UNAMIR or it was invited by the Secretary General. One account states that the Belgians were invited by Secretary General Boutros-Ghali while the other version states that the RPF suggested the participation of Belgian peacekeepers to neutralize French influence in Rwanda (OAU Panel of Experts 2000). Irrespective of which account is correct, Belgian participation was considered to be "a mixed blessing" right from the initial deployment (Dallaire 2004: 89 and Prunier 1995:194). France offered to participate in UNAMIR but was denied the opportunity because the RPF opposed French participation due to France's long standing political and military relationship with the Rwandan Government (Melvern Op. Cit.). The rationale for denying former colonial powers from participating in peacekeeping missions in their former colonies was that former colonizers would find it

---

<sup>27</sup> Former colonial powers could however organize peacekeeping missions to manage the transition towards independence as happened in Zimbabwe where a Commonwealth Peacekeeping mission was deployed to monitor the transition from Rhodesia to Zimbabwe. In actual fact, colonial powers preferred to mount peacekeeping missions that were under their complete control as opposed to missions that were under the command and control of the UN since they would have limited influence over UN sponsored missions, a situation that militated against their national self-interests.

extremely difficult to remain impartial in a situation in which they had clearly defined self-interests and preferred political outcomes of the mission. This policy was adopted to dispel any fears of UN peacekeepers serving the interests of the former colonizers yet in practice, the interests of western powers were taken care of by US dominance of the missions at the strategic and operational levels as demonstrated in chapters three and four of this thesis.

The British were denied the opportunity to contribute peacekeepers during the Suez crisis of 1956 and the Belgians were denied a similar opportunity during the Congo crisis of 1960 to 1964 (Al-Qaq 2009). Surprisingly, the Belgian government was not only keen to support UNAMIR but actually provided the strongest military contingent to the Rwandan mission and was assigned the most strategic and sensitive military sector of securing the capital Kigali and the airport (OAU Panel of Experts Report 2000). In actual fact, Belgian troops formed the military backbone of UNAMIR. The justification for deploying Belgian troops, the only NATO country to do so remains unclear although this appears to have been a well calculated strategy to implement the regime change agenda designed to displace French influence from the Great Lakes region and replace it by an English speaking regime that advanced the geo-strategic interests of the Anglo-American alliance (Interview with an African Diplomat in Addis Ababa 2015).

General Dallaire advances the argument that a deal could have been struck between the French and Belgian authorities for Belgian troops to protect French interests in Kigali after the departure of the French battalion as required in the Arusha Peace Agreement (Dallaire 2003). On the contrary, the Rwandan government that was very close to the French authorities was being undermined by the presence of Belgian peacekeepers implying that French interests in Rwanda were also being undermined by the presence of Belgian troops in Kigali. Prunier (1995:103–6) argues that France feared that the RPF, with Ugandan diplomatic and military support represented a formidable threat from the Anglo-American alliance against a former French-speaking colony. Belgian troops were therefore not necessarily promoting French interests as Belgian peacekeepers deliberately undermined the Rwandan government authority and sovereignty favouring the RPF to the extent that it is strongly suspected that they were instrumental in the assassination of the two presidents on 06 April 1994 that triggered the genocide (Bruguiere Report 2006). Moreover, it was the RPF that suggested the deployment of Belgian peacekeepers in Rwanda to counter the influence of France during the deployment of UNAMIR as stated above. France desperately tried to prevent the coming to power of “English-speaking Africans” in Rwanda but failed (Hintjens 1999:273). In facilitating the coming to

power of the RPF, the peacekeepers were playing the role of managing the demise of French influence in Rwanda and the ascendancy and installation of the RPF regime. Once hostilities started, the UN following its traditional practice, sided with the US in facilitating the demise of the Habyarimana regime (Al-Qaq 2009:162). This was in clear violation of the host state sovereignty that attracted hostility from those that were going to lose power as a result of Belgian manipulation of the crisis to secure an outcome favourable to the Belgians and their US and UK allies.

### 5.5.1 Anti-Belgian sentiments in Kigali

According to the Bruguiere Report (2006), the origins of the anti-Belgian troops' presence in Kigali can be traced to several factors. Firstly, the participation of Belgium in UNAMIR was at the recommendation of the RPF that aimed at neutralizing the strong French influence in Kigali; Secondly, the entry into Kigali by the RPF battalion, under the escort of Belgian peacekeepers on 28 December 1993 as part of the Arusha Agreement, caused some serious resentment and mistrust of the Belgian contingent among government troops and elements loyal to the Rwandan government. This was aggravated by the questionable conduct of Belgian troops during their stay in Kigali, where they were perceived to be favouring the RPF elements deployed in the capital. Of particular importance was the alleged role played by the Belgian peacekeepers in the assassination of the two presidents on 06 April 1994.<sup>28</sup>

On the fateful day when the presidential jet was shot down, Belgian peacekeepers had earlier escorted RPF rebels into the Akagera national park located in the direction from which the missiles that shot down the presidential plane were fired (Bruguiere Report 2006:7). The Belgian Parliamentary Commission that investigated the killing of 10 Belgian peacekeepers failed to identify the RPF rebel officials who were escorted into the national park and the exact nature of the mission thereof (*Ibid.*). The fact that despite the death of 10 Belgian soldiers in Kigali at the hands of the Presidential Guards troops, the Belgian Parliamentary Commission failed to identify the RPF officials that were escorted to the area considered to be the launching base for the missiles, significantly contributed to the strong theory and suspicion that Belgian peacekeepers were directly or indirectly involved in the conspiracy and possibly the actual facilitation of the terrorist attack of the two presidents (*Ibid.*). Empty missile launchers were

---

<sup>28</sup> The Security Council has failed to commission an independent international inquiry into the deaths of two African presidents. Efforts to establish such an inquiry continue to be blocked by powerful members of the Security Council whose international standing might be jeopardized by the true findings of such an investigation.

later found abandoned in the Akagera national park which tends to reinforce the suspicion of the Belgian peacekeepers' unexplained visit to the park on the day the two presidents were assassinated.

It is now an undisputed fact that the missiles that were used to shoot down the presidential aircraft were from the official inventory of the Ugandan Armed Forces, thus linking the Belgians and RPF to the shooting incident.<sup>29</sup> The Rwandan forces had no anti-aircraft missile systems in their military inventory. On the contrary, the RPF had surface to air missiles (SAM 14 and SAM 16) missiles in their inventory (Bruguiere Report Op. Cit.). The fact that the Rwandan Forces did not have anti-aircraft missiles in their inventory dispels the theory that Presidential Guards troops shot down the aircraft. We can recall that Belgian troops' (not peacekeepers) role in the assassination of Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba as discussed in Chapter Four of this thesis.

There appears to be too much of a coincidence in that the Belgians were directly involved in the assassination of Prime Minister Lumumba, in covert cooperation with the American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). In Rwanda Belgian troops were implicated in the terrorist attack on the presidential plane that killed the Rwandan President and his Burundian counterpart, an act that triggered the genocide. In both cases the CIA was implicated. The failure by the international community to investigate the assassination of the two African presidents reflects the existence of a powerful influence within the Security Council to block any such attempts at establishing the true facts as to who shot down the presidential aircraft killing two African heads of state (Philpot 2005).

It is evident from the discussion above that the deployment of Belgian peacekeepers in Rwanda was unethical right from the start. The deployment ultimately resulted in unethical conduct by the peacekeepers arising from the strategic role they were meant to play in the implementation of a geo-strategic plan to promote Belgian and Anglo-American interests designed to dislodge French influence from this region. Worse still, the Belgian authorities influenced the Security Council to withdraw the bulk of UN peacekeepers at the height of the genocide following the withdrawal of the entire Belgian contingent.

---

<sup>29</sup> The origins of the missiles used were from an official weapons consignment delivered to Uganda from the USSR. The serial numbers of the fired cartridges matched the remaining missiles still in the Ugandan military inventory, thus linking the RPF and possibly the Belgian peacekeepers to the act of assassination.

The next section examines the unethical conduct of the peacekeeping mission in Rwanda to determine the degree to which host state sovereignty and peacekeeping principles were violated or undermined.

## **5.6 An analysis of unethical conduct by UNAMIR**

This section aims to demonstrate that UNAMIR was intrusive in the political and military affairs of Rwanda. These intrusive activities were meant to serve the interests of big powers that were sponsoring the RPF rebel movement and in doing so the peacekeepers were undermining host state sovereignty. I will demonstrate that UNAMIR acted along similar modus operandi as UN peacekeepers in Congo during the early 1960s where ONUC actively participated in regime change activities to the extent of being accomplices in the assassination of government officials that had earlier consented to the deployment of the peacekeepers.

### **5.6.1 UNAMIR unethical intrusiveness in Rwanda domestic affairs**

The composition of UNAMIR (320 civilian staff and 2 548 troops) depicted a mission that was not primarily meant to effectively deal with any wayward behaviour by spoilers of the peace agreement but rather to supervise the assembly of the Broad Based Transitional Government (BBTG), a new political dispensation through a regime change process that was to be micro-managed by the peacekeeping mission (Al Qaq 2009:114). A critical analysis of the conduct and activities of UN personnel reflects deep involvement as opposed to nominal participation in Rwandan political affairs through squeezing and pushing the Habyarimana government to accelerate its political and economic liberalization processes in order to fast track the outcome of the transition process in whose outcome was in favour of the Anglo-American sponsors of the opposition parties including the RPF (*Ibid.*). In doing so, the peacekeepers aggravated an already volatile political environment to the extent that resorting to violence as a means of mitigating or even reversing the effects of the fast track political liberalization process became the most logical and practical strategy for the greater part of the Hutu population (*Ibid.*). There was very little the GoR could do to reverse the course of political developments as the forces marshalled against it were formidable.

One diplomat that the researcher interviewed in Addis Ababa acknowledged that once a country accepts the deployment of peacekeepers, it is a public admission that it would have failed to run and administer its own domestic affairs without outside interference hence failed and failing states must bear the consequences of having peacekeepers on their soil. He added that the presence of UN peacekeepers is a direct result of their political incompetence to

stabilize the political and security situation in the affected country.<sup>30</sup> He emphasised that Rwanda was no exception as it had to submit most of its government economic, political and military functions to direct and indirect monitoring and supervision by the civilian component of UNAMIR and military peacekeepers on behalf of the Security Council. These views are shared by an official from the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) that was interviewed by the researcher in Durban on 16 July 2015. He argued that African states have themselves to blame for having their sovereignty violated by UN peacekeepers because the UN does not invite itself to come to these countries. He added that failure to resolve internal conflicts through dialogue, coupled with the politics of exclusion and winner takes all mentality result in the deployment of UN peacekeepers. On arrival they interpret the situation through their own lenses and attempt to seek solutions that they believe will bring about long lasting solutions to the country even if it means violation of state sovereignty to achieve this objective. In his view, the peacekeepers intrusive activities in the political activities of the host country such as monitoring and supervision of the political processes constituted unpopular but necessary intrusive behaviour on the part of the peacekeepers that undermines host state sovereignty in order to achieve a better future for the population. However what this official failed to acknowledge was the fact that peacekeepers intrusiveness was meant to promote the self-interests of some big powers at the expense of the local population. Regrettably, in the majority of cases, host governments have little room to manoeuvre in order to limit the extent of the intrusiveness by the peacekeepers because they would have voluntarily consented to the deployment of foreign forces on their soil in the first place. This was the case with the Rwandan government although the incumbent government agreed to the deployment of UN peacekeepers under duress from the US authorities.

Al Qaq (2009:114) argues that the Habyarimana government had consented to the deployment of UN peacekeepers under duress hence the host-state consent it granted was coerced consent because it acquiesced to the deployment of peacekeepers in Rwanda as an alternative to a military defeat by the RPF and also as a result of increased international political isolation. This view is buttressed by Prunier (1997:101-102) and Des Forges (2007:50) who confirm that the GoR agreed to the deployment of UN peacekeepers as the only viable alternative to a

---

<sup>30</sup> The diplomat gave an analogy of a domestic squabble between a husband and wife. He said that once the in-laws or neighbours are invited to assist in resolving their dispute, in the majority of cases these outsiders end up knowing too much about the private life of the affected couple and their advice, to be effective, should be premised on certain domestic sensitive facts that might appear as if they are intruding in the private affairs of the couple seeking assistance.

military crashing defeat by the RPF on the battlefield. The GoR was rescued from a humiliating military defeat by the RPF through the timely military intervention by French troops during the 1993 rebel military offensive operations (*Ibid*). Added to this, the UN system was conscious of the fact that the outcome of the Arusha Agreement amounted to a “negotiated surrender of political power” by the incumbent government hence its approach in dealing with the regime was cognisant of the regime’s inherent political, economic and military weaknesses (Al Qaq 2009). In the same vein, the main leverage the UN had over the GoR was the threat of withdrawing the peacekeepers. A withdrawal of UNAMIR would translate into a defeat of the GoR on the battlefield (Al Qaq 2009). With this in mind we can appreciate the negative impact of the threats of peacekeepers’ withdrawal that were exerted on the GoR to speed up the transitional process which it viewed as a negotiated surrender of power and privileges to the opposition.

In a letter to President Habyarimana in January 1994, the Secretary General Boutros-Ghali reminded the state president that continued presence of UNAMIR was dependent on the fast track implementation of the Arusha Peace Agreements. He stressed that in its Resolution 893 of January 1994, the Security Council had “strongly urged the parties to comply fully with the Arusha Peace Agreements...the Council stressed that continued support for UNAMIR would depend upon the full and prompt implementation by the parties of the Arusha Peace Agreement (UN Doc. United Nations and Rwanda 1993-1996:42)

Mounting additional pressure on the Rwandan government to speed up the implementation of the Arusha protocols, the Council further warned: “...Security Council calls the attention of the parties to the consequences for them of non-compliance with that provision of the Agreement. It notes that UNAMIR will be assured of consistent support only if the parties implement the Arusha peace Agreement fully and rapidly (S/PRST/1994/8, dated 17 February 1994). The Secretary General further ratcheted up the pressure on the Rwandan Government by threatening to withdraw UNAMIR if the transitional process was not speeded up (S/1994/360, dated 30 March 1994). In a deliberately calculated move to further mount the pressure on the Rwandan President, on 05 April 1994, instead of extending UNAMIR mandate by six weeks as recommended by the Secretary General to the Security Council, an extension of only four weeks was granted on condition that the Secretary General reported progress on the implementation of the transitional process, failure which UNAMIR was to be withdrawn (S/RES/909 (1994) dated 5 April 1994). The unethical and irresponsible withdrawal of the bulk of UN peacekeepers that took place at the height of the genocide was in part a fulfilment of

this threat that was meant to pressurize and squeeze the GoR to speed up implementation of peace agreements that the government considered to be a “negotiated surrender” of political power (Al Qaq 2009 Op. Cit.). The deliberate and concerted pressure on the GoR however ended on 06 April 1994, when the Presidential plane was shot down triggering the genocide and the RPF final and decisive military offensive operation to take over complete and undiluted political power in Kigali and not necessarily to stop the genocide.

#### 5.6.2 An analysis of UNAMIR’s failure to use force to stop the genocide

UN initial response to the outbreak of the genocide was to evacuate foreign nationals, especially American and European citizens, after which the Security Council authorized the withdrawal of the bulk of the peacekeepers in an act of abandoning the endangered Rwandese to their fate (OAU Panel of Experts Report 2000). Having realized that indeed genocide was taking place in Rwanda, potent ethical arguments and justifications were articulated with a view to stop the genocide but no decisive action was taken to effectively bring the genocide to an end (Aoi 2011:85). Reluctance by big powers to launch a military humanitarian operation in Rwanda emanated from the absence of strong power-political national self-interests, as well as absence of geo-strategic justification for the use of force for humanitarian reasons in Rwanda (*Ibid.*). In fact the powerful members of the Security Council played power-political games to justify non-intervention.

The US, was not keen to financially support or take part in an expensive enforcement mission following the Somalia disaster, arguing that another failed intervention would tarnish the image and authority of the UN as there was a strong perception that another intervention in Africa would most likely fail hence non-intervention was meant to preserve the image and authority of the world organization (*Ibid.*). The ethical justification for a military intervention was primarily humanitarian, to stop the genocide and preserve precious human life and the need to promote multilateral security. The ethical counter-argument for non-intervention was to preserve and protect the international image and authority of the UN through the avoidance of yet another disaster in military humanitarian intervention, in a mission that was promising to be complex and difficult (Al Qaq 2009). It was generally argued that Rwanda had no strategic importance to justify an expensive military humanitarian intervention a perception that was worsened by the restrictive US Presidential Policy Directive (PPD 25) which viewed UN peacekeeping operations as having been over used by major powers hence it sought limiting scenarios in which the US would support UN peacekeeping missions (PDD 25 2004). Fears of launching yet another failed mission in Rwanda soon after the Somali debacle contributed to

UN inaction. The US was the strongest opponent to any attempt at using military force in Rwanda as it argued that any hasty military intervention in Rwandan civil war would result in failure as was the case in Somalia (Barnett 1997:572). Thus the mandate for UNAMIR was very restrictive in what the mission could do without prior approval from New York.

Hiding behind a restrictive interpretation of its mandate, UNAMIR remained idle and watched hopelessly as Rwandans were slaughtering each other during one of largest and fastest genocides of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Sitkowski 2006:111). Although the Security Council mandate did not categorically authorize UNAMIR to use force to protect civilians in danger of being killed, the Rules of Engagement (ROE) drafted and distributed by the force commander General Dallaire authorized peacekeepers to use force for the sake of protecting endangered civilians. Sitkowski (2006:16) observed that UNAMIR ROE authorized peacekeepers to use force in order to “prevent crimes against humanity, but these were deliberately not applied” demonstrating continued existence of ambiguity in the exact role of military peacekeepers in peace operations with a humanitarian dimension (*Ibid*). Paragraph 17 of the ROE specifically authorised UNAMIR peacekeepers to use all means available for protecting Rwandan civilians.

It stated in detail that:

Crimes against Humanity: Ethnically or politically motivated criminal acts may also be committed during this mandate and will morally and legally require UNAMIR to use all available means to put an end to them. Examples: Executions, attacks or displaced persons or refugees, ethnic riots, attack on demobilized soldiers, etc. On such occasions, UNAMIR military personnel will follow the ROE outlined in this directive, in support of UNCIVPOL and local authorities or in their absence, UNAMIR will take the necessary action to prevent any crime against humanity (ROE-Operational Directive No.2 dated 19 November 1993).

Directives such as this were very uncommon during traditional peacekeeping operations as this violated the principle of minimum use of force except in self-defence (UN Doc. S/1999/1257). The deteriorating security situation in Rwanda where low level acts of genocide were taking place and preparations for genocide were evident through the distribution of war materials and the spreading of hate language against the Tutsi influenced General Dallaire to draft this rare set of ROE. The Force Commander described the inclusion of paragraph 17 in the ROE as breaking new ground in a bid to compensate for the absence of a Chapter VII mandate that authorizes the use of force for the protection of civilians (Dallaire Op. Cit.:71-72). Although the ROE was in force among UNAMIR contingents, it was neither endorsed nor denounced by UN headquarters when the draft copy was submitted for approval. This was condoned possibly because it was morally appropriate to use force other than in self-defence for the sake of

protecting endangered innocent civilians in a situation of an ongoing genocide. It would have been legally and ethically justifiable to use force in order to curb crimes against humanity in line with the provisions of the Genocide Convention. What is morally apprehensible is that the provisions of paragraph 17 were not applied to curb or stop the genocide. The mission lacked both the authority and capacity to use force in defence against gross human rights violations as stated in paragraph 17 of the ROE. As a result the parties to the conflict took advantage of the weak UNAMIR as a golden opportunity to reorganize and regroup their forces for the resumption of the unfinished civil war (Doyle and Sambanis 2006:282).

Reasons given for non-use of force to stop the Rwanda genocide was that the ROE were self-limiting and restrictive in that they prescribed that authority to use force of arms in situations other than legal self-defence had to be secured from the Sector Commander of Kigali or from the Force Commander who in turn had to seek authority from his superiors in New York (Sitkowski 2006). This is evidenced by denial of permission for the Force Commander to use force to protect the Rwandan Prime Minister Madam Agathe Uwilingiyimana who was killed in a UN compound in the presence of peacekeepers (OAU Panel of Experts Report 2000). This also partly explains why the ten Belgian peacekeepers were killed in cold blood without firing a single bullet in self-defence (*Ibid*). The other reason for non-use of force was fear of triggering a violent military backlash from government forces once peacekeepers used fire arms aggressively against government security elements threatening the lives of government officials and committing genocide.

The Carlsson Report (1999) noted that General Dallaire did not launch a military operation to rescue the captured Belgian peacekeepers that were being tortured by Presidential Guards soldiers because he felt the risk of intervening peacekeepers' casualties would be unacceptably too high to justify an attempt at rescuing the ten peacekeepers. He equally felt that UNAMIR had too limited resources in manpower and military fighting capacity to mount a violent rescue operation. Considering that UNAMIR contingents had no adequate food, medical supplies, ammunition and combat supplies, it would have been a futile if not suicidal attempt at rescuing fellow peacekeepers through the use of force as the peacekeepers were completely outnumbered and out gunned by government forces. In addition, such an act of war would almost have guaranteed the withdrawal of government consent to the continued deployment of

the peacekeepers.<sup>31</sup> This scenario posed a serious military ethical challenge on whether or not to risk the lives of many more peacekeepers in an attempt at rescuing ten Belgian peacekeepers implicated in the shooting of the presidential plane. The future of the mission itself would have taken a totally different and dangerous course had an attempt to forcefully rescue the Belgian troops been mounted. Considering that UNAMIR was a Chapter VI peacekeeping mission General Dallaire decided that it was prudent to let the Belgian troops pay the ultimate price without any assistance from their fellow UNAMIR peacekeepers (UN Doc. S/1999/1257).

### 5.6.3 Unethical and senseless withdrawal of peacekeepers amid genocide

The killing of ten Belgian UNAMIR peacekeepers provoked the immediate and senseless withdrawal of the entire Belgian contingent that was the backbone of UNAMIR. Belgium, for unethical and selfish reasons, irresponsibly and senselessly lobbied for withdrawal of the entire UNAMIR in order to avoid being singled out as the only country that abandoned the Rwandan civilians at the time of their greatest need (Adebajo and Landsberg 2000:174). The lobby was supported by the US and resulted in an unethical compromised decision to reduce UNAMIR to a derisory and ineffective 270 peacekeepers (UNSC RES/912 of 21 April 1994)<sup>32</sup>. The Secretariat officials in New York instructed General Dallaire not to take any action towards protecting the Rwandan population facing the threat of genocide under the pretext of being impartial in a situation of a “civil war” (Boutros-Ghali 1999:138). This was a demonstration of having little respect for African lives.

What this basically meant was that the international community literally abandoned the Rwandan population at the time of their greatest need when they were facing mass murder. This was indeed a morally reprehensible decision, which had far reaching implications in that over 800 thousand Rwandese lost their lives and the genocide triggered a massive exodus of refugees to neighbouring countries namely Burundi, Tanzania, Uganda and Zaire.

---

<sup>31</sup> In an interview with a Colonel who was with an African contingent in Kigali at the outbreak of the genocide, he confirmed that the idea of rescuing the Belgian peacekeepers was not entertained for long by other contingents that were scared of reprisals by government forces that were vastly superior to the peacekeepers in every respect. He added that any forceful attempt at rescuing the peacekeepers would have been interpreted as an act of war against the host government that was morning President Habyarimana who had been killed in circumstances that implicated the Belgian peacekeepers that were detained, tortured and later killed by the Presidential Guards troops.

<sup>32</sup> UN Security Council Resolution 912 S/RES/912), dated April 21, 1994, para. 8, reduced the UNAMIR troops to 270 peacekeepers. The Rwandan UN Ambassador Jean-Damascène Bizimana complained that: “The international community does not seem to have acted in an appropriate manner to reply to the anguished appeal of the people of Rwanda . . . The option chosen by the Council, reducing the number of troops in UNAMIR . . . is not a proper response to this crisis. . . .” (UN Doc. S/PV.3368 dated 21 April, 1994).

Commenting on the unethical decision by the Security Council, Secretary General of the OAU, Salim Ahmed Salim is quoted as having lamented that:

It was absolutely incomprehensible for Africa that the UN should withdraw the majority of its troops from Rwanda and refuse to change its decision at the very time its presence is required to end the massacre of innocent people. The Security Council must recognize it is the responsibility of the international community to end the large-scale killings and genocide being perpetrated in Rwanda (Furley 1998:240-241).

The OAU itself did nothing to come to the rescue of the Rwandan civilians because there was no consensus on what was the best response to the genocide among African states. The OAU Report on The Preventable Genocide (2000) made a very illuminating conclusion regarding the apartheid like decision to withdraw the bulk of UNAMIR after the successful withdrawal of foreigners from Rwanda when it stated that:

There are reasons why Africa has been marginalized, why the world is indifferent, why there seems to be a double standard when it comes to Africa. Events in recent years make inescapable the conclusion that an implicit racism is at work here, a sense that African lives are not valued as highly as other lives. Nowhere was this demonstrated more flagrantly than when UNAMIR was instructed by New York in the first days of the genocide to give priority to helping expatriates flee Rwanda, and if necessary to go beyond its narrow mandate to achieve this end (OAU Report on The Preventable Genocide 2000:252).

The OAU Report fell short of clearly acknowledging that the African states with the responsibility of protecting their own citizens must be seen doing everything in their power to safeguard the human security of their citizens; as opposed to relying on outside peacekeepers whose agenda is not always in sync with the wishes and aspirations of the African populations in affected countries. The realization that when it comes to saving African lives, the USSC plays double standards should in itself galvanise African states to jointly seek African solutions to African problems without over reliance on outside assistance.

Africa continues to be marginalized, and the world continues to be indifferent, while double standards continue to be applied to African conflict areas yet little to nothing is being done to improve Africa's self-sufficiency in dealing with her regional conflicts.<sup>33</sup> These observations

---

<sup>33</sup> These were the views of a frustrated diplomat interviewed in Pretoria during the SADC Defence and Security Coordinating meeting held in October 2015. He further lamented that, "Programmes to mobilize financial resources to make the AU self-sufficient are never implemented because Africa lacks unity of purpose when it comes to peace and security issues on the continent. Our heads of state are always being manipulated by the big powers for the sake of continued financial aid which in itself is meant to perpetually lock our countries in the dependency syndrome that serves the interests of our former colonial masters."

call for a serious continental determination to develop the political will power and unity of purpose among African leaders to channel financial and human energy resources towards investing in conflict prevention and resolution initiatives by African states themselves in order to operationalize the “African Solutions to African Problems” dictum. It is disheartening to note that the continental organization still heavily relies on donor funds to finance its continental security challenges, yet some of the conflicts are instigated by the same donor community that comes under the pretext of assisting in resolving the conflicts they would have instigated.<sup>34</sup>. In an interview with Ibbo Mandaza (November 2015) in Harare, he highlighted the fact that Africa can achieve self-sufficiency in addressing continental security challenges in the same manner that the OAU had unity of purpose when it sought to liberate the continent from colonialism.<sup>35</sup> The same degree of commitment, dedication and sacrifice has been watered down as each African state minds its own business to the extent of even being used as spring boards by powerful western countries to launch insurgency military attacks in neighbouring countries to further the self-interests of foreign powers.

#### 5.6.4 UNAMIR’s unholy alliance with the RPF

After the signing of the Arusha Peace Agreement (APA), the RPF successfully negotiated on 28 December 1993 for the deployment of its advance battalion in the heart of Kigali allegedly to provide protection to its officials working on implementing the BBTG. The RPF protection battalion was quartered around the parliament building, strategically located in the central district of Kigali, and this eventually became the forward logistics base for perpetrating the RPF military offensive operations. Furthermore, the parliament building served as an advance bridgehead for launching the military campaign that toppled the Rwandan government (Bruguiere Report 2006:32). The decision to deploy the RPF battalion at the parliament building, the seat of government, had a devastating psychological impact on government forces and

---

<sup>34</sup> This was the view of an African diplomat interviewed in Harare on 13 November 2015. The Ambassador lamented the AU continued dependency on foreign funds to run its operational and security budgets and added that “some of the so called AU strategic partners are like arsonists who set your house on fire and later come dressed as fire brigade to pretend as if they genuinely want to assist you in putting out the fire yet they would have created access for their intrusion in your own domestic affairs without you realizing it. They will be pursuing their own selfish interests, based in your country, undermining your sovereignty under the cover of assisting you to put your house in order.”

<sup>35</sup> In an interview in Harare on 15 November 2015, the academic called for commitment and sacrifices of similar magnitude as demonstrated during the decolonization era if the slogan “African Solutions to African Problems” can be fully operationalized. He however acknowledged that African countries continue to be divided by former colonial powers to guarantee that there is no unity of purpose among the African states as such unity acts against the self-interests of the big powers that benefit from the fragmented approach of African states.

officials alike who felt that this was a confirmation of a surrender of political power in the making. Confirming the strategic importance of the parliament building area, General Dallaire acknowledged that UNAMIR was initially opposed to the selection of this site in central Kigali because it was “a position which permitted considerable control over communication arteries between the city and the airport and also the resupply communication access onto another principal roads” (Dallier’s Testimony to the ICTR on 25 February 1999). Thus the selection of this vital location had both military and political strategic significance that favoured the occupants of this vital piece of ground at the centre of the capital.

Dismas Nsengiyarmene, former Prime Minister of Rwanda, testified that the RPF exerted pressure on the interim Prime Minister Madam Agathe Uwilingiyimana to have its battalion deployed on the parliament building premises from where the rebel troops took advantage of the concession which was meant to smuggle weapons, ammunition as well as additional unsanctioned troops into Kigali (Testimony by Dismas Nsengiyarmene to the ICTR). This account is corroborated by Gerard Ntashamanje who confirmed having witnessed secret infiltrations by the rebels into Kigali of “reinforcements of the RPF’s military capability, particularly the supply of surface-to-air missiles.” Most disturbing is the fact that UNAMIR not only witnessed the clandestine operations by the RPF but also abated and facilitated the smuggling efforts in clear violation of their mandate and the principles of peacekeeping operations especially that of impartiality.

A Belgian peacekeeper, Corporal Johnny Boreaux, who participated in the deployment of RPF battalion from their headquarters in Mulindi to Kigali on 28 December 1993; testified on 15 December 1996, that the RPF was infiltrating unauthorised rebels into Kigali when he stated that the monitoring system that had been put in place, “allowed soldiers (RPF) dressed as civilians to infiltrate Kigali and to commit assassinations” that would be blamed on government forces (Bruguiere Report 2006:33). This is corroborated by Human Rights Watch (2006) that observed that the Arusha Peace Accord permitted the RPF a total of six hundred soldiers only in Kigali but the rebel movement clandestinely infiltrated more troops, weapons and ammunition in violation of the peace agreement. To further corroborate this account, Belgian Colonel Luc Marchal, who was UNAMIR commander of the Kigali region also added that he had always believed that each time the RPF rebels went out looking for firewood in the northern region of Rwanda, “it was in order to bring back weapons” (Bruguiere Report Op.Cit.). This

assessment has been further corroborated by several peacekeepers interviewed by this researcher.<sup>36</sup>

The bottom line remains that UNAMIR condoned the RPF illegal smuggling of unauthorised personnel, weapons and ammunition into Kigali whilst they kept government heavy weapons under their custody without applying the same measures and principles to the rebel movement in clear violation of the principle of impartiality.<sup>37</sup> General Dallaire appeared to have been working closely with the RPF leadership with the intention of facilitating the illegal, strategic military build-up in anticipation of the military offensive against the Rwandan government. Black (2014) highlights that there was massive evidence of RPF build-up of men and war materials from Uganda despite UNAMIR's presence, a mission supposedly deployed to guarantee a peaceful transition to multi-party democracy yet it ended up serving as a smoke screen for US strategic interests and her allies. Black also adds that Dallaire hid this build up not only from the host President and the Rwandan Army but also to his immediate superiors Booh-Booh and Secretary General Boutros-Ghali (*Ibid.*). In so doing, General Dallaire was undermining the sovereignty of Rwanda at the same time violating peacekeeping principles of host state consent and impartiality. In this regard, UNAMIR violated an unwritten assumption and responsibility that peacekeepers should not aggravate or worsen the already precarious situation in which the host country finds itself during the entire duration of the mission's deployment.

In an act of defiance and lack of respect for the Rwandan authorities, General Dallaire closed one of the two runways and left open runway 28 that overlooked the heavily wooded Masaka Hills from where the missiles that killed the President Habyarimana were fired. The closure of the runway was done at the request and insistence of the RPF (Black 2014). The closure of one

---

<sup>36</sup> Retired Colonel Bambazonke (not real name) admitted that "UNAMIR peacekeepers were sympathetic to the plight of Tutsi exiled rebels and refugees whose human rights to return home were being blocked and violated by the Habyarimana regime that was practicing apartheid like policies against a minority segment of the Rwandan population." He added that "this sympathy made the peacekeepers turn a blind eye and in some cases assisted the RPF in the smuggling of illegal weapons and ammunition because we strongly felt that the Tutsi deserved better treatment and this could only materialize if enough military pressure was exerted on the government of Rwanda by the rebels who were fighting to liberate themselves just as we liberated ourselves from our colonial masters. The only difference was that the Tutsi were being subjugated by fellow Africans in a land of their common ancestors."

<sup>37</sup> The Arusha Peace Agreements had directed the peacekeepers to establish a weapons free zone around Kigali by withdrawing heavy weapons from the belligerents and keeping them in safe custody. UNAMIR kept Government heavy weapons under custody while at the same time allowing the RPF to smuggle its heavy weapons, (including missiles use in the shooting of the presidential aircraft) into the country from Uganda and the northern demilitarized zone into Kigali.

of the two runways in January 1994 channelled approaching aircraft for landing to a single approach route thus raising the probability of precision aiming and hitting oncoming aircraft. The closure of the runway was done without prior consultation with the Rwandan government authorities in violation of host state sovereignty. This act alone signifies the extent to which peacekeepers can go towards undermining host-state sovereignty in furtherance of the interests of big powers that are the main sponsors of UN peacekeeping missions.

The preparations for the RPF military offensive to effectively take over power in Kigali was manifested by several activities that started long before the shooting down of the presidential aircraft and the military offensive operation that ensued thereafter. The Bruguiere Report (2006:40) highlights some of the prominent signs for the preparation of a major military offensive by the RPF which include the following: stepping up of campaigns to recruit young exiled Tutsis and those within the country to join the RPA; the logistical preparations for a major military campaign through stockpiling of weapons and ammunition caches by the rebel movement in the de-militarized zone that was under UNAMIR control; the unchallenged infiltration of rebel combatants; weapons and ammunition into Kigali including the SAM 16 anti-aircraft missiles under the guise of fetching firewood from RPF Headquarters in Mulindi under the escort of UNAMIR troops and replenishment of weapons from Uganda with the connivance of the peacekeepers.

These observations and views are corroborated by UNAMIR Belgian Colonel Luc Marchal who testified that the RPF strategy was to mislead the international community together with the peacekeepers on their real intentions when he stated that: “I state this with all the more conviction as I myself (sic) was fooled by their persistent propaganda when faced with the ARUSHA negotiations. Once in KIGALI, I realized that there was a gap between words and deeds. A milling machine, that’s what this totalitarian movement was.” (Bruguiere Report 2006:40). Colonel Luc Marchal had earlier noted in his diary on 04 April 1994 that: “in fact the theory defended is that the sole motivation of the RPF in taking up arms against the current government is not the victory of democracy but the conquest of power by violence … this theory fits my observations and deductions” (Quoted in Bruguiere Report 2006:43).

According to the International Panel of Eminent Personalities (2000), the military offensive operations by the RPF against government forces began several hours after the shooting down of the presidential. The capacity to launch a countrywide military offensive by the RPF within several hours of downing the presidential plane suggests a deliberately pre-planned military

operation; as it is impossible to initiate battle procedures and launch an offensive campaign for a large military force within a few hours unless they were already on standby to spring into action. Thus the genocide that was triggered by the terrorist assassination of president Habyarimana was meant to trigger the civil war that was destined to benefit those who masterminded the conspiracy against the legitimate GoR.<sup>38</sup> The level of commercial looting of strategic minerals from eastern DRC tends to confirm this observation as western powers together with their regional proxies continue to prolong the UN mission in this region for them to loot natural resources without paying taxes to the DRC government in violation of that government's sovereignty.

Based on the discussion above, it is clear that the granting of consent to the deployment of peacekeepers does not in itself guarantee success of the mission. The Rwandan genocide happened when the two belligerents had signed the Arusha peace agreement and conceded to the deployment of international peacekeepers, yet the mission was a total failure. The undermining of the host state's sovereignty aggravated the tension between government loyalists and the rebels as UNAMIR was accused of being not only sympathetic to the rebel cause but actually facilitating the infiltration of weapons and rebel fighters into Kigali in anticipation of the civil war that would eventually topple the legitimate host government.

The Rwanda civil war and genocide effectively belied the Arusha peace agreement and this was a direct result of a weak mission coupled with weak implementation which further undermined a peace agreement that had already weakened the government's cohesion and authority. Steadman (1997:25) is of the view that a strong UNAMIR with credible capability to effectively deal with extremists and spoilers could have prevented the genocide. However the real problem was that such a force could not be created and deployed in Rwanda as this could have scuttled Anglo-American strategic plans to re-shape the Great Lakes region in their favour. The overall ethical assessment of UNAMIR is that the mission facilitated the downfall of the Rwandan government, as well as the military ascendency to power of the RPF. In doing so, the mission did very little to protect the victims of the genocide that was aggravated by the RPF military offensive operations that violated the terms of the Arusha Peace Agreement as

---

<sup>38</sup> Views expressed in an interview with a senior military analyst who decided to remain anonymous. The interview was carried out in Harare on 14 August 2015.

well as Rwanda's national sovereignty in their bid to take over complete and undiluted power in Kigali.

### **5.7 Conclusion**

This chapter examined the factors that contributed to the deployment of a weak and ineffective peacekeeping mission in Rwanda and the role the peacekeepers played in facilitating the fall of the host Rwandan government that had consented to the deployment of the mission under duress from foreign powers. UNAMIR was mandated to cooperate with the host government in order to guarantee the implementation of the Arusha peace process, yet some of its contingents acted in ways that undermined host state sovereignty by collaborating with the RPF that was aiming at a military defeat of the government of Rwanda. UNAMIR, like other second generation peacekeeping missions of the early 1990s, was an intrusive and invasive instrument of the US tasked with the responsibility of facilitating and supervising the downfall of a Francophone regime in Kigali and the installation of a pro-Anglo-Saxon regime in that country. In this regard, UNAMIR served to mitigate Franco versus Anglo-American rivalry in Rwanda where it was originally designed to preside over a peaceful and orderly regime change in Rwanda though events got underway but ultimately the strategic result was realized (Al Qaq 2009:161).

The chapter argued that the response by the international community was driven by narrow national self-interests primarily those of the US and its British allies and that the ultimate objectives of the mission had little to do with upholding international moral obligations and justice by coming to the rescue of victims of the genocide. The Security Council denied the OAU to be in charge of the neutral international force to oversee the implementation of the Arusha Peace Agreement; because doing so could have derailed Anglo-American geo-strategic plans to displace French influence from the African Great Lakes region. The DPKO deliberately failed to make use of the OAU and Rwanda's neighbouring states, the countries that could have exerted their influence towards a successful implementation of the Arusha Agreements. This failure resulted in a disconnection between the negotiated settlement and the implementation process that ultimately led to the catastrophic genocide (Eriksson 1996). Thus, the Rwanda peacekeeping experience highlights the critical importance of the implementation phase of any negotiated settlement between warring parties (Scorgie 2004:66). It is a sad reality that a noble institution such as the UN undermined its integrity by turning its back to UNAMIR when the Rwanda theatre of operations became killing fields and slaughter camps during the genocide (Barnett 2002:1-21).

The chapter also exposed UNAMIR's intrusiveness in the domestic affairs of Rwandan politics ultimately undermining Rwanda's national sovereignty. It highlighted that UNAMIR played as a proxy force and political instrument to promote Anglo-American geo-strategic, neo-liberal political and economic interests. Equally, the chapter has argued that UNAMIR was deployed to facilitate the establishment of a pro Anglo-American government in Rwanda through a regime change strategy that was implemented with the full knowledge of the commander of UNAMIR and some officials at the UN Secretariat. Peacekeepers' sympathy and unethical cooperation with the RPF rebels contributed to the demise of the host Rwandan government in violation of that country's state sovereignty and the provisions of the Arusha Peace Accords (Chossudovsky 2003). Moreover, the presence of UN peacekeepers in Rwanda gave a false sense of hope and security to the Rwandan government and its population as the RPF was left to plan and execute a military offensive operation to topple the government in Kigali in order to avoid a power sharing political arrangement as agreed in the Arusha Peace Accords. The chapter also highlighted the fact that peacekeepers with a weak mandate and an ineffective military strength can only use force in self-defence and that they cannot protect civilians from gross human rights violations by spoilers of the peace agreement.

The withdrawal of the bulk of UNAMIR peacekeepers from Rwanda clearly left the local civilian population with inadequate protection and exposed them to the vagaries of the genocide perpetrators. This explains why the local population and the international community condemned and criticized peacekeepers' decisions to abandon hundreds of thousands civilians who were ultimately slaughtered by the genocidaries (Zacarias 1996:18). The mission was complicit to a military coup d'état by the RPF against a legitimate host government in violation of the Arusha Peace Agreements.

The case study has confirmed what was established in earlier case studies of Congo (1960-1964) and Somalia (1992-1993) that peacekeeping operations are primarily designed to influence local politics in host countries in accordance with the preferences of one or other foreign powers. In so doing, peacekeepers not only promote neo-liberal Western agenda but also facilitate the entrenchment of neo-liberal hegemonic agenda of one of the major powers in competition with others in the Southern hemisphere (Al Qaq Op. Cit.:161).

The deliberate mishandling of the Rwandan genocide by the UN Secretariat, through failing to effectively take measures to stop the genocide galvanized international perception regarding UN sponsored military humanitarian intervention; to the extent of serving the purpose of

affirming the Western neo-liberal ideological doctrine that advocates for more and not less UN sponsored military interventions in African countries in violation of host countries' state sovereignty (Al Qaq 2009:99-100). Such policy changes that culminated in the adoption of the R2P Doctrine have witnessed abuse of humanitarian interventions in countries like Libya and Syria; where regime change agenda is implemented under the guise of addressing humanitarian concerns.

The lesson to be learnt is that UN peacekeepers should avoid a reputation for glaring weaknesses and inconsistencies while at the same time peacekeepers' strength and capability should endeavour to raise the opportunity cost of non-compliance or non-cooperation with the agreed peace process. In the case of Rwanda, the mission failed because UNAMIR was deliberately made weak by the Anglo-Saxon allies as the weakness served their self-interests at the expense of the millions of Rwandese who were killed, maimed or displaced as a result of the civil war and genocide. Finally, this chapter has reinforced the observation made by Al Qaq (2009:161) that UN peacekeeping missions were primarily designed to influence the outcome of host-nation local politics in accordance with preferences of one or more foreign powers demonstrated in the case studies of Congo in the early 1960s and Somalia in the early 1990s. The findings of this chapter further buttress the view that peacekeeping missions not only promote the neo-liberal Western agenda but also facilitate the entrenchment of the hegemonic agenda of one or more major powers in competition with others in the southern hemisphere.

The next chapter examines ethical challenges related to UN/AU hybrid peacekeeping mission in Darfur.

## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **Multilateral Response to Humanitarian Crisis in Darfur: A Case Study of United Nations Organized Hypocrisy in Peacekeeping**

#### **6.1 Introduction**

The conflict in Darfur is a complex security challenge with multiple actors such as the Government of Sudan (GoS) and its sponsored militias, other militia groups sponsored by regional and foreign powers, the AU, the UN, the big powers namely China and the US and their multinational corporations seeking a stake in Sudan's rich natural resources.<sup>39</sup> International response to this crisis has been influenced by arguments in defence of host state sovereignty; claims of threats to international peace and security, decisions by the International Criminal Court (ICC) to indict the Sudanese President Omar Al-Bashir and the evolving nascent doctrine and norm of R2P that advocates for military humanitarian intervention to save civilian lives in situations similar to that prevailing in Darfur (Sitkowski 2006:148).

The reason for choosing this case study is that the UN/AU hybrid mission in Darfur is one of the quintessential current peacekeeping operation in that: it is one of the twenty-first century missions to be deployed after the adoption of the R2P doctrine; it is currently experiencing major ethical and operational challenges in fulfilling its ambitious and high sounding mandates and lastly it encompasses major characteristics of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa. At the time of deploying peacekeepers in Darfur in 2004, the conflict and atrocities in that western region of Sudan were considered to be the worst humanitarian disaster across the entire world as well as the first genocide of the twenty-first century (Tatum 2010). In 2004, the US labelled these atrocities "genocide" (Kristof 2005). The Security Council and other big powers did not agree with this labelling of the civil conflict in Darfur triggering serious debate on appropriate response to the crisis (Badescu 2011).

The atrocities in Darfur were expected to shock the "conscience of mankind" and galvanize world opinion towards adopting and employing effective measures to stop the ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity that were being perpetrated by government sponsored Arab

---

<sup>39</sup> It is estimated that Sudan's oil reserves together with its enormous natural gas deposits rival those of Saudi Arabia and its high-purity uranium deposits are considered to be among the top three largest deposits in the world. It is further estimated that Sudan has the fourth-largest deposits of copper in the world (American Bedu 2008).

militias against non-Arab Africans.<sup>40</sup> This did not happen underscoring the tension and yawning gap that continues to exist between the collective international community's will to operationalize the doctrine of R2P and the existing Westphalian state-centred norm of state sovereignty (de Kerckhove 2008:233).

The Darfur humanitarian disaster provided the AU and the UN with a “litmus test for the R2P framework” considering that it was the first conflict to be dealt with by the UN after the adoption of the principle of R2P at a world summit in 2005 (McClean 2008:14). The international community failed to act decisively or it demonstrated unwillingness to operationalize the R2P doctrine, preferring to settle for an ineffective UN/AU hybrid peacekeeping mission (Kindiki 2007). This failure to come to the effective rescue of endangered civilians in Darfur forms the basis of this case study as it attempts to expose the hypocrisy of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa which basically fail to live up to the ideals espoused by the world body. The chapter aims to demonstrate the continued prevalence of the four dominant fallacies of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa namely: “the gulf between mandates and means; the inadequacy of symbolic deterrence in the face of a systematic campaign of violence; the pervasive ambivalence within the UN regarding the role of force in pursuit of peace and an institutional ideology of impartiality even when confronted with attempted genocide” (UN Doc. A/54/549 para 503).

This chapter further highlights the continued mismatch between high sounding and impressive mandates for the peacekeeping mission in Darfur on one hand and the lack of practical and political commitment to provide the necessary resources to implement the mandates on the other. The chapter will expose the myth that Western powers are truly concerned about saving strangers' lives in Africa when they organize highly publicized marches and campaigns such as the “Save Darfur” rallies. It will be argued and demonstrated that realist calculations and considerations that serve the national self-interests of big powers take precedence over idealistic and altruistic wishes to save civilian strangers on the African continent. The chapter will highlight more critically, the ethical challenges associated with the protection of civilians in civil war situations as being experienced in Darfur (Badescu and Bergholm 2009).

This chapter is divided into seven sections. The first section gives a brief background to the conflict in Darfur. The second section highlights AU response to the conflict while section

---

<sup>40</sup> For a detailed account of the ethnic clashes in Darfur, See Prunier, (2006); Prunier (2007) and de Waal, (2004) who offer detailed accounts of historical background to the conflict.

three covers UN response to the crisis. Section four explores the ethical and practical challenges being faced by hybrid peacekeepers in Darfur. Sections five and six investigate US and Chinese responses respectively. The last section is the conclusion that summarises the main arguments of the chapter.

## **6.2 Background to the Darfur conflict**

Sudan's population is divided along religious, ethnic and tribal lines. It is estimated that religiously, 70 percent are Muslims, 25 percent Animists and 5 percent Christians (Ejibunu 2008:3). The region of Darfur is located in western Sudan and its population is characterized by a complex tribal mix of Black Africans and Black Arabs with the Arabs that speak Arabic forming the greater majority (Hagan and Rymond-Richmond 2009:109).

The Darfur region, like other southern regions dominated by the Black Africans, has systematically suffered neglect and marginalization by successive governments since independence in January 1960 (Flint and De Waal 2008). This regional neglect was also extended to health care facilities, infrastructure and the local economy which led the Darfuris to realize that within their own country they were not treated as full citizens hence they resorted to violence as a means to attain self-determination (Burr and Collins 2008:9). The failure by the GoS to protect its people from depravation exacerbated the insecurity situation in Darfur and provided a rallying point for deprived groups to wage a campaign of violence as a way of expressing their grievances (*Ibid.*). Having peacefully coexisted for centuries, the current conflict and misunderstanding among the ethnic groups in Darfur started when the Khartoum government adopted a pro-Arabic national policy that introduced segregation and exclusion against non-Arabs leading to social and political tensions (Prunier 2007:5).

Although the friction in the Darfur region started a long time ago, the current conflict started in February 2003, when the Sudan Liberation Army (SLA) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) attacked GoS military establishments as a response to decades of political exclusion, as well as economic marginalization and deprivation (Badescu 2011:138). The Darfur crisis was equally triggered by the momentous North-South Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) that brought a peace settlement in South Sudan and left the Darfuris out of the settlement despite appeals to the GoS to accommodate their political, economic and developmental concerns in the peace talks (Power 2004). The immediate spark for the current conflict in Darfur was therefore the denial of political and economic space for Darfuris to participate in the negotiations that were meant to end the twenty one year war between the GoS

and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A). The North-South comprehensive peace settlement created fears that Darfuris would be deprived of political power and economic wealth-sharing agreement negotiated between the government and the SPLM/A.<sup>41</sup>

The military response by the GoS to the insurgency was widespread and ruthless. Government forces launched counter attacks targeting whole villages of African Darfuris from three ethnic groups namely the Fur, Masalit and Zaghawa that were considered to be anti-government in what was interpreted as a government sponsored military genocidal campaign (Prunier 2006). The aim of the government sponsored violence against the supporters of the rebel movements appeared to be wiping out and eliminating these non-Arab ethnic communities in order to effectively neutralize any potential for a formidable political opposition from this region resulting in over 400 000 civilians killed and millions made homeless and landless or driven into refugee camps (Hagan and Rymond-Richmond 2009). The Sudanese Government military reaction involved arming and sponsoring the horse mounted Janjaweed Arab militias by supplying them with weapons of war, giving them air support; while according them free reign to terrorize, rape, and pillage the non-Arab villages in Darfur region in a bid to alienate and deprive the rebels of their local civilian support base (Human Rights Watch 2004).

The Janjaweed unleashed a scorched earth terror campaign against the Black non-Arab communities through burning their villages; raping, looting their property, abducting their inhabitants, destroying their livestock and forcing them to abandon their homes; water points, mills, and other village assets (Human Rights Watch, 2004:14). Alex de Waal (2005), observed that the GoS deliberately and consistently “franchised its counter-insurgency operations” to the Janjaweed Arab militia forces that had been committing atrocities against the civilian population while the government provided the militias with combat support and military intelligence. Worse still, the government allowed Janjaweed militias to operate with complete impunity, creating an “ethics-free” ruthless military campaign against civilians (*Ibid*: 129).

---

<sup>41</sup> In an interview with an African diplomat in Addis Ababa on 13 October 2015, he stressed that the African Darfuris feared to remain under perpetual subjugation of the Arab authorities whose apartheid like policies denied the ethnic groups of the Fur, Masalit and Zaghawa any meaningful role to play in national politics and economic activities as the central government practiced politics of exclusion and segregation. He further pointed out that whereas there were grievances among the segregated ethnic groups in Darfur; the current crisis was instigated and fuelled by western foreign powers that are keen to deliver autonomy to this region. In this bid, they are actively supporting insurgents that are fighting for secession or greater autonomy as was the case with South Sudan hence this conflict to a large extent is a proxy war meant to serve the self-interests of western powers seeking to have unfettered access to vast mineral deposits in Darfur region.

These acts were designed to deliberately inflict physical community destruction that would drive the victims away from their ancestral villages (Tatum 2010:151).

The 2003 dramatic upsurge in the humanitarian crisis in Darfur attracted unusually high global attention and media coverage that led to the visit of Darfur region by the then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, on 29th June 2004. This was followed by General Colin Powell's visit, then Secretary of State of the US on 30th June 2004 who declared that genocide was taking place in Darfur (Natama 2010:2). This categorization of the conflict as genocide remained an American view not shared by other members of the Security Council and the AU.

The international reaction to the atrocities being perpetrated in Darfur was varied both in scope and intensity. The Security Council found it extremely difficult and controversial to determine that there was a threat to or breach of international security considering that the GoS activities were mainly targeted at its own population in a civil war setting. The fact that the politics and causes of the conflict were largely internal to Sudan strictly meant that the crisis was an internal Sudanese affair that did not warrant outside intervention (Bellamy and Williams 2010).

The following section briefly discusses the reaction of the AU as it formed the basis for the establishment of the hybrid UN/AU peacekeeping.

### **6.3 AU response to the Darfur crisis**

This section briefly examines the AU response to the humanitarian crisis in Darfur and the extent to which it demonstrated the organization's resolve to seek African solutions to African problems as well as safeguarding Sudan's national sovereignty against possible humanitarian military intervention by Western powers. The nature and manner in which the AU responded is important as it partly informs us on the overall response by the UNSC to the crisis in Darfur. Murithi (2009:2) observed that the speed, boldness and determination to seek "African solutions to African problems," demonstrated by the AU was evidenced by the organization's ambitious deployment of a "hasty, erratic, and not carefully planned" peacekeeping missions in Burundi (2004), Darfur (2004) and Somalia (2007). The AU mission to Sudan (AMIS) was largely ineffective because it lacked adequate funding and logistical support.

The catalyst to AU response to Darfur conflict was the signing of an AU brokered partial Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement (HCFA) on 08 April 2004 in N'Djamena, Chad. This was between the GoS and two rebel movements namely the JEM and the SLM/A leaving out other insurgency groups (Bellamy and Williams 2010:207). The fact that some parties to the Darfur

conflict did not append their signatures to the ceasefire agreement made the operating environment for the peacekeepers very difficult and dangerous.<sup>42</sup> On 28 May 2004, a Ceasefire Monitoring Commission was established following the signing of further agreements in Addis Ababa marking the decision to deploy AU military observers and a small protection unit to monitor ceasefire implementation in Darfur (*Ibid.*). Subsequently, this led to the establishment of a Humanitarian Ceasefire Commission and the hurried and inadequately planned deployment of (AMIS 1) which deployed 60 military observers and a small contingent of protection force of 310 soldiers in June 2004 (Birikorang 2009:7). This peacekeeping force level was in every respect grossly inadequate to meet the challenges on the ground and to fulfill its mandate (Holt and Berkman 2006:5). Unfortunately, the ceasefire did not hold leaving the AU observer mission to operate in a war zone area with no capacity to adequately defend itself let alone protect civilians.<sup>43</sup>

The AU deployment into the Darfur region was a bold step reflecting the AU's political determination to follow through on its commitment to non-indifference to intra-state conflicts on the continent (Aboagye 2007). This was done in an attempt to seek African solutions to African problems following a marked decline in Western countries' interest in participating in peacekeeping missions in Africa after the 1992 Somalia peacekeeping debacle. The UN's response to conflicts in Africa since then had been reflective of "abdication from responsibility, or minimalist peacekeeping interventions, in the aftermath of the Somali debacle of the UN Operation in Somalia and the 1994 Rwanda genocide" (Aboagye 2007:4). Additional troops were thus required to boost the effectiveness of the African peacekeepers.

Further consultations with the AU Peace and Security Council (PSC) resulted in approval of reinforcements for peacekeepers in Darfur that transformed the mission to become AMIS II. This mission was established with a force level of 3 320 personnel composed as follows: 670 observers, 1703 protection force, 815 civilian police (CIVPOL) and 132 civilian staff (Neethling 2009:11). Despite these reinforcements, the mission proved to be ineffective,

---

<sup>42</sup> UNAMID fatalities of peacekeepers in Darfur are very high. According to UNAMID Facts and Figures (2015) the breakdown of the casualties is as follows: 154 military troops; 47 civilian police; 1 military observer; 4 international civilians serving with the mission; 24 local civilians serving with the mission and 2 other non-members of the mission.

<sup>43</sup> In an interview with one of the military observer who participated in AMIS 1, he questioned the seriousness of both the dispatching countries and the AU department responsible for peacekeeping missions considering that the observers were clearly deployed in a hostile area without adequate protection vehicles such as armoured cars and heavy weapons to deter rebel groups that were not part of the partial peace agreements. In his view the AU was being over ambitious and sacrificing African troops in dangerous theatres of war without first securing a comprehensive cease fire among the belligerents. Interview held in Addis Ababa on 18 October 2015.

mainly because the AU lacked the means, expertise and resources to effectively plan and launch complex and modern peacekeeping operations, hence the search for a partnership with the UN which has more planning expertise, experience and resources for peacekeeping operations (Aboagye 2007:5). In an effort to influence the deployment of a UN peacekeeping mission to Darfur, several international NGOs including the Global Policy Forum highlighted and emphasized the gross operational and logistical inadequacies inherent in AMIS II which it was hoped, could be addressed by the deployment of a more resourced UN peacekeeping mission.

Aboagye (2007:8) argues that the AU intervention in Darfur happened by default as opposed to being a deliberately planned peacekeeping operation. The absence of peacekeeping deployments by the UN and the international community, he argues, “forced the AU to be seen to be doing something in line with its newly adopted policy shift from non-interference to non-indifference as endorsed by the Union’s constitutional right to intervene” (Ibid.: 9). This policy shift was reinforced by the much talked about but hardly implemented policy rhetoric and slogan of seeking African solutions to African problems. Thus the ineffectiveness of the AU mission and the desire by various NGOs and Western powers to have a UN mission deployed to Darfur influenced the calls for the deployment of a UN mission which was vehemently denied by the Sudanese Government.<sup>44</sup>

The worsening situation in Darfur during 2006 and a corresponding failure by the AU to fully support AMIS II, led the UNSC to approve resolution 1706 that authorized the deployment of 17 300 UN troops to reinforce poorly funded and ill-equipped AU troops (Weiss 2009:135). The GoS strongly objected to this resolution arguing that if the UN peacekeepers deployed without its consent, they would be treated as “foreign invaders.” It follows therefore that the original plans to hand over the AU mission to the UN were scuttled by the Sudanese authorities leading to further negotiations that ultimately resulted in the UNSC resolution 1769 that authorized the deployment of a UN/AU hybrid peacekeeping mission to Darfur (UNAMID),

---

<sup>44</sup> In an interview with a Sudanese diplomat in Addis Ababa in October 2015, he informed this researcher that the Sudanese Government was afraid of a regime change agenda that the UN peacekeeping missions are now known to be associated with. In his own words, “The government of Sudan was clearly of the view that Western powers wanted a different regime in Sudan that would normalize relations with the Western powers leading to the dislodgement of Chinese and Russian influence in the country in order for them to exploit the vast mineral resources in my country. Having witnessed the modus operandi of UN peacekeeping missions in previous operations in Congo in the 1960s, Somalia and Rwanda in the early 1990s, it was evident that UN peacekeepers were not going to come simply to the humanitarian aid of the Darfuris but to use them in the process to achieve their own selfish political and economic objectives.

the first of its kind in the history of UN peacekeeping.<sup>45</sup> The hybrid mission is formally and officially both a regional and UN mission where the AU and the UN jointly approve the appointment of senior officials and the composition of the mission while the UN provides UNAMID’s “command and control structures and backstopping” together with financing its operations (Ban 2010a). Thus the hybrid option was a compromise deployment of a joint UN/AU hybrid peacekeeping mission in Darfur (Durward 2006:27). Adoption of this type of mission was meant to avert a UN military humanitarian intervention that was going to be resisted by the Sudanese government through force of arms as well as the need to maintain a mutually beneficial working relationship between the GoS and powerful members of the Security Council that had vested self-interests in Sudan. The successful deployment of UNAMID served to protect the national sovereignty of Sudan from being violated by a humanitarian intervention force spearheaded by the western powers. Governments friendly to Khartoum had successfully protected the Sudanese national sovereignty against possible infringement by foreign forces even when it was evident that there were documented cases of large-scale atrocities and crimes against humanity (Simon 2008:57).

Abass (2007:432) observed that the adoption of a hybrid mission was critical as it averted a perception among African and Arab countries that the UN was acting illegally or illegitimately in a manner that threatened or violated Sudan’s state sovereignty. In this regard, the innovative and unprecedented transformation of AMIS II into UNAMID hybrid mission was a “legitimacy boost” for the AU since it was the only international body that had the state consent of the Sudanese government (*Ibid.*). However, the first and primary challenge to the UN/AU hybrid peacekeeping mission in Darfur was that there was no peace to keep in the Darfur region and that the Sudanese government was not fully cooperating with the international community in finding a lasting solution to the Darfur crisis (Murithi Op.Cit.:13). Military clashes involving Government troops, militias sponsored by the government and the various other militia groups continued to take place constituting a major source of insecurity among the civilian population and the peacekeepers (UN Doc. S/2013/22 dated 10 Jan 2013).

---

<sup>45</sup> The hybrid nature of UNAMID was manifested by the following: first, the UN component of the combined mission was grafted to an existing AU mission (AMIS) and the combined mission was expected to support the implementation of an AU negotiated peace settlement; second, the UN/AU mission has characteristics of both peacekeeping and peace enforcement.

The next section analyses the response by the UN to the crisis in Darfur and the operational effectiveness of UNAMID towards protection of civilians facing threats of crimes against humanity.

#### **6.4 Organized hypocrisy: UN response to the Darfur crisis**

This section critically examines the factors that contributed to the dismal response by the UNSC to the humanitarian crisis in Darfur. It aims to expose the hypocritical nature of the big powers that portray a misleading positive public picture of being concerned about the welfare and suffering of African populations in conflict situations yet they end up perpetuating the conflicts in pursuit of their self-interests at the expense of the host population and government. There is a need to first define what organized hypocrisy is all about.

##### **6.4.1 Definition of organized hypocrisy**

Dijkzeul and Beigbeder, (2003) have noted that the concept of organized hypocrisy and the political and diplomatic dynamics associated with it are not commonly known to many scholars and practitioners of global politics, diplomacy and governance. They also observed that these dynamics have implications on the conduct of UN peacekeeping missions and global governance. Identifying aspects of organized hypocrisy as a deliberate source of UN peacekeeping missions' failure helps in understanding the causes and dysfunctional nature of UN peacekeeping operations.<sup>46</sup>

According to Lipson (2007) organized hypocrisy is a phenomenon espoused by organizational behaviour theorists to explain how organizations respond to conflicting and challenging pressures emanating from external environments through adoption of contradictory actions and statements in order to deliberately mislead the public. Organized hypocrisy is manifested by inconsistencies and contradictions between publicly pronounced organizational expressions and aspirations to respect norms such as state sovereignty yet in real practice, these norms are violated. Krasner (1999) argued that organized hypocrisy explains the enduring and routine violation of state sovereignty. Brunsson (1989), one of the leading theorists on organized hypocrisy argued that organized hypocrisy refers to organizational responses to “conflicting logics of consequences and appropriateness.” It also refers to parallel structures that are set by organizations as what happened during UN peacekeeping operations in Congo during the early 1960s. Secretary General Hammarskjold established a secretive cabinet of Americans special

---

<sup>46</sup> See also Barnett, M. and Finnemore, M., (2004) *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.

advisers and himself known as the “Congo Club” to run the affairs of the UN peacekeeping mission whose aim was to entrench US hegemony in Africa after dislodging Belgian post-colonial influence in that country (O’Brien 1962:56). Brunsson (1989:27) concluded that “organized hypocrisy is a fundamental type of behaviour” in most political organizations.

In the case of the crisis in Darfur, organized hypocrisy has had the effect of widening and exacerbating the resource gap between theoretical commitments as stated in the UN mandates for UNAMID and the provision of resources to execute the mandates resulting in undermining efforts to mitigate the suffering civilian population in Darfur. In actual fact, UNAMID’s mandate appears to have been deliberately designed to dilute and diminish the mission’s effectiveness towards achieving its basic and primary objective of providing adequate physical protection to civilian victims of war in Darfur (Jibril 2010:15). The mandate for UNAMID responsibilities covers protection of the civilian population, enhancement of physical security for NGOs undertaking humanitarian activities; promotion of human rights and the rule of law, and finally monitoring and verifying the implementation of peace agreements (UN Doc S/RES/1769 of 2007). Despite the deaths of over 460,000 Darfuris and an estimated 2,500,000 internally displaced people who abandoned their homes as a result of the conflict, UNAMID like most UN peacekeeping missions in Africa remains undermanned and under-equipped with critical shortages of road transport and aviation assets as widespread atrocities continue.

Considering the UN failure to effectively respond to the tragic crises in Rwanda and Darfur in order to save civilians, these failures qualify to be labelled and classified as organized hypocrisy by the world body that is charged with the responsibility of safeguarding international peace and security. UN failure to stop the killing of Tutsis in Rwandan or protect civilians in Bosnian zones declared ‘safe areas’ led to the accusations of UN hypocrisy in its peacekeeping rhetoric (Rieff, 1996; Barnett, 2002). That hypocrisy is again being practiced in Darfur where very little practical measures are being put in place to enhance the protection of civilians. Detailed aspects of this hypocrisy are covered in the paragraphs below.

#### 6.4.2 An overview of UN response to the Darfur crisis

The UN response to the Darfur crisis can be likened to its response to the Rwandan crisis in 1994 where a semblance of serious humanitarian intervention only took place after the genocide had run its course and over 800 000 civilian lives had been lost (Mgbeoji, 2003). Jean-Marie Guéhenno UN Under-Secretary-General for peacekeeping at the time of the crisis, after having observed the foot dragging by big powers regarding UN response to the crisis in

Darfur, warned that UNAMID faced the greatest risk of failure compared with other UN missions deployed in the previous 10 years and encouraged that “it was imperative that the United Nations rose collectively to meet the challenges, or it would fail” (UN Doc GA/SPD/382 of 2007; UN TODAY 2010: 6). His fears were fulfilled as the world body failed to live up to expectations of the suffering population in Darfur whose hopes had been raised following the decision to deploy UN/AU peacekeepers to protect civilians affected by the conflict.

Bureaucratic and diplomatic wrangling among the Security Council P5 to secure and promote their self-interests added weight to the slow decision making process regarding international response to the crisis in Darfur. The case study on Rwanda and the current study on Darfur reveal that in situations where the P-5 are indifferent, nothing or very little can be done as they pretend to be doing something through organized hypocrisy. In situations where they have vested strategic self-serving interests, they either act as obstacles to action in order to protect their interests as happened in Rwanda or they intervene in ways that promote their self-interests and not to serve the interests of the wider good (UN 43rd Conference 2008:25).

Enabulele (2010:420) observed that China and Russia were considered to be the main stumbling blocks against any strong military humanitarian response against the GoS by the Security Council. This assertion is based on China’s shareholding of fourty percent in Sudan’s oil production industry while Russia is considered to be the leading arms supplier to the GoS (Clough 2008). However, the US also had its self-interests to safeguard by avoiding a direct military clash with the government of Sudan (Cohen and O’Neill 2006). Considering that the Darfur crisis started at the height of the US led western armies’ invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, there is a theory that argues that western powers would not have seriously preferred to launch another military humanitarian invasion of an Arab country.<sup>47</sup> This argument will be further developed in subsequent paragraphs below.

#### 6.4.3 An ethical assessment of UN response to the crisis in Darfur

The UN Security Council adoption of Resolution 1556 of 2004 marked its official reaction to the conflict in Darfur. The resolution harshly condemned the brutal acts of violence in Darfur and determined that: “... the situation in Sudan constitutes a threat to international peace and security and to stability in the region” (UN Security Council 2004). Thereafter very little was

---

<sup>47</sup> Leading proponents of this theory include Cohen and O’Neill 2006.

done to demonstrate a serious and purposeful determination to bring sanity to this region. This led then Secretary General Kofi Annan to call for appropriate action in Darfur that did not rule out military action against the perpetrators of the ethnic cleansing activities (UN Doc SG/SM/9197 AFR/893 HR/GN/1077, April 7, 2004).

In 2005, UN SC Resolution 1593 referred the perpetrators of human rights abuses in Darfur to the International Criminal Court (ICC) for prosecution although Sudan has not ratified the ICC Statute (De Haas 2008:226). The Sudanese government refused to surrender the officials implicated for prosecution ultimately leading to the indictment of President Al Bashir for prosecution by the ICC a situation that further complicated the relationship between the host state and the Security Council. The western world's support for indicting the sitting President of Sudan and attempting to send him to the Hague for prosecution while appearing morally necessary, had the effect of derailing any meaningful negotiations the Security Council has been pursuing with authorities in Khartoum over the regime's cooperation with UN/AU peacekeepers.

The Security Council, without consultations with the GoS passed Resolution 1706, in August 2006 authorizing the deployment of a UN Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) to Darfur whose mandate included the "use of all necessary means ... to protect civilians under threat of physical violence" (UN Doc. S/Res./1706, 2006). In adopting Resolution 1706 the Security Council made its first country-specific reference to the protection of civilians in armed conflict with specific focus on Darfur (Roberts 2008:125). The GoS sensed danger in the implementation of this resolution hence its strong opposition to it. It feared that the proposed UN mission with a strong western peacekeepers' presence "could serve as an occupation force" in Darfur thereby undermining its state sovereignty (De Haas 2008:314). The GoS rejected resolution 1706 on the basis that it was tantamount to an invasion of its territory and a serious violation of its state sovereignty.

Against strong advocacy for a military humanitarian intervention to stop the "genocide" in Darfur, the GoS linked the Western sponsored "Save Darfur" campaign and activism with US military actions in Iraq. The Sudanese authorities successfully portrayed US and Western activism in Darfur as both oil and other strategic minerals oriented machinations as well as an anti-Islamic crusade (Igiri and Layman 2004:21). Thereafter, it took extensive high-level negotiations among the P5, the UN Secretary-General, the EU and the League of Arab States and the AU to secure the consent of the GoS to the deployment of a UN/AU hybrid

peacekeeping mission that was predominantly manned by African peacekeepers<sup>48</sup> (UN Doc. S/2007/301/Rev.1 dated 5 June 2007).

UNAMID was deployed with a vague and ambiguous mandate particularly regarding provision of protection to civilians. This was deliberately done to mask the major disagreements among the permanent members of the Security Council that had conflicting self-interests to promote and safeguard in Sudan (Badescu 2011:140). In this regard, it is apparent that the suffering civilian population that was placing its hope on UN protection had been grossly let down. Some analysts like de Waal (2007) concluded that the weak response by the UN marked the failure of the R2P framework. Others felt it was too early to declare the emerging norm and doctrine a failure based on one case study (Badescu and Bergholm 2009). Whatever interpretation is given to the deployment of a weak UNAMID, the mission served as a convenient alternative to a Western powers' direct military involvement in Darfur (Cohen and O'Neill 2006: 52). Although largely ineffective, the deployment of this hybrid mission was ethically a lesser evil than allowing the western powers the opportunity to launch a military humanitarian intervention that was most likely to result in far more civilian casualties as happened in Libya.

#### 6.4.4 Ethical and political justification for a hybrid peacekeeping Mission in Darfur

The decision to adopt a UN/AU hybrid peacekeeping mission in Darfur did not come about as a deliberate, well calculated innovative idea of burden sharing between the two organizations. It was a compromise between the GoS which had previously refused to consent to a deployment of a purely UN force on one side and the UN on the other arising from the western countries' agitation to mount a massive military humanitarian operation in Darfur to "save the civilian population" (Durward Op.Cit.). It also was a compromise to address the internationally acknowledged fact that peacekeeping efforts in Darfur required enhancement in order to be effective' (Ban & Konaré 2007). It was a compromise that took into consideration the self-interests of the great powers with vested interests in Sudan and not necessarily meant to effectively address the plight of the suffering population in that region. Institutionally, UNAMID became the first peacekeeping mission that was truly a formal joint undertaking

---

<sup>48</sup> Important to note is the fact that despite the changing doctrine and practice of UN peacekeeping operations, the "United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines," as enunciated by the Capstone Doctrine still upheld the cardinal and founding principles of peacekeeping namely consent of host state; impartiality and use of force only in self-defence. See United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines. Available [www.pbpu.unlb.org/pbps/library/Capstone%20Doctrine%20--%20Consultation%20Draft.pdf](http://www.pbpu.unlb.org/pbps/library/Capstone%20Doctrine%20--%20Consultation%20Draft.pdf) Accessed on 18 April 2016.

between a continental organization and the world body reflecting a new convergence of regional and UN peacekeeping undertakings (Coleman 2011:537).

The prevailing circumstances at the time of adopting UNAMID were that the GoS had refused to consent to deployment of a “purely” UN mission to replace the African mission that was already on the ground but was facing enormous financial and logistical challenges due to inadequate international support. The Sudanese Government opposed the proposed UN deployment arguing vehemently that allowing non-African troops into Darfur would be tantamount to agreeing to be re-colonized (Badesu 2011:64). In actual fact the government threatened to wage a holy war (jihad) against such a force if deployed. The GoS strongly objected to multilateral intervention by outsiders in the case of Darfur because it did not share the humanitarian justification of doing so and more importantly strongly felt that the crisis in Darfur was an internal matter to be addressed by Sudanese people themselves without outside interference.

The Sudanese ambassador to the UN eloquently demonstrated the fear that the humanitarian intervention that was being contemplated could serve the self-interests of the intervening Western powers. He wondered whether the crisis in Darfur was not being used as a Trojan horse to advance hidden self-serving agendas for those advocating for UN military humanitarian intervention in that region (Krieg 2013). In saying this, the ambassador was expressing genuine fears and concerns among weak and developing countries that the concept and doctrine of humanitarian intervention as enshrined in R2P was being abused as a subtle grand strategy by powerful western countries to extend and broaden their geo-political and economic influence thereby guaranteeing unfettered access to vital natural resources essential for the survival of their economies (Krieg Op.Cit.:46). These sentiments are shared by Ottaway and Lacina who observed that following the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2003 presumably on humanitarian grounds, genuine fear of a new imperialism was particularly prevalent and acute among developing countries that had experienced colonization, and that military operations constituting international interventions revive bitter memories of the colonial past (Ottaway and Lacina 2003:74). An alternative form of international response to the humanitarian crisis in Darfur had to be found that did portray neo-colonial connotations or threaten the national sovereignty of the Sudanese government and people more so considering that the regional AU peacekeeping mission had dismally failed to deliver on its mandate to protect civilians in Darfur.

It has been noted that regional peacekeeping missions face ethical challenges of legitimacy and capacity considering that regional actors like the AU can be plagued with several limitations to be serious brokers in domestic conflicts. The AU mission that preceded the deployment of the hybrid mission compellingly illustrated these glaring limitations. It failed to meet the challenges of the atrocities and displaced civilians in need of protection despite the African political will and determination to resolve the Darfur crisis (Badescu 2011:68). As the AU experience in Darfur demonstrates, legitimacy can be compromised by over dependency on outside financial and logistical donor assistance, whose donations usually come with strings attached and certain conditionalities that may not be in the interests of the host population or the regional actors (de Coning 2006). These are some of the ethical and practical considerations that led to the adoption of a hybrid style peacekeeping mission in Darfur.

It follows therefore that one of the major advantages of adopting a hybrid concept of peacekeeping operations in Africa is that it brings to an end the undignified “begging syndrome” characteristic of AU sponsored peacekeeping missions. Both the predecessor OAU and now the AU are notoriously known for going to the Western powers with a begging bowl in hand for financial and logistical donations to support African peacekeepers (Yorke 2001:86). The adoption of the hybrid option clearly spells out the division of labour and burden sharing strategy between the AU and the UN hence it has been hailed as a serious and practical attempt at transcending the old practice characterized by ad hoc and at times erratic financial and logistical contributions from former colonial masters, meant to promote neo-colonialism in affected regions (Piiparinne 2007:385). The Somalia debacle in which vulnerable Somali civilians were abandoned after the death of only 18 US troops followed by the UN troop withdrawal from Rwanda after 10 Belgian troops were killed highlighted the dangers of having African peacekeeping missions dominated by western countries.

To avoid a repeat of such embarrassing episodes of UN peacekeepers abandoning endangered African populations, it is morally and ethically desirable to adopt a hybrid concept of peacekeeping in Africa where the bulk of the peacekeepers are African troops with the political resolve to withstand high rates of troop casualties. The abandonment of African missions by Western peacekeepers at the height of conflicts exposes thousands of vulnerable civilians at risk of being harmed. Morally, this appears as if African civilian lives were being abandoned by their benevolent Western saviours thus portraying a misleading picture that UN peacekeeping missions in Africa, involving troops from developed countries were genuinely concerned about the well-being of African populations. It therefore comes as no surprise when

analysts observe that a moral and ethical problem arises each time African populations are abandoned by peacekeepers in a bid to save the lives of peacekeepers as happened in Somalia and Rwanda (Barnett 2002).

The reason for abandoning African missions is simply that these countries are not primarily answerable and accountable to the endangered populations, but rather to their domestic electorate. Once the electorate back home disapproves of the body-bags coming from African missions, their respective governments are politically forced to abandon the poor and endangered African populations irrespective of the consequences. The ethical challenge arising from the abandonment of civilians in African missions is that the local populations usually invest their trust in the protection capacity of peacekeepers through their coming to seek refuge near peacekeepers' bases yet the peacekeepers' priority is preserving their own lives and not that of civilians. Once the foreign troops leave at the height of the conflict as happened in Somalia and Rwanda, the vulnerable population presents itself as a large soft target thus unintentionally facilitating their own mass killings by the unruly gunmen seeking revenge against those who had put their trust in foreign troops as exemplified in the Rwandan crisis (Piiparinens Op.Cit. :375).

## **6.5 Political and ethical challenges to UNAMID peacekeeping operations**

The international community has over the past thirteen years made several attempts at resolving the Darfur crisis using different conflict management and resolution strategies yet these efforts including peacekeeping missions have failed to produce desired results. One of the main reasons for this failure is due to lack of an all-inclusive political process towards finding a lasting political solution to the crisis<sup>49</sup>, which has been classified by the UN as “the world’s worst humanitarian disaster in recent times” (Ejibunu 2008:24). Those who blame the GoS for lack of progress point towards a distinct lack of political will on the part of the government to effectively implement policies of political accommodation and national integration in a country

---

<sup>49</sup> In an interview with J. Makusha on 07 August 2015 at Great Zimbabwe University in Masvingo, Zimbabwe, he castigated the approaches adopted by foreign mediators to political conflicts in Africa. His views were that Africa is driven by communitarian approaches to resolving problems whereas outsiders are guided by liberal approaches hence their approaches are ineffective in addressing the real issues that give rise to conflicts on the continent. Moreover he highlighted the fact that UN peacekeepers use coercion and not persuasion hence the need for Africans to dominate UN missions in Africa. He further highlighted that UN peacekeeping missions are purported to come and help settle instabilities in Africa yet the rebels fighting sitting governments are sponsored, supported and armed by the very powers that are the major sponsors of UN peacekeeping missions. He wondered where rebels with torn clothes end up with new weapons at times better weapons than for government soldiers would have sourced the weapons. Makusha emphasised that peacekeeping missions create opportunities for foreign powers to exploit Africa’s natural resources illegally

of such an ethnically, racially, religiously and economically diverse population (*Ibid.*). In addition those blaming the Sudanese Government for lack of political settlement, there are some who blame the respect for Sudan's national sovereignty that impeded the launching of a robust military humanitarian operation against the perpetrators of "acts of genocide" (Weiss 2009:44). The AU has failed to bring pressure to bear on the Sudanese president and the rebel groups in order to force them towards embracing the peace initiatives it initiated. To make matters worse, some western powers are financing and sponsoring insurgent groups fighting both the peacekeepers and the host government. Such sponsorship of rebel groups in Darfur complicates the political operating environment for the hybrid peacekeepers.

The first ethical challenge to be considered is to do with the attitude and behaviour of the Sudanese Government towards the peacekeepers. The GoS after reluctantly accepting the deployment of UNAMID deliberately complicated and at times disrupted the deployment processes and operating environment of the peacekeepers. Murithi (2009:16) highlighted examples of Sudanese Government's interference with peacekeeping deployments such as: refusing troops from particular countries; holding equipment in the customs warehouses from where most equipment had to be transported to Darfur; denying permission for flights at night and limiting patrol areas to UNAMID observers and peacekeepers. UNAMID land movements and patrols as well as flight requests continue to be restricted with the government citing lack of sufficient notification time, lack of government written authorization and insecurity challenges as reasons for denying planned activities (UN Doc. S/2013/22 dated 10 Jan 2013). The GoS agreed to allow night flying on condition that the UN upgraded its airports in Darfur as the government tried to maximize its benefits from the presence of UNAMID on its soil (UN Doc S/2007/759 dated 24 December 2007).

Reporting to the UN Security Council on the situation in Darfur, Titov (2010:1) emphasized that the challenges facing Darfur must be met within a national context. He stated that, "The conflicts in Sudan, which have a primarily internal structure, cannot be solved in a peace-meal fashion or by addressing primarily external factors." Titov noted that formal talks between the major warring parties had not been possible since some of the groups are externally handled and manipulated. Despite successes in some regions of Darfur, the hybrid force has so far failed to be more effective than its predecessor AMIS at protecting the population of Darfur. The frustrating strategies employed by the GoS to the deployment and operational activities of UNAMID reflect limited host state consent at the strategic level, which is just short of demanding the withdrawal of the hybrid peacekeepers from the country as the mission has been

allowed limited operational space to manoeuvre. This has led Beck (2011:28) to conclude that Darfur offers a classic case of an assertive state at the operational level whose activities are enough to curtail the efficacy of the mission yet remaining out of the immediate danger of receiving international punishment or censure at the strategic level.

The second major ethical challenge is related to security concerns facing UNAMID's operations in Darfur because there is no peace to keep in that region. The absence of a comprehensive ceasefire agreement among the belligerents creates a very dangerous operating environment for the peacekeepers. The increased proliferation of factional insurgent groups has significantly contributed to worsening insecurity of the Darfur region since these groups did not consent to the deployment of peacekeepers in the first place. This explains why UNAMID has experienced high levels of banditry, occasional military engagements, ethnic clashes and deadly attacks on its peacekeepers (UN Report 2009:7). The peacekeeping mission remains grossly ill-equipped to deal with violations of the ceasefire by both government troops and insurgent groups hence protection of civilians is seriously compromised. The best peacekeepers can do in order to protect the civilian population is facilitating their movement to internally displaced people (IDP) camps (Coulon and Liegeois 2010).

A rebel attack on peacekeepers in July 2008 resulted in seven peacekeepers killed and twenty-two others wounded. General Agwai, then commander of UNAMID blamed the heavy losses on the UN Security Council which had deployed the peacekeepers without adequate resources to protect themselves against such attacks (Anyidoho 2006). Critical to note is that the EU and US partners and other donor countries that were upbeat about deploying a robust UN peacekeeping mission in Darfur with a stronger mandate and firepower to effectively deal with perpetrators of violence in Darfur have reneged on their earlier pledges. This goes to further demonstrate that altruistic and ethical considerations regarding the protection of endangered civilians were never the primary reasons for wanting to launch a military humanitarian intervention in Darfur. If the western powers were truly concerned about the suffering of civilians in Darfur, they should have fully equipped the predominantly African hybrid mission to execute the very tasks they were planning to undertake if indeed these tasks were humanitarian in nature.

Gowan (2008:453) argues that the UN is riddled with a "systemic crisis" because its traditional framework for guiding peacekeeping deployments as well as many of its assumptions about transitions from war to peace have been found wanting in many cases involving peacekeeping

missions. Murithi (2009:3) concurs and is also of the view that the UN has “stumbled into a series of missions in an increasingly ad-hoc fashion” the consequences of which have been the inabilities to effectively plan, prepare and deploy effective peacekeeping operations on the ground hence the failure to deliver the desired results. Whereas these observations are correct, what they miss is the linkage of these failures with organized hypocrisy practiced by the UNSC in its peacekeeping missions in Africa.

The third challenge facing UNAMID is related to the ethical challenge of using force to protect civilians in Darfur. Justification for the ‘use of force’ for the sake of protecting civilians knowing fully well that some civilian casualties would occur is difficult to sustain more so when the peacekeepers themselves do not have the capacity to protect themselves from the rebels. Badescu and Bergholm (2009: 301) observed that the hybrid peacekeepers in Darfur had no peace to keep and at the same time their mandate was not to wage war, meaning that their presence was just symbolic. This view was echoed by then UNAMID Force Commander General Martin Luther Agwai who stated that even if the mission was fully equipped and resourced, “peacekeepers would not stand between rival armies and militias engaged in full-scale combat.” Adada (2008:3) emphasized UNAMID lacked five critical capabilities to enhance their effectiveness namely: surveillance aircraft for reconnaissance, attack helicopters to deal with spoilers, medium lift helicopters to support both movement of troops and for logistical support, qualified military engineers and logistical support staff.

The modern international state system is founded on the principle that sovereign nation states have a right to non-intervention and unwarranted external interference in their domestic affairs. State sovereign immunity has been violated by UN peacekeepers in the altruistic doctrine of protecting civilians from conflict that prioritizes human security. The use of force in these circumstances has been formalised through the adoption of the doctrine and concept of responsibility to protect civilians in conflict areas as is the case in Darfur.

UNAMID peacekeepers in Darfur have remained ill prepared and insufficiently equipped for the mission of protecting civilians due to several factors that revolve around the fact that protection of civilian strangers on the African continent remains a non-priority for big powers whose main priorities are to safeguard their self-interests even if it means this is done at the expense of the local population.<sup>50</sup> Added to this is the fact that there continues to exist an ethical

---

<sup>50</sup> This point was emphasised by the DRC ambassador to Zimbabwe citing the failure of UN peacekeepers in the DRC to prioritize the protection of Congolese civilian population. In an interview in Harare on 12 November

tension between the new norm of human security and its related doctrine of R2P on one hand and the continuing dominance of the realist doctrine that prioritizes respect for state sovereignty and promotion of national self-interests on the other. False humanitarian rhetoric as part of organized hypocrisy should be taken seriously as abuse of this altruistic term by the US led to attacks on Iraq in 2003 and Libya in 2011. Abuse of the ethical humanitarian justification for using military force tends to blur the distinction between genuine and legitimate exceptions to the non-intervention norm (Terry 2002)

The fourth challenge facing UNAMID is bureaucratic procedures that hinder effective decision making within the AU and UN systems. Commenting on the slow and late response of the UN to the crisis in Darfur, Human Rights Watch summed it up as "...too late, too little." Considering the combined AU/UN bureaucratic decision making procedures coupled by deliberate efforts by the Sudanese Government to ensure that its sub-optimal performance activities are kept in check, it is therefore not surprising to witness the logistical and operational difficulties which UNAMID is operating under that contribute to its limited success.

The fifth challenge is related to the high protection expectations of the civilian population in Darfur that the hybrid peacekeepers cannot satisfy. This results in an ethical problem in that on one hand, the internally displaced population holds the peacekeepers in high esteem and harbour great expectations regarding the peacekeepers' ability to provide them with protection. Some of the influential religious Sheikhs have gone to the extent of considering UNAMID as "a powerful military ally that will help them train their self-defence militias and transform the camps into entrenched bastions from which they'll be able to conduct military operations" (Weissman 2008:16). On the other hand the GoS holds the peacekeepers in contempt as they are labelled as an "anti-Arab" military force that serves the interests of the anti-government rebels (*Ibid.*).

There are few incidences in which the peacekeepers are credited with effective protection of civilians one of which involved UNAMID troops that staved off military attacks that "could have cost many more civilian lives" (Holt, Taylor, and Kelly 2009, 358). Success stories of this

---

2015, his main argument was that UN peacekeeping missions constitute a lucrative business for the developed countries whose military industrialized complexes that supply weapons and ammunition used by the peacekeepers greatly benefit from continued peacekeeping operations. The same also applies to multinational corporations that supply other combat and logistical supplies. In his view, this explains why UN missions in Africa are prolonged over several years without tangible results related to the resolution of local conflicts to the satisfaction of local populations.

nature are few and far in between. In other incidences, UNAMID exaggerates the GoS denial of access to areas requiring investigation on crimes against humanity. An example that illustrates this point is when UNAMID claimed to have been “denied access by Sudanese military at a checkpoint” when they attempted to investigate the report about 200 women that had been raped in El Fasher, North Darfur. The official UN bulletin misinformed the world that the peacekeepers had been denied access to the area when in fact they interviewed a few witnesses before they were confronted by Sudanese intelligence officials who asked them to leave after they had obtained confirmation of the crime committed (Reeves 2007). Fabrication of such lies is meant to serve a hidden agenda of UNAMID leadership while at the same time angering the government officials in Khartoum,

The existence of an undermanned and ill-equipped hybrid UNAMID mission in Darfur in reality represents symbolic gestures and face saving measures to portray a positive picture that the world community was responding to the plight of Darfur’s civilian population yet in practice little is being done to protect the civilians. Moreover, because of the tasks related to the protection of civilians, the neutrality of UN peacekeepers has increasingly been compromised as demands from concerned governments and humanitarian agents call for the effective protection of civilians, which entails that peacekeepers take military coercive action against spoilers that potentially put them on a collision course with different armed groups embroiled in the conflict (Clement and Smith 2009).

## **6.6 US attitude and response to the Darfur crisis**

The US attitude and position regarding a particular peacekeeping mission has a significant if not a dominant role in the nature and conduct of that mission. This is because of its political and financial contribution as it contributes a quarter of all UN peacekeeping expenses. In the case of the Darfur crisis Williams and Bellamy (2005: 36–40) are of the view that US’ geo-strategic self-interests revolve around access to oil deposits and exchange of vital and strategic intelligence in the “war on terror” campaign that has been waged following the 9/11 attacks.

The US response to the Darfur crisis should be considered within the wider context of US/Sudan relations since the end of the Cold War. According to the World Savvy Monitor (2010:1)“...the relationship between the two countries has been incoherent over the past decades as it alternated from being allies against Libya at one stage to a situation where the US was supplying arms of war to the secessionists in South Sudan.” At some point the US considered Sudan a pariah state harbouring Osama Bin Laden and his Al Qaeda movement; yet

on the other hand the US developed the Chevron oil installations which it abandoned when the US imposed economic sanctions against Sudan (*Ibid.*). At the outbreak of the Darfur conflict in 2003, the US considered Sudan as an ally in its Global War on Terror yet at the same time accusing it of pursuing a policy of genocide against the Black African civilian population in Darfur. This was a practical example of the realist approach to US foreign policy where it considers that there are no permanent friends in international relations but permanent interests.

Having noted acts of indiscriminate killing of civilians by government sponsored Janjaweed militias in Darfur, former US Secretary of State General Colin Powell declared on 9 September 2004 that genocide was indeed taking place in Darfur and that the GoS and its Arab rebel militias bore the responsibility (US Department of State: 2004). This classification and categorization of the Darfur civil war as genocide, was neither adopted by the UN Security Council nor the Secretariat hence it remained a purely American labelling of this civil war. This categorization generated controversy as the European Union (EU), China, Russia and the AU did not agree to the assertion that genocide was indeed taking place in Darfur (World Savvy Monitor Op.Cit. :2). The US declaration of genocide in Darfur was interpreted as both a heroic expression of concern and more cynically, as a way to transfer responsibility for the Darfur crisis to the UN (*Ibid.*). Despite different interpretations of what was going on in Darfur, the humanitarian crisis in this region triggered western calls for military humanitarian intervention to stop the Arab militias from terrorizing innocent and vulnerable civilian population in Darfur (Gberie 2004). The “Save Darfur” campaign exerted a lot of pressure on politicians in Washington to launch a humanitarian intervention in Darfur as if they were genuinely concerned about the welfare of African strangers. The proponents for a military humanitarian intervention had to resort to sensationalization of the humanitarian crisis in order to garner American population’s sympathy and support.

A US diplomat based in Sudan once acknowledged that by explaining to the American public that Arabs were massacring Africans in Darfur, “we are harnessing two very powerful feelings in American society: anti-Arab racism and pro-African paternalism” (Coulon and Liégeois 2010). This sensational advocacy and strategy did not work. It did not lead to a military humanitarian intervention as realist international politics militated against such action by those inclined to embark on such a military adventure (Heinze 2009:1). There was a US self-serving strategic reason and justification for passing on the responsibility of protecting civilians in Darfur to the UN. Alex de Waal noted that: “... it is not too cynical to assume that President Bush’s advisors calculated that once a UN force had been approved, any disappointments could

be placed at the door of the UN and the troop contributing countries not the U.S.” (de Waal 2007: 378). There are other possible realist self-serving strategic reasons why the US avoided a military humanitarian intervention option in Darfur.

According to Engdahl (2007:1) the major American interest in Darfur is access to oil fields and not humanitarian concerns as he observed that the case of Darfur is a new Cold War over oil between China and the GoS on one side and the US with her western allies on the other side. He highlights that of particular interest is Bloc 6 of oil concessions which straddles western Darfur, near the border with Chad and the Central African Republic. China’s National Petroleum Company, (CNPC) holds the rights to this oil field which the Sudanese government announced in 2005 that it had discovered oil in Darfur with an estimated capacity of 500 000 barrels/day (*Ibid.* :5). Had the US succeeded to convince the UNSC to accept the genocide charge, this would have given it the opportunity to spearhead a drastic and violent “regime change” intervention by NATO under the auspices of humanitarian operations leading to serious undermining of Sudan’s national sovereignty as was the case with Libya where the country was subjected to massive aerial bombardment by NATO under the pretext of “protecting the civilian population” against the Gaddafi regime.<sup>51</sup> This largely explains why the GoS refused the deployment of a purely UN “peacekeeping” mission in the Darfur preferring a predominantly African peacekeeping operation under African command. This stance adopted by the GoS resulted in the deployment of a watered down peacekeeping mission. UNAMID was deployed with a weaker mandate and very little material support from developed countries that initially favoured a robust UN humanitarian intervention force. The current weak UNAMID serves US interests in that it does not have the military muscle to interfere with insurgent activities that are being funded by the US and its allies. The US had to re-strategize having failed to sell the genocide theory to the international community. It sought to maintain a working relationship with the GoS in the fight against global terrorism whilst at the same time sponsoring rebel forces fighting the same central government in Darfur.

Engdahl (2007:11) observed that most of the arms that have fuelled the killings in Darfur and even in South Sudan have been brought into that country through murky, protected private “merchants of death” such as the notorious former KGB operative, Victor Bout who operates

---

<sup>51</sup> In an interview with a diplomat in Harare in November 2015, he expressed the view that the US and EU efforts to influence the deployment of a robust UN peacekeeping force in Darfur with a stronger mandate to impose peace in Darfur was meant to ultimately result in regime change or the secession of Darfur region adding that ultimately, the US and its allies want access to the untapped vast oil reserves in Darfur.

from the US. He adds that since the discovery of oil in this region, the US has fuelled the conflict that has led to the deaths of tens of thousands and several millions displaced from their homes. In this regard, a strong UNAMID is not desirable as it will interfere with the operations of US proxy forces operating in Darfur fighting the Sudanese Government. It follows therefore that the US is the primary architect of the “organized hypocrisy” approach adopted by the UN as it has the overwhelming influence over its allies when it comes to adopting strategies to counter the spreading influence of China in Africa in general and Sudan in particular.

Given this situation, the US authorities opted to maintain a working relationship with the GoS at the strategic level as it feared that any western sponsored military attack on Sudan at a time when western powers were heavily involved in military campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq would be interpreted as yet another invasion of an Arab country, thus fuelling further anti-Western terrorist sentiments and activities.<sup>52</sup> At the operational level, the US continued financing insurgent groups fighting the Khartoum government. These self-serving priorities and considerations trumped gross humanitarian concerns over human rights violations in Darfur and ultimately influenced the adoption of a peacekeeping mission as opposed to a military humanitarian intervention to save Darfuris experiencing mass atrocities and crimes against humanity. This calculus in the US decision making process goes to demonstrate that national self-interests take precedence when considering the nature and size of peacekeeping intervention force to be deployed in any African country.<sup>53</sup> In addition it demonstrates the nature of organized hypocrisy practiced by the UN under the leadership of the US strategists. A closer examination of big powers’ politics and their interests in Africa reveals the

---

<sup>52</sup> Interview with a Minister of Foreign Affairs (name withheld) held in Harare during visit to the National Defence College in Harare. He stressed that the US considered it safe to play double standards with the Sudanese authorities. On one hand the Khartoum government was considered an ally in the fight against Global Terrorism yet on the other hand, the US was sponsoring a proxy war to check-mate the growing Chinese influence in that country whose natural resources are at the centre of the conflicts bedevilling various regions of Sudan. He added that the establishment of the US Africa Command (AFRICOM) in 2007 is indisputable evidence that US policy-makers now view Africa rich in mineral and natural resources as an area of military contention with China for the foreseeable future.

<sup>53</sup> This was the view of one senior military commander who served with UNAMID. In an interview on 03 April 2016, he declared that, “Do not ever think or imagine that the big powers would ever prioritize the welfare and well-being of African populations sacrificing their own economic benefits in the process, even if it means watching the poor African civilians dying in their thousands as long as the end result is profitable to their cause as happened in Rwanda.” He went on to add that, “neo-liberal economic policies being propagated by the Bretton Woods Institutions through Structural Adjustment Programmes were impoverishing millions of African populations and their governments that are lured into perpetual debts yet the western powers continue with the same policies that are condemning the populations of Africa to eternal poverty.”

machinations of the Military-Industrial Complex (MIC) that fuels conflicts on the African continent.

Erlinder (2010) noted that the American empire's political, economic and military manipulations benefit from fuelling local conflicts to ensure that its allies prevail in every corner of the globe. Accordingly the US has stepped up ongoing war for control of Sudan's resources namely: petroleum, copper, gold, uranium, and fertile plantation lands for sugar and gum Arabic (essential for Coke, Pepsi and Ben and Jerry's Ice cream). It has been observed that the war in Darfur is being played out on the ground through the "Humanitarian" NGOs, private military companies, "peace keeping" operations and covert military operations backed by the US and its closest allies. The Washington Post of 27 April 2006 pointed out that Sudan has been using its oil for committing a cardinal sin of developing an economy independent of the US. This, the paper continued, is not permissible to the US as any developing nation that attempts to develop an independent economy is considered a pariah state. Sudan has benefitted from its political and business relationship with China to the extent of being able to develop an economy independent of the US.

Considering that China is the biggest investor in the Sudanese oil industry, and that China is the biggest trading partner of the Sudanese government there is a conflict of interest between China and the US that has witnessed both powers fighting proxy Cold Wars in Sudan, starting with Southern Sudan and now in Darfur. The next section examines China's interests in Darfur and how this influenced the peacekeeping efforts in that region.

### **6.7 China's Strategic Interests in Darfur and their impact on UNAMID**

China has been the strongest ally of the Al Bashir government. This is so for several reasons. First, China's major reason for its steadfast support for the Sudanese Government is meant to serve as a counter strategy to check-mate and counter-balance US spreading hegemony in Africa (Bellamy and Williams 2010). Although China relies on coal for most of its energy needs it is the second largest consumer of oil in the world after the USA. Currently China imports about half of its oil supplies from the Middle East, and that percentage is projected to grow in stiff competition with the US demand for the same commodity from the same region. According to Elizabeth Economy (2007:15) China's most successful African energy investments have been in Sudan which now exports 60 percent of its oil output to China.

China's growing influence in Africa and the Middle East positions it in direct competition for energy resources with the US and the West as one analyst told the Financial Times that:

“China’s strategy in the middle East puts us in competition for influence. But the answer is not a confrontational approach over energy interest- it is a more cooperative relationship with the Chinese on energy security” (The World Savvy Monitor 2008:5).

Newly discovered natural resources in Sudan have made that country of great strategic importance to big powers and powerful corporations. Sudan is believed to have oil reserves rivalling those of Saudi Arabia (The International Energy Agency (IEA) (2007:3). It has the largest deposits of natural gas and in addition it has one of the three largest deposits of high-purity uranium in the world along with the fourth-largest deposits of copper (American Bedin, 2008:3). The Chinese oil rights stretch from the southern region to the Darfur region, near the border with Chad and the Central African Republic. US interests in these oil reserves caused it to orchestrate the genocide campaign against the GoS at the same time sponsoring insurgents against the Khartoum government in an effort to promote Darfur’s secessionism as did Southern Sudan (Zhang 2006).

China currently draws an estimated 30% of its crude oil from Africa. This competition over African natural resources has a strong bearing on how peacekeeping missions in Africa are constituted as great powers jostle to ensure that their geo-strategic and economic interests are not undermined by the deployed peacekeepers. China buys two thirds of Sudan’s oil, sells weapons and military aircraft to the GoS and has used its seat on the UNSC to dilute resolutions aimed at pressuring the Sudanese Government to stop the atrocities in Darfur (World Savvy 2008:11). In this regard, China protects Sudan from unwarranted UN attention with its Security Council Veto. It is Sudan’s largest trading partner. One human rights group reported that China was the main supplier of small arms used by government sponsored militias in Darfur (*Ibid.*). With the US supplying arms of war to rebels fighting the Sudanese government and the Chinese supplying weapons being used by pro-government rebels in Darfur, it follows that the conflict is a proxy war that is largely fuelled by foreign interests hence its resolution will equally largely depend on the satisfaction of the foreign powers behind the civil war.

#### 6.7.1 Chinese Response to the Darfur Crisis

China has provided political support to the GoS throughout the Darfur crisis whilst also contributing troops to UNAMID. China has opposed the indictment of President Omar Al Bashir by the ICC, a position similar to that of the AU and the Arab League and it has used its veto powers to keep away undue pressure on the Sudanese government (Engdahl 2007:13).

China insists that it has been unfairly targeted on the Darfur issue since one Chinese spokesman remarked that: “China has been using its influence to the largest extent possible to persuade the relevant parties to resolve the situation in Darfur” (World Savvy Monitor Op.Cit.:11). In an effort to overcome its negative image over Sudan, China has offered to mediate in the Darfur negotiations, it supported the resolution calling for the establishment of UNAMID and has sent 315 Chinese peace keepers equipped with 145 heavy vehicles to Darfur since 2007 (Zhang Op.Cit.:98). China insists that the Darfur crisis is not an “ethnic genocide” as alleged by the US. China believes that the crisis in Darfur is a struggle over natural resources mainly between Arabian and African black tribes complicated and exacerbated by global climatic change (*Ibid* :100). As such China believes that the Darfur crisis needs international efforts to restore peace and stability and it appears prepared to play an active role in safeguarding its investments whilst championing the AU’s position on the crisis. China has equally cautioned western powers against resorting too easily to imposition of economic sanctions and embargoes; and turning too easily to use of force (Brosché 2008:97). To make matters worse, the AU has allowed individual countries like Libya and Qatar to initiate their own peace talks outside the strategic guidance of the continental organization.<sup>54</sup> These parallel initiatives tend to undermine the effectiveness of the AU in addressing the crisis in Darfur.

Gomes (2015) is of the view that the EU and US preferred a purely UN mission in Darfur where some EU countries could donate sophisticated military equipment to be manned by the Europeans themselves in order to advance their self-interests through undermining the host state sovereignty.<sup>55</sup> Now that the GoS rejected the deployment of EU or western troops in Darfur, the donor countries have withheld their equipment, thus undermining the operational effectiveness of UNAMID in the process. The refusal by Sudanese authorities to surrender the perpetrators of atrocities in Darfur to The Hague for prosecution, angered western powers who

---

<sup>54</sup> In an interview with Gomez a senior official in Addis Ababa in October 2015, he lamented the practice of AU member states and outsiders usurping the power of the AU and mounting their own initiatives to broker peace talks in Darfur without synchronizing their efforts with the position of the AU. He was of the view that these countries should sponsor AU initiated negotiations as opposed to mounting parallel negotiations that have the potential of undermining the authority and success made by the continental body.

<sup>55</sup> Gomes is of the view that a strong UNAMID is undesirable to the western sponsors of the rebel movements fighting the Sudanese government. What the western powers want to achieve is the installation of a puppet regime in Darfur that will give their oil giants unfettered access to the rich oil fields in the Darfur region. It follows therefore that UNAMID is deployed to deliberately mislead the world that a genuine peace settlement is being sought in that region which translates to organized hypocrisy.

facilitated the indictment of President Al Bashir. In an interview with an African diplomat in Harare on 11 February 2016, he argued that:

Although President Al Bashir was not directly involved in the acts of atrocities, considering that he was the Commander in Chief of the Sudanese Armed Forces and that operations were conducted in line with his policies, he should have surrendered the indicted officials if he felt that they had acted outside his official orders and parameters of waging the war against rebels in Darfur. The fact that he refused to surrender these officials made him an accomplice to the crimes against humanity committed in his name (Interview with an African diplomat in Harare on 11 February 2016).

This was the first time that a sitting head of state was indicted for prosecution at The Hague by the ICJ in clear violation of Sudanese national sovereignty. Sudan's instability is aggravated by the fact that its security is undermined by several internal conflicts that are linked to regional conflicts that are also fuelled by foreign interests emanating from outside the African continent. Sudan is located at the centre of a very unstable region with multiple inter-broiled and cross-border conflicts. The porous borders with Chad, the DRC and Uganda are constantly violated by armed rebel groups from these countries escaping from home country security forces in hot pursuit and they end up crossing into Sudan where they aggravate the security situation (Coulon and Liégeois 2010).

The mass atrocities witnessed in Rwanda and Srebrenica' shocked the "conscience of mankind" and led to the advocacy for the R2P doctrine that was adopted at the world summit in 2005.<sup>56</sup> However, in real life situations, ethical and moral considerations play second fiddle when it comes to big powers' decision making processes regarding peacekeeping responses to crises on the African continent. Whereas Russia and China were protecting their lucrative business interests with the GoS, the US was equally doing the same as well as trying to keep Sudan as an ally in the war against terror. All this was being done at the expense of protecting civilian Darfuris that were internationally acknowledged to be under threat of ethnic cleansing and genocidal attacks by the same government these powers were doing serious business with, paying lip service or little attention towards capacitating the peacekeepers on the ground to discharge their mandate of protecting civilian populations.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> The adoption of R2P as a doctrine and international norm was the culmination of several years of research and lobbying for the adoption of such drastic concept that had far reaching consequences on such other international norms as the inviolability of state sovereignty and non-interference in internal matters of UN member states.

<sup>57</sup> This was the view of one senior military commander who served with UNAMID. In an interview on 03 April 2016, he declared that, "Do not ever think or imagine that the big powers would ever prioritize the welfare and well-being of African populations sacrificing their own economic benefits in the process, even if it means

The indictment of President Al Bashir for war crimes, while appearing morally necessary, served to undermine Sudan's state sovereignty. It has had the effect of derailing any meaningful negotiations the world community has been pursuing with authorities in Khartoum over the regime's cooperation with UN/AU peacekeepers. The Sudanese government officials view the indictment as a political act, designed to 'obstruct' political developments in Khartoum. This development led Krieg (2013:47) to conclude that a combination of colonial legacy and recent experiences of ostensible humanitarian interventions have created fear in former colonies that Western powers employ the humanitarian argument to serve as a vehicle to circumvent the sovereignty principle with the ultimate aim of having unfettered neo-colonial access to exploit a countries' natural resources.

## 6.8 Conclusion

The conflict and humanitarian crisis in Darfur presents a formidable and complex multilateral challenge to UN peacekeeping efforts towards finding a long term solution to the crisis (Bah and Johnstone 2007:29-43). Chijiwa (2013:35) observed that the crisis in Darfur resembles a classic/text book example of a government that was either unwilling or unable to protect its civilian population, a situation that makes Darfur a strong candidate for the application of R2P doctrine where the international community is expected to come to the rescue of the victims of crimes against humanity. This did not happen despite widespread acknowledgement that the conflict in Darfur was generating mass civilian atrocities or acts of genocide, which according to R2P should have triggered a coercive humanitarian intervention. Weiss (2009:135) termed the UN response to the crisis "collective waffling reflecting an unadulterated respect for Khartoum's sovereign prerogatives." Several geo-strategic and ethical reasons for this poor response have been highlighted in this chapter.

Two major reasons have been identified for the UN's failure to operationalize the doctrine of R2P in Darfur. First ethical reason, was the resistance by the Sudanese government and her allies to any external coercive measures or intervention that threatened Sudan's state sovereignty in the name of protecting civilians in Darfur. Attempts at operationalizing the R2P doctrine in Darfur following the adoption of UNSC Resolution 1706 triggered serious and

---

watching the poor African civilians dying in their thousands as long as the end result is profitable to their cause as happened in Rwanda." He went on to add that, "neo-liberal economic policies being propagated by the Bretton Woods Institutions through Structural Adjustment Programmes were impoverishing millions of African populations and their governments that are lured into perpetual debts yet the western powers continue with the same policies that are condemning the populations of Africa to eternal poverty."

contentious debate regarding the use of force for humanitarian purposes that thwarted any attempts at military humanitarian intervention (Badescu 2011:136). The second ethical reason was the realization that the use of force in trying to protect civilians in Darfur was going to be a very costly undertaking in both material and human lives since the GoS had threatened to resist any foreign troops deployed on its soil without her consent (Bellamy 2009:198). Thus, the proposed deployment of a UN military humanitarian intervention force was abandoned and replaced by a UN/AU hybrid peacekeeping mission that remains under equipped and poorly funded almost 10 years after its deployment, factors that have contributed to its gross ineffectiveness to discharge its primary objective of protecting civilians exposed to crimes against humanity.

The chapter also highlighted that the responses by the big powers to the “conscience-shocking” situation in Darfur remain governed by geo-strategic self-interests of the major powers as well as regional political dynamics and regional interests at stake. It is not the magnitude or degree of suffering by the victims of atrocities and crimes against humanity that determine practical international responses, but rather the geo-strategic and economic self-interests of the powerful nations that dictate the magnitude and quality of UN responses to humanitarian crises especially on the African continent. This implies that ethical and moral considerations are only publicly acknowledged while practically the responses take a totally different dimension in what has been observed as organized hypocrisy by the Security Council and its Secretariat. The other reason for the poor performance of the UN in Darfur is that whereas the Darfur civil war has local and regional causes, the conflict is to a large extent a proxy war fuelled by foreign powers that take advantage of the political fault lines in the local ethnic relationships in order to promote their own self-interests as they compete for the control and exploitation of natural resources.

The Darfur case study has demonstrated that practical limits and ethical problems of UN missions are largely explained by the power politics and the pursuit of self-interests by the P5 as they debate on what measures to adopt in order to address a particular crisis. It has been observed that where the P5 have a consensus to act, they can authorize a powerful mission to produce desired results and in situations where there is no consensus, as was the case in Darfur, the Security Council may opt to do nothing or decide to make a symbolic and ineffective gesture as was the case in Rwanda and now in Darfur. Such symbolic responses qualify to be categorized as “organized hypocrisy.” It follows therefore that the success or failure of UN

peacekeeping missions has more to do with the private and self-interests of the big powers as opposed to the desire to assist affected populations in target countries.

It is widely acknowledged that humanitarian military intervention is a dangerous and difficult undertaking. Irrespective of this realisation, UN policymakers continue to deploy small, inadequately equipped and poorly funded peacekeeping forces into these dangerous theatres of operation where there is no peace to keep and with vague and unachievable mandates in what is clearly organized hypocrisy on the part of UN authorities.

The chapter has demonstrated the continued conflict between states' self-interests on one hand and the humanitarian needs of vulnerable and unprotected African civilian communities on the other hand. This tension remains a serious challenge to the operationalization of the R2P as a doctrine to render effective protection to the victims of internal conflicts in Africa. The complex political and security situation in Darfur with fragile peace agreements that were violated willy-nilly, witnessed a largely symbolic international response to the humanitarian crisis because geo-strategic and economic self-interests of some of the permanent members of the Security Council with the "omnipresent" veto power, deterred any strong action against the Sudanese government. The chapter has also demonstrated that the international community's hesitancy to effectively grapple with crimes against humanity in Darfur exhibits the proven and growing lack of political will and lack of agreement among the P5 to come to the rescue of endangered civilian populations in Africa. This exposes the characteristic of a "selective security system" and "double standards" applied by powerful nations when dealing with humanitarian disasters on the African continent (Lowe, Roberts and Zaum 2008). This should therefore further encourage the AU and African leaders to genuinely explore strategies for the operationalization of the principle of seeking "African Solutions to African Problems" that currently exists in theory only. It is disheartening to note that current attempts at seeking conflict resolution through peacekeeping in Africa are dependent of foreign donations that come with strings attached (Interview with Ambassador Mapuranga on June 12, 2015). This trend can only be reversed if African leaders realize that UN peacekeepers deploy with hidden agendas not clearly spelt out in their mandates. In most cases these hidden agendas do not serve African interests hence the urgent need to operationalise the dictum "African solutions to African problems" within the shortest possible feasible period.

The next chapter is the concluding chapter of this study that will be followed by scholarly and practical recommendations to address identified ethical challenges to UN peacekeeping missions in Africa.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### An ethical critique of the violation of UN peacekeeping principles

#### 7.1 Introduction

United Nations peacekeeping operations are based on three principles that govern their constitution, legitimacy and conduct of field operations. These principles are; consent of the parties to the conflict, impartiality towards treatment of parties to the conflict through ensuring that peacekeepers do not take sides by favouring one party to the conflict at the expense of others, and non-use of force except in self-defence or in defence of the mandate (Goulding 1993:445). These principles are viewed as being interlinked, hence the term “holy trinity” and are considered critical to the effectiveness and success of peacekeeping operations (Liu 1992). Peacekeeping principles “play a pivotal ontological and semantic role” in that they describe the essence of peacekeeping as a distinct tool for the resolution of conflicts (Tsagourias 2006:2). According to The Blue Helmets (1996:37-39), the principles governing UN peacekeeping missions were first formulated and promulgated by the then UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold during United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF 1) deployment to diffuse the 1956 Suez Crisis. This deployment is officially acknowledged as the first UN armed peacekeeping mission (*Ibid.*).

Karns and Mingst (2001:215) argue that UN peacekeeping principles have reached a level where they have acquired constitutional status in the sense that their application and acceptance continues despite radical changes to the context, environment and substance of peacekeeping operations. Wedgewood (1995:640) posits that peacekeeping has a “singular origin in a kind of ethical non-violence” hence the adoption of the three principles that form the bedrock of UN peacekeeping missions. According to Durch and Berkman (2006) during the Cold War, UN peacekeeping operations were the preserve of supposedly neutral, medium sized and non-aligned states whose military troops were tasked to competently monitor a buffer zone between states without the mandate to effectively defend the international boundary. During this period, it was generally believed that the strict observance of the principles of peacekeeping constituted the embodiment of both the political principle and mission protection strategy that also served the interests of host states. In that regard, the conceptual idea of establishing peacekeeping as a tool for conflict management sounded as a very innovative and noble idea, however the application and implementation of these principles in the field of operations in most cases, violated host state sovereignty as demonstrated in the case studies of this thesis.

Conceptually, traditional peacekeeping missions posed little threat to norms of international sovereignty and territorial integrity as theoretically envisioned by the UN founding fathers. UN peacekeeping missions were expected to serve with the consent of all the parties to the conflict and play a non-coercive role when handling disputes. Sadly, the current state of UN peacekeeping practice as well as its future appear to be in jeopardy as a result of violations of both the “holy trinity” principles of peacekeeping and host state sovereignty. Berman and Sams (2000:172) observed that UN peacekeeping operations have become “more intrusive, multidimensional and often coercive” thus not only broadening their scope but also challenging their conceptual coherence and ultimate intentions. This chapter seeks to provide a critique on why peacekeeping principles are being violated and why peacekeepers continue to undermine host state sovereignty. The chapter also attempts to unpack the meaning and application of UN peacekeeping principles and why big powers not only undermine these principles but also violate host state sovereignty in pursuit of their national self-interests.

This chapter is divided into five sections. Section one examines the meaning of consent, its relationship with nation-state sovereignty and the problems associated with its practical application. Section two analyses the meaning and challenges associated with the principle of impartiality. The third section examines the meaning and ethical challenges linked to the practical application of the principle that deals with “non-use of force except in self-defence.” Section four is a theoretical and conceptual explanation why UN peacekeepers are in the habit of violating the cardinal principles of UN peacekeeping. Finally, the fifth section is a critique of UN peacekeeping missions through the African ethical lenses. The above section is followed with a conclusion.

## **7.2 Host state consent**

The first fundamental ethical principle of peacekeeping operations that contributes towards their constitutional and legal basis for deployment and continued presence of a peacekeeping force within a state is host state consent. This is a vital requirement for the deployment of consensual peacekeeping missions for the simple reason that state sovereignty plays a critical role in the context of establishing a UN mandate for non-violent peacekeeping intervention. Tsagourias (2006:3) buttresses this point by acknowledging the criticality and centrality of host state consent when he states that “...consent is critical for the creation of a conducive operating environment for a peacekeeping force inside a target country and this consent provides the mission with the relevant legal and legitimate basis, failure which the deployment would be viewed as a violation of host state sovereignty.” Article 2 (7) of the UN Charter prevents the

world body from intervening in matters that are within the domestic jurisdiction of member states (United Nations Charter 1945). It follows therefore that the deployment and continuous presence of a peacekeeping mission requires the host state's consent, failure which, the deployment will be in violation of Article 2 (7) of the Charter.

Since there are no provisions for peacekeeping missions in the UN Charter, peacekeeping operations derive their legitimacy from the Security Council resolutions and host state consent (Jett 2001:39). Host state consent legitimizes the deployment of foreign troops in a given country. Consent is derived from the parties' "perceptions of the peacekeepers' impartiality and moral authority" (Durch 1993:12). Essentially, consent serves to reduce the risk to the peacekeepers and more importantly, upholding this principle preserves the sovereignty of the host state (Doyle and Sambanis (2006). Any erosion of consent can significantly diminish the peacekeepers' ability to fulfil their mission and mandate in addition to endangering their lives hence peacekeepers have an incentive not only to maintain consent but also to cultivate and nurture it for the benefit of all concerned. In theory, host state consent and Security Council mandate together make a very strong case that prevents the world body from intervening and meddling in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of member states without their approval.

The presence of host state consent also ensures that peacekeepers are in the majority of cases, deployed into stable and "permissive" operational environments where the use of force in self-defence is anticipated to be at a minimal. In that regard, irrespective of how the operating environment is, it is critical that the mission maintains and upholds its legitimacy since legitimacy of peacekeeping troops influences the behaviour of local actors, general support from the population and provides the basis for continued acceptability (Latif and Khan 2010:236). In the post-Cold War era, host consent has been granted grudgingly in some cases as it was not offered freely and wholeheartedly by receiving states. Some powerful states have sought to apply various strategies to manipulate weak states into accepting peacekeepers' deployment in their territories for meagre political and economic incentives thereby undermining their state sovereignty and national integrity. It is therefore pertinent to investigate why the big powers go to the extent of coercing receiving states to accept the presence of UN peacekeepers against their will.

Welsh (2008:562) noted that in cases such as in Haiti, Kosovo and East Timor, host state consent was coerced by the big powers through diplomatic, political and economic pressures especially in situations involving humanitarian emergencies. In the African context, the

Sudanese President was coerced to accept UN peacekeepers in Darfur against his government's wishes (De Haas 2008). In the DRC, UN peacekeepers remain deployed in that country when the host government demanded their departure or their drastic scaling down all to no avail. These cases are testimony to the current practice of undermining host country's sovereignty, a development that heralded a significant and regrettable departure from the original founding principles of UN peacekeeping operations as a non-coercive tool of third-party involvement designed to ameliorate and contain violence without undermining the authority of the host government.

As demonstrated in the previous chapters, post-Cold War peacekeeping operations are a tool that is being frequently used to undermine host state sovereignty through manipulation and violation of host state consent. At the international level of states' interaction, the concept of sovereignty implies the ability to deny any unwelcome foreign intervention in domestic affairs that are strictly considered to be within the jurisdiction of the state. In practicing its sovereignty, the state is not subject to any foreign authority of any nature whatsoever, including ethical values, without its consent and out of response to its national interests (Abu al-Haj 2013:118). Some scholars argue that the principle of non-intervention is not absolute citing situations where a government fails to protect its citizens from genocide, it would have reneged on its responsibility to protect its own population. The most recent example in Africa is when the Libyan government threatened to massacre its own citizens that were revolting against Gaddafi's continued rule, the UN Security Council imposed a no-fly zone as the international community assumed the responsibility of protecting the Libyan population against its own government.

The principle of non-intervention is considered to be one of the fundamental principles of International Law that is designed to guarantee international order and the independence and sovereignty of states, hence the commitment and undertaking by member states to respect rights of each state and not to intervene in the domestic affairs of other states (Shukri 1986:141). Regrettably, the principle of territorial integrity, though substantially retained in theory, has in practice, been negatively affected and substantially watered down as a result of the effects of globalization and accelerated interdependency among member states (Enabulele 2010:409-410). Host state consent in the context of UN peacekeeping operations has equally been watered down and violated as a result of these global forces.

### 7.2.1 The problem of state sovereignty and human security

The need for host state consent prior to the deployment of peacekeeping missions at times causes problems in some complex mission environments. The importance accorded to human security over the past two and half decades has taken centre stage to the extent that if a UN mission does not guarantee or be seen to be prioritizing human security in the first place, then it is considered a futile undertaking (Latif and Khan 2010:236). This implies that human security, under these circumstances is being accorded higher priority over that of state sovereignty.

Newman and Richmond (2001:4) observed that the focus of post-Cold War peacekeeping has dramatically shifted towards human security in the context of international society. This view is supported by the Brahimi Report (2000) which called for a stronger rethinking regarding human security (Peou 2002:65). These developments have resulted in the complication of issues regarding host state consent in the context of “new humanitarian interventions” and state sovereignty. This complication has resulted in a dilemma between the defence of humanity and defence of sovereignty and it is unclear which principle should prevail when they are in conflict (Latif and Khan 2010:237). Following the humanitarian disasters that happened in places like Somalia, Rwanda, DRC, Bosnia and Haiti, the UN Secretariat came to acknowledge the existence of the dilemma of nation state sovereignty and human security. In the year 2000, the then Secretary General Kofi Annan acknowledged that in the practice of classical peacekeeping operations, “consent” by host states was vital however, he was also quick to highlight and emphasize the problem that exists in contemporary missions when he stated that:

I also accept that the principle of sovereignty and non-interference offer vital protection to small and weak states. But to the critics, I would pose this question: if humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to a Rwanda, to a Srebrenica - to gross and systematic violations of human rights, violations that offend every precept of our common humanity? (Annan 2000:47-48).

He further acknowledged that humanitarian interventions can be used as a cover up to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states and that it can be used by secessionist movements from affected countries to deliberately provoke governments to commit gross human rights violations and trigger foreign intervention in support of their cause (*Ibid.*). A problem arises where it is not clear what action the international community should take in order to assist the suffering population without undermining the sovereignty of the host state that is suspicious of actual intentions of the intervening forces.

The granting of host state consent is further problematized by both endogenous and exogenous factors such as: the type of conflict; timing of the intervention; self-interests of great powers; the nature and interests of domestic and external actors, and the nature of threats and challenges to the operating environment (Latif and Khan 2010:235). UN missions that witnessed increased interventions in internal conflicts, increase the conflict between the values of state sovereignty and human rights and in so doing, they further blur the distinction between domestic and international issues (Badescu and Bergholm 2009). Whereas there are many cases where the UN missions have intervened in civil conflicts with the invitation and consent of the host states and the warring parties, there are equally many precedents where the UN interventions were undertaken without consent of the belligerents which tends to legitimize the predominant evolving logic that “rights of states may shift to rights of human beings” (*Ibid.*). Boutros-Ghali (1992) was supportive of this normative change when he stated that, “...the time for absolute and exclusive sovereignty has passed.” This assertion tends to confirm the view highlighted by Debrix (1999:17) that UN peacekeeping was invented as a serious undertaking to realize the establishment of “a neo-Kantian universal moral community in which process, peacekeeping was to be used as a proxy.” Manipulation of host state consent to facilitate peacekeepers’ deployment in selected countries tends to support this view point.

The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) states that state sovereignty carries with it the responsibility to ensure the safety of the lives of its citizens and their welfare implying that it is an obligation for member states to consent to and actively facilitate humanitarian assistance on the basis of customary international law. The report further states that: “where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-interference yields to the international responsibility to protect” (ICISS 2001:xi).

Under modern international understanding, state sovereignty inheres in the people and the state’s sovereignty is thus conditional and is therefore challenged when a government wilfully embarks on activities that cause death and widespread suffering among its population (Ademola 2005). It follows that a state that fails to act decisively towards protection of its innocent population in turn loses claim to its sovereignty. This appears to be making it easy for the UN to intervene without state consent hence states are suspicious of foreign interventions as they are used by big powers as a way of interfering with domestic affairs of less powerful states. In cases where it is proven that there is dereliction of responsibility to protect innocent

civilians on the part of the state, sovereignty and human security interests of international community come into conflict with potential results that national sovereignty interests could play second fiddle (Chartoff 2009). Thus, the ethical problem arising from the competing interests of state sovereignty and human security remains contentious in international relations.

#### 7.2.2 A critique to the principle of host state consent

The UN approach to strict compliance with the consent-based missions was seriously undermined and challenged by warlords in civil conflict zones like in Angola, Liberia, Somalia and the DRC where peacekeepers were attacked in a bid to terminate the deployments that were viewed by non-state actors as disrupting their agenda and grand political designs. These developments further complicated the issue of host state consent and gave rise to the advocacy for robust peacekeeping and more calls for peace enforcement missions where Africa was used as a pioneer continent and testing ground for peacekeepers with explicit authority to use force in order to enforce peace in Somalia (Al-Qaq 2009).

Peacekeeping missions in the post-Cold War era are increasingly being launched under Chapter 7 of the Charter (enforcement action) implying that the importance of host government consent is being whittled down, though in some cases consent has continued to be sought after for pragmatic and principled reasons (Zaum 2008:90). Coercive tendencies by big powers over weak states have led Berdal (2008:176) to lament that UN peacekeeping operations that were originally designed as a limited non-coercive tool of third party involvement in conflict management, reliant on host-state consent and geared towards diffusing and containing violence have been profoundly affected by changes in the political context and member states' ambitions over time. Given this development, important to note is the fact that when there is no consent, the principle of impartiality becomes more problematic as highlighted in the next section that examines the meaning and problems associated with the principle of impartiality in UN peacekeeping operations.

### 7.3 The ethical principle of impartiality

Impartiality is an abstract political term, subject to differing interpretations by different interest groups bent on satisfying their own self-interests. Broadly speaking, it is a product of perception as well as of practice and it has a direct relationship with the principle of consent in that to retain host state consent or that of the belligerents, peacekeepers must be seen to be impartial which leads to cooperation of the parties to the conflict.

Being impartial in peacekeeping operations, means that peacekeepers cannot take sides in disputes among local belligerents. To a very large extent, impartiality is derived from consent, which in turn is closely connected with maintaining a non-threatening military posture that is linked to the principle of non-use of force except in self-defence (Interview with General Nyambuya 13 October 2015). The General's views are derived from UN guidelines on peacekeeping operations (UN Doc. GA/SPD/120, 1997). In cases where the UN peacekeeping operation has retained absolute consent from the conflicting parties, peacekeepers can more easily claim to be acting in accordance with the principle of impartiality toward the parties (*Ibid.*). Osmancavusoglu, (2000) observed that in conflict situations involving ethnic-based issues, or the collapse of state institutions, the UN has lacked clear consent from the parties to the conflict a trend that continues to endanger the lives of peacekeepers.

Gibbs (2000:360) defines peacekeeping impartiality as follows: "peacekeepers will be expected to serve universalistic interests (such as attenuation of violent conflict or protection of minorities from persecution) and must not serve the parochial interests of specific foreign powers, which seek to project their influence into the conflicts in question." From a theoretical perspective, the general assumption is that UN peacekeepers are not biased and remain as objective and disinterested parties as they can humanly be. However, in practice it is extremely difficult to be impartial in the interpretation and implementation of UN Security Council resolutions since from the outset, the Secretariat was never designed to be completely autonomous from great power influences (*Ibid.*).

Simply put, the UN Secretariat is there to serve the interests of the P-5 first and foremost to avoid unnecessary friction with the main financial sponsors of the UN peacekeeping budget. Levine (2011) observed that the interpretation and understanding of impartiality has evolved in conformity with the UN greater willingness to get embroiled in intrastate conflicts. This has been coupled with UN peacekeepers' ever increasing involvement in multi-dimensional and humanitarian missions where their mandates authorize them to deal with human rights abuses and protection of civilians as well as performing their traditional tasks of monitoring and overseeing an end to local hostilities.

At the time of adopting the principle of impartiality, the then Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold (1956) emphasized that the UN mission would not "influence the military balance in the present conflict and thereby the political balance affecting the efforts to settle the conflict." This has not been the case in most UN peacekeeping missions as demonstrated

in the case studies in preceding chapters, where the principle of impartiality was seriously violated and compromised.

The principle of impartiality requires that UN peacekeeping missions should be “strictly impartial” in their dealings with the host government and other non-state actors. To guarantee impartiality in a civil war setting where the peacekeepers are tasked with the responsibility of maintaining law and order is extremely difficult, especially in civil war settings that include many competing warlords as demonstrated in the case studies on Somalia, and Darfur.

The vital importance of impartiality in peacekeeping has been stressed by James (1993) one of the most distinguished authorities on this subject who noted that: “it is impartiality which gives peacekeeping its distinctiveness... Impartiality is the lifeblood of peacekeeping.” The significance of peacekeeping impartiality is also shared by several authors such as Diehl (1993:8-9); Fetherston (1994); Goulding (I993:454); Ramsbotham & Woodhouse (I996:I25); Vayrynen (1996:35) and Vohra (1996:63-85 who regard impartiality as one of the key cornerstones of peacekeeping operations. These authors also add that impartiality, provides peacekeepers with a sense of legitimacy, which helps facilitate the success of peacekeeping operations. Despite these acknowledgements, the importance of impartiality continues to be whittled down hence the need to determine the theoretical basis for this unfortunate development.

According to the Brahimi Report (2000) in contemporary peacekeeping missions, impartiality is no longer viewed and understood as equal treatment of all parties to a conflict under all circumstances but as “adherence to the principles of the Charter and to the objectives of a mandate that is rooted in those Charter principles”. This interpretation of impartiality enables peacekeepers to distinguish between aggressors and victims and deal with them differently.

### 7.3.1 Ethical challenges to the maintenance of impartiality

The post-Cold War era witnessed a dramatic increase in UN peacekeeping missions as a result of an increase in civil wars that required third party intervention and mediation as civil wars replaced inter-state wars as the major global security threats (Frederking 2007:42). In the process of increasing interventions in internal conflicts, peacekeeping missions with multidimensional scope and mandates have resulted in peacekeepers increasingly handling national security issues such as maintenance of law and order as well as human security issues. This development has created ethical problems in the field of operations as emerging norms of human security have increasingly led to complex peacekeeping missions whose impartiality is

questionable (Hampson and Malone 2002:77-98). The major challenges for UN peacekeeping missions in the post-Cold War era are linked to the development of concepts and norms which authorize the deployment of peacekeepers in “semi-permissive or non-consensual environments where they have increasingly been called to operate since 1988” (Hansen, Ramsbotham, and Woodhouse, 2004:6). It is therefore imperative that this chapter attempts to unpack the major theoretical and philosophical reasons why there is growing appetite to deploy UN peacekeepers in “semi-permissive and non-consensual” operating environments.

As we have seen in chapter four on Somalia, ethical challenges arise when disarmament mandates are sanctioned by the Security Council as happened in Somalia during the manhunt for warlord General Farah Aideed. UN peacekeepers became embroiled in local conflict thus becoming a direct threat to some of the clan leaders. This was a direct interference with the power dynamics within the local clan power structures in which peacekeepers’ attempts at disarming the warring factions in Somalia, and efforts to capture Farah Aideed translated to forfeiture of all pretences of impartiality as United Nations troops became active belligerents in the conflict (Sens 1997). Under these circumstances, the most logical outcome of the venture was to abandon the mission, leaving behind a Somalia that was worse than what the peacekeepers found it in terms of political cohesion and humanitarian suffering.

During contemporary peacekeeping missions, the UN continues to demonstrate a propensity towards dictating or imposing solutions to the disputants/protagonists by prescribing preferred views of the organization on how a crisis should be resolved. This approach does not give the belligerents options to explore and adopt their common grounds and implement them as a basis for a long term peace agreement. Based on this perspective, Coicaud (2001:25.) argues that “the UN has lost its innocence and peacekeeping has lost its impartiality as it aims to impose a specific agenda and solution on the disputants.” Foreign political impositions such as the one attempted by UN forces in Somalia demonstrate the lack of sensitivity by UN peacekeepers when they disregard the national aspirations and self-determination of host populations.

The next section examines the issues related to the use of force in peacekeeping other than in self-defence and in defence of the mandate.

#### **7.4 The use of force in UN peacekeeping missions**

The use of force by UN peacekeeping missions is a controversial and politically sensitive issue that is yet to be resolved among UN member states. Tardy (2007:49-70) observed that the UN has always found it challenging to reconcile its primary role of maintaining international peace

and security and the idea of coercion through robust peacekeeping or peace enforcement. He further adds that the UN blurred the lines between robustness and peace enforcement with its operations in the DRC and Mali. And that it is uncertain how long troop contributing countries are willing to sustain this level of robustness where troops are constantly exposed to danger. This has resulted in serious divisions among member states.

China and the developing countries advocate the use of force in self-defence as outlined in the founding principles of peacekeeping. Western countries support the use of force for the purposes of implementing tasks given in Security Council mandates that are beyond self-defence yet Western countries are reluctant to provide the fighting troops and adequate logistical resources to successfully undertake such missions in fear of own citizens' casualties (Findlay 2002:327-328). The Security Council continues to authorize peacekeepers' use of force in situations that go beyond self-defence such as protection of civilians and maintenance of law and order and public security (Johnstone 2009:65). A peacekeeping mission that transcends the legal limits of self-defence becomes an active hostile force, and the host state could revoke its consent, a development that could serve to weaken the chances of the mission being a success.

Blocq (2006:202) observed that the Rules of Engagement (ROE) which define the scenarios for the use of force lack adequate ethical guidance with respect to the proper use of force to protect civilians. He further posits that in spite of the absence of such detailed ethical guidelines, peacekeepers are still expected to act morally in this "ethical vacuum." In addition, Weiss, Forsythe and Coate (2004:48) observed that peacekeeping missions have become more ambitious and at times more robust, a result of less friction and suspicions in the Security Council that had stifled peacekeeping operations prior to the 1990s. Blocq (2006:205) further notes two ethical issues that concern the lack of adequate guidance that peacekeepers require in that ROEs are of a discretionary nature since they lack firm ethical guidelines for peacekeeping operations; a situation that is further aggravated by the fact that the ROEs are an amalgamation of legal, political, and military operational exigencies hence they contain some ambiguities in relation to how peacekeepers should apply political and legal requirements underlying these rules on the use of force.

United Nations Security Council mandates for the protection of civilians are a new addition to mission objectives reflecting a normative shift in the conduct of peacekeeping operations. The Brahimi Report (2000) clearly states that "UN peacekeepers who witness violence against

civilians should be presumed to be authorized to stop it, within their means, in support of basic UN principles.” This normative shift is supported by the ICISS which went a step further and gave birth to the controversial concept/principle of “responsibility to protect” (ICISS 2001). Although this “responsibility to protect” norm was endorsed at the 2005 World Summit, there is still no consensus on the practical application of the principle thus raising a number of practical and ethical challenges on how peacekeepers should protect civilians without endangering themselves and other civilians who might be attacked elsewhere as a punitive measure for close liaison with peacekeepers.

In practice, increased UN propensity towards the use of force other than in self-defence raises a number of dilemmas in the execution of peacekeeping missions. Findlay (2002) has observed that this is more apparent when peacekeeping practitioners in the field lack “institutionalized guidance” on the use of force resulting in ad hoc, improvised, incoherent and inconsistent responses to challenges encountered in the mission areas. The pervasive functions of contemporary peacekeeping operations namely protection of civilians and provision of law and order, functions that are ideally and traditionally the responsibility of the host government, raise numerous dilemmas that demand the development of solid doctrinal guidelines.

#### 7.4.1 Problems related to the use of force

The first problem in the use of force is that the proactive use of force as expected in robust peacekeeping may indeed contribute towards restoration of peacekeepers’ credibility but in the process may also worsen the mission’s operating environment by increasing the risks to peacekeepers in a situation where peacekeepers are overwhelmingly outnumbered by local forces (Roberts 1994:23-24). As a result, many pacifists object to the use of military force on the assumption that physical force creates more problems than it tries to solve, and that it is morally wrong anyway to use directed force in non-coercive peacekeeping operations (Janzekovic 2006:43).

Examples that come to mind where use of force by peacekeepers worsened the situation include the UN missions in Somalia, DRC and Darfur where peacekeepers were outnumbered by local forces and in so doing, they were subjected to life threatening situations. In the cited countries, the use of force by peacekeepers resulted in peacekeepers’ exposure to more attacks, deaths, robberies as well as being taken hostage as manifestation of a deteriorating operating environment as well as withdrawal of local consent by some of the spoiler groups (Roberts Op. Cit.:24).

The second problem, which has direct linkages to the first, is that the use of force by United Nations peacekeepers in complex civil wars such as in Somalia, DRC and Darfur frequently involves killing and injuring civilians as well as armed spoilers in a war-like situation. Once civilian and even combatant casualties increase, as experienced in Somalia in 1993, international and local outcries and accusations of peacekeepers' brutal and colonial like behaviour take centre stage as neither the UN nor its leading members are immune from such accusations (Janzekovic Op. Cit.:24). Belligerents who command some respect and sympathy from the local population tend to find plausible excuses to abandon whatever diplomatic and political negotiations currently underway and revert back to violence once the use of force is seen to be deliberately targeting certain factions, thus further complicating the operating environment and possibly prolonging the conflict and the mission resulting in a lose-lose political outcome.

Janzekovic (2006:152) argues that most of humanity is morally torn between not interfering in another state's genocidal activities because of the very real risk of own countrymen's death or injury to family and friends on one hand, and the dreadful realisation that every minute of inaction means that more atrocities are occurring on the other hand. He further argues that for the sake of a suffering and dying humanity, it is morally not good enough to be stunned into indecision since only observers to atrocities have the luxury of moral indecision since those suffering and dying in their tens of thousands have no such moral dilemmas to worry about. Just-war theorists and utilitarians support a view somewhere in the middle. They are of the view that it is at times morally prudent and appropriate to use force, particularly in response to life threatening situations, but at other times it is not appropriate where the anticipated solution or outcome would cause more harm than good (Orend 1999:323-53).

The third problem is that use of force by peacekeepers could result in the risk of undermining perceptions about the impartiality of the peacekeeping force involved in the hostile acts. Maintaining impartiality in humanitarian situations poses great difficulties especially if aid is needed in certain areas more than others. Peacekeepers cannot afford to create enemies in a foreign land as they desperately need local allies and supporters. Cooperation with locals irrespective of their status is needed more so if the mission is operating in a hostile environment.

The fourth problem linked to the use of force is that once civilians fully appreciate that the peacekeepers are mandated to protect them, they will re-locate to where peacekeepers are

deployed in the hope of getting safety under the protection umbrella of the peacekeepers against the local belligerents. Several scenarios can be triggered by such a development. The displaced civilians seeking shelter from the peacekeepers can overwhelm the capacity of the mission and expose it to manipulation by those who want the operation to fail or invite robust action from peacekeepers in the hope that it will work to their advantage (Johnstone 2009:70). The safety expectations of the civilian population are naturally raised once they are under the protection of peacekeepers and the protectors may resort to use of force in the event that the lives of the civilians are threatened by spoilers.

The fifth ethical problem arises when protection of civilians in one area results in reprisals against other civilians elsewhere as a consequence of peacekeepers' isolation of this part of the population from some of the factions. Giving civilians protection knowing full well that others are going to be victimized as a result of this noble initiative puts the peacekeepers in a serious dilemma (Johnstone 2009:70). Peacekeeping troops are sometimes exposed to attacks while protecting relief aid. In such circumstances, peacekeepers are entitled to fight back in self-defence. However such responses are at times misconstrued as an act of hostility by some spoilers which lead to more fighting resulting in the escalation of the conflict to guerrilla warfare and possible withdrawal of consent by affected parties (Viloria 1999:5). Related to this dilemma is the timing and scale of the use of force by peacekeepers which if not properly considered would result in worsening the situation.

The sixth problem arises when deciding whether peacekeepers should pre-emptively use force in their bid to protect civilians. This is so especially when there is evidence of the intent by spoilers to harm civilians. Under such scenarios peacekeepers either have to proactively use force or they should wait until the damage is done in which case civilians would have been killed whilst peacekeepers were exploring other appropriate measures before using force to protect the civilians. Pre-emptive action translates to a declaration of war which could escalate to levels that most peacekeeping missions are not equipped to wage on a sustained basis. In Somalia, proactive use of force resulted in disaster as the warlords responded viciously to peacekeepers' initiative to forcefully disarm them as "insecurity and suspicion replaced consent and trust" (Tanner 1996:140-141).

The "deeper dilemma" arising from the protection of civilians' norm is that of trying to achieve order and justice at the same time. Johnstone (2009:71) observed that protection of civilians is part of trying to restore order through quick results yet this effort can undermine long-term,

multidimensional efforts to achieve justice. If peacekeepers were to wait for political and diplomatic efforts to protect civilians to bear the desired results while civilians are being butchered, that scenario would seriously undermine the reputation and legitimacy of the mission and equally lose credibility and support among locals and international well-wishers the mission needs for success.

The principle that a peacekeeper must refrain from using armed force until absolutely necessary is related to the principle of impartiality. The use of force against one party translates to taking sides with the other party, in violation of the principle of non-interference and impartiality. This led the US Department of the Army, to sum up the dangers and dilemmas associated with use of force by peacekeepers as follows:

...the use of force by peacekeepers usually attracts a violent response from the affected parties ultimately resulting in heightened tensions, polarized public opinion against the peacekeepers and foreclosure of available negotiating opportunities. In that process, the impartiality of the mission is compromised and violence is escalated outcomes that are counterproductive to the overall attainment of mission objectives US Army (FM 100-23:34).

The well-documented and publicized failures to protect civilians by UN peacekeeping missions in Bosnia, Rwanda, DRC and Sudan led to the realization that civilians caught up in conflict zones cannot be protected by international humanitarian law alone but with physical action to stop the human rights violations. This influenced UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's advocacy for a "culture of protection" to be adopted by the international community (UN Doc. S/2005/740:15). This proposal, according to Tanner (2010:209-217), inevitably introduced ethical conflict between the protection of civilians and the consent of local parties to the fore implying that peacekeepers were now expected to deploy with sufficient fire-power and determination to use force to deal with spoilers, a requirement that was not well received by developing countries that were suspicious of the motives behind this policy shift from traditional peacekeeping principles. The next section examines the theoretical reasons why traditional peacekeeping principles have been violated over the past decades as demonstrated in the case studies

## **7.5 Theoretical explanations for systematic violation of peacekeeping principles**

This section attempts to unmask some of the unethical power dynamics that lead to the systematic and deliberate violation of UN peacekeeping principles. The section focuses on possible theoretical explanations for the behaviour of certain powerful actors, especially the big powers towards the suffering populations in conflict riddled countries in Africa. It

highlights the fact that the humanity of countries in conflict, especially in Africa, is not as valuable when compared to those who are in militarily and economically advanced countries. This is amply demonstrated by the international responses to bombings in Paris where dozens of innocent civilians were killed compared to the same international response to hundreds of thousands of civilians massacred in cold blood in countries like Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria. The disparity in the urgency of responses demonstrates that as human beings, we do not share the same moral values in that some societies are considered to be more equal than others. In this regard, the chapter also aims to refute the commonly accepted belief that UN peacekeeping missions are predominantly launched to attain altruistic and cosmopolitan objectives that are universally in the interest of humanity, inclusive of host populations. In line with this argument, UN humanitarian interventions are said to be inspired by moral considerations in order to promote the well-being of humanity in fulfilment of a cosmopolitan or a global ethic that emphasises universal value systems and universal cosmopolitan responsibilities (Dower 2002). Based on how the international community responded to humanitarian crises in Africa following the end of Cold War, this section highlights that it is misleading to argue that humanitarian crises have been responded to with a clear determination to address the plight of affected civilians. On the contrary, sceptical realists' analysis and observations highlight the fact that material interests and big powers' national self-interests have largely determined the size and nature of international responses to crises in African countries hence the responses have predominantly remained highly selective (Binder 2009). This section further addresses the selectivity issues regarding UN peacekeeping responses to humanitarian crises.

#### 7.5.1 UN peacekeeping as a vehicle to spread neo-colonial and neo-liberal values

Political analysts have observed that UN peacekeeping shares with colonialism attributes and capabilities to reconstruct identities through reconfiguration of cultures, races, gender relations and class stratus in host countries to suit the intentions of the fast spreading neo-liberal world order. Peacekeeping missions have been noted as having their ultimate objective the encapsulation and reframing of the global political economy that entrenches neo-colonial power relations between the developed and developing countries, neo-liberal marketization of target countries and economic militarization of host countries to benefit the military industrial complexes in the leading weapons manufacturing countries (See Desire Industries: Sex Trafficking... Neo-Liberal World Order). To achieve these goals that favour the interests of the big powers, UN peacekeeping missions are manipulated in very subtle ways to advance the national self-interests primarily of the US and her Western allies. The use of UN missions falls

under the collective responsibility norm and custom where there is no moral pressure directed or exerted on specific individual actors hence the growing preference to ride on the benevolence of UN peacekeepers.

Susan Rice at the time she was US Ambassador to the United Nations was quoted as having declared that since America's resources and influence are finite, the country considers the United Nations as a strategic partner in safeguarding its national security and interests in that the world body accords the opportunity to share the financial costs and other logistical and military burdens of dealing with global security problems. In so doing global problems are not left to be tackled by America alone (Rice 2011). This simply implies that UN peacekeeping missions serve the self-interests of the US and its allies designed to configure affected target countries to suit the neo-colonial economic and political image imposed from foreign countries with little respect for traditional indigenous value systems.

Susan Rice's statement was a clear pronouncement that UN peacekeeping missions are indeed manipulated or taken advantage of, to promote US national and global interests across conflict riddled regions. Spreading of such lofty neo-colonial and neo-liberal values cannot effectively take place through the respect and adherence to UN peacekeeping principles. The four case studies of this thesis demonstrated that UN peacekeeping missions in Africa not only pose a threat to the autonomy of targeted developing countries on the continent but have been effectively used as proxy forces by powerful nations to undermine host state sovereignty in a bid to consciously and deliberately promote foreign geo-political and economic interests at the expense of the host country's population.

What is most disturbing is the fact that some Western powers have gone to the extent of initiating and sponsoring conflict in African countries with the ultimate intention of sponsoring military intervention in those target countries under the pretext of peacekeeping yet their ultimate objective would be guaranteeing that the host country is under their economic grip and effective geo-political sphere of influence. According to Elizabeth Schmidt (2013) many of the armed conflicts and political predicaments bedevilling the African continent are not entirely and solely an outcome of African mismanagement of their domestic political affairs. She argues that they are also a direct consequence of foreign interference, machinations and intrusion into the domestic affairs of African sovereign states and concludes that military interventions in Africa have aggravated the worsening of the conflicts so created and indeed harmed the civilian populations of African countries (*Ibid.*). The publicly acclaimed altruistic

intentions of peacekeeping interventions are indeed misleading. This is because peacekeeping interventions on the African continent are intricately linked to the issues of effective control of African countries and their natural resources as well as domination of the African political space by the big powers in order to entrench their spheres of influence. This explains why Tardy and Wyss (2010) noted that Africa has become the “epicentre of UN peacekeeping” as well as the “experimental laboratory” where peacekeeping norms are formulated, practiced and even violated when it suits the powerful nations.

#### 7.5.2 Double Anarchy and UN peacekeeping operations

During the Cold War, the two ideologically opposed camps were preoccupied with the maintenance of the balance of power in an international environment where any military manoeuvres that interfered with the domestic politics of any state were strictly interpreted as targeted at disrupting the existing delicate balance of power to the disadvantage and detriment of one of the super powers (Frost 2009). This sensitivity towards maintaining the delicate balance of power was significantly reduced at the end of the Cold War thus creating an opportunity for some powerful states to strongly consider military interventions in the domestic affairs of smaller and weaker states under the misleading guise of promoting and maintaining international peace and security as happened in Somalia, Iraq, DRC, Libya and Darfur.

The growing and recurrent practice of UN troops conducting offensive military operations in host countries continues to threaten host state sovereignty that has been a pillar of international politics since the Treaty of Westphalia (Ibid.). The increasing prevalence of UN sanctioned military operations in developing countries on the periphery has been explained by the existence of an operating international environment that is characterised by two anarchies namely: global civil society and the society of sovereign states (Ibid.:124). Given this scenario, big powers are abusing UN peacekeeping missions as a smoke screen to cover their true geopolitical objectives of power projection or to protect and extend their spheres of influence as was the case in Congo, Somalia, Rwanda and Darfur (Gibbs 2000:51). Such exploitation of UN missions by powerful states to further their national self-interests tend to compromise the legitimacy and ethical integrity of these operations (Ibid.).

The case study on Somalia clearly demonstrated that there was no genuine sympathy and consideration for the suffering Somali population. Working in a coalition of twenty countries, the US contributed 28 000 out of a total 37 000 troops thus demonstrating that the presence of nineteen other countries could not negatively impact on the non-altruistic objectives that the US aimed to achieve. In actual fact, the presence of the accompanying nineteen other countries

only served to legitimise the entire mission in the eyes of the international community. Equally, operating under the UN banner did not deter the US from pursuing its national self-interests in the war ravaged and famine stricken Somalia (*Ibid.*).

The case study on Rwanda further demonstrated that there was no genuine consideration of the civilian population that was being subjected to genocidal activities. All the US and its allies wanted was the displacement of French influence from the Great Lakes region in order to gain unfettered access to mineral rich eastern Congo. The case studies in this thesis have demonstrated that the developed countries that predominantly sponsor and advocate for intrusive UN peacekeeping missions in Africa, have little or no respect for the suffering African populations in conflict countries, a situation that is supported by the theory of group mentality. The Rwanda case study indeed demonstrated that at the time of withdrawing peacekeepers from that country, the big powers were busy reinforcing peacekeepers in Kosovo, a country that was facing less danger compared to Rwanda genocide.

### 7.5.3 Group Morality and the conduct of UN peacekeeping missions

The conduct of UN peacekeeping missions is influenced more by the prominence given to group morality as opposed to international morality. According to Mary Maxwell (1990:74) international morality entails order as governed by the laws and regulations together with welfare provisions depicted by acts of mercy, benevolence and generosity towards others in foreign lands. Group morality on the other hand concerns itself with the cohesion of the in-group to strengthen itself in order for it to attack or to defend itself against possible hostilities from outside the group (*Ibid.*:106). In this regard, group morality is synonymous with racism; xenophobia; nationalism and ethnocentrism: attributes that enhance beliefs in self supremacy over others as well as perceptions that help the group to identify itself from potential enemies or competitors for survival (*Ibid.*).

Group morality generally manifests itself through activities that are highly altruistic towards itself such as self-sacrifice, team spirit and loyalty to the ideals of the group-attributes that are indeed virtuous towards the group members. Important to note is the fact that group morality emphasises on the moral superiority of one's own group over non-members that are considered as barbarians, heathens or infidels thus downgrading the moral importance of other groups hence denying them their right to be treated with moral consideration. The same mentality is applicable to the conduct and behaviour of powerful nations that draft UN peacekeeping resolutions and sanction the deployment of peacekeepers to selected countries. Members of the Security Council codify and promulgate peacekeeping resolutions as if they are designed to

attain international justice yet they primarily serve their own self-interests at the expense of local populations. Moreover, the P-5 group mentality lacks any binding obligations towards moral accountability by individual members for the group's unethical activities.

In the light of the previous chapters in which this researcher discussed some of the problems related to peacekeeping operations in post-colonial Africa, it became clear that most of these peacekeeping operations did not successfully accomplish their missions. In fact these peacekeeping operations have ended up getting entangled in intractable controversies that sometimes defeated the publicly stated purpose of these missions. The peacekeeping operations in the DRC, Somalia, Rwanda and Darfur have been a spectacular failure in the sense that despite the efforts that were put in these peacekeeping missions by the United Nations, with the exception of Rwanda, most of these African countries have remained in a state of perennial civil war.

In the light of the examples given in the previous chapters, it is evidently clear that these peacekeeping missions were entangled in numerous problems which can easily lead the reader to question the commitment of those countries that were commissioned by the UN to participate in these peacekeeping operations. Equally questionable are the true intentions of the main sponsors of these missions. In this regard there are two ethical explanations that can shade light into the behaviour of these peacekeepers and their chief sponsors.

#### 7.5.3.1 Ethical theory on kin altruism among nations

The first ethical theory is based on the prevalence of kin altruism among nations. According to the ethicist Peter Singer, kin altruism is the tendency inherent in our human nature to help those whom we deem to be close to us than those who are distant from us (Singer 1981:14). One way of promoting group altruism lies in pursuing the group's national interests to the exclusion of the interests of any other nationalities that are deemed as not belonging to the same group or nation. Singer further states that, "group altruism would work best when coupled with a degree of hostility to outsiders, which would protect the altruism within the group from penetration and subversion from outside. Hostility to outsiders is in fact, a very common phenomenon to social animals" (Singer 1981: 20). This has been manifested through historical periods of slavery, colonialism, and currently in the global fight against terrorism. Kin altruism implies that by nature human beings do not have a sense of concern to those who do not share the same nationality with them.

If we are to apply the theory of kin altruism to the practice of peacekeeping missions in Africa as demonstrated in the previous chapters, we can conclude that the lives of those who were suffering as a result of civil war and political persecution did not matter so much when compared to the lives of peacekeepers as well as the lives of powerful nations sanctioning the deployments. When American lives were lost in Somalia during the UN mandated intervention, the Americans unceremoniously withdrew from Somalia whilst the civil war was raging on among the Somalis. Another vivid example which demonstrates the predominance of promoting group altruism in peacekeeping operations was that of Rwanda whereby approximately one million innocent lives were lost as a result of an ethnic cleansing genocide whilst the UNSC was doing nothing. This example convincingly demonstrated that the lives of Rwandese did not matter much as compared to the lives of the Westerners who were hurriedly evacuated out of Rwanda by French troops at the start of the genocide. There is no doubt that if a genocide was detected that it was about to take place in one of the economically developed countries in Europe, the reaction from the UNSC would have been swift and effective in preventing it from occurring. In this regard, sympathy is not a universal feeling that is shared equally among all of humanity, rather we are more inclined to feel more sympathetic to those who are close to us in terms of culture, skin, colour and language.

From anthropological studies, kin altruism is found in ethnicity whereby the humanness of other people is judged or appreciated on the basis of their ethnic affinity to our own humanity. Munyaradzi Murove (2016) observed that the theory of kin altruism is closely related to the anthropological theory of ethnicity which states that, “ethnic groups develop ties of loyalty among themselves and hostility to those who are considered to be outside the group. This obviously implies that that which is moral will always remain relative to the group”. Murove went on to say that, “In our contemporary times this type of reasoning has gained a great deal of popularity in theories of international relations – especially the theory of sceptical realism which argues that governments are not morally accountable to the citizens of other nations because they don’t share common moral values with those citizens” (Murove 2016:206). This mode of thinking and argument partly explains the attitude of indifference which has been displayed by UN peacekeepers in selected African countries as we have seen in the previous chapters. It is an attitude that dehumanises those who are seen as not belonging to the nationality or ethnic group of the peacekeepers from outside the continent.

### 7.5.3.2 The pursuit of national self-interests

The second ethical issue that serves as a plausible explanation to the behaviour of foreign forces in peacekeeping missions is related to the pursuit of national interests in UN peacekeeping missions. Thomas Hobbes came up with the theory that the reason why international relations are anarchic lies in the fact that within the international sphere, human beings do not share common values and that there is no common power to determine what is right and wrong, hence the relations of states are solely based on the pursuit of national interests (Hobbes 1962). Hobbes' theory of the absence of morality in international relations was adopted by Hans Morgenthau who characterised international relations as based on political realism which is mainly based on the presumption that we should accept human nature as it is.

The tenets of Morgenthau's theory of political realism are as follows: Politics, whether domestic or foreign, is essentially a struggle for political power, which means the domination of human beings by [other] human beings. ...The primary criterion for a country's foreign policy as long as that country exists must be the pursuit of enhancing national interests; where peace is the main goal of a state, it puts itself in the hands of the most reckless member of the community of states. In the struggle for power a competition or alignment of interests is possible. Where interests coincide, collaboration between the nations is possible; where interests collide, rivalries and conflicts between them are unavoidable (Cited in Kung 1998: 39). Since the international political scene is dominated by the pursuit of national interests, it follows that the issue of domination plays an indispensable role in the realisation of a particular country's national interests.

Equally, the pursuit for power within the international arena is the reason for collaboration among states who otherwise would be enemies. The quest for power or domination remains central to international relations. As we have seen previously, the quest for national interests has influenced decisions to participate in peacekeeping missions. When the powerful members of the UNSC realise that a country plagued by conflicts does not have anything they can gain from, they usually do not participate in such peacekeeping missions. In other cases they do not even sanction the deployment of UN peacekeeping missions. The idea of undertaking peacekeeping missions on the basis of promoting national interests can also imply that if a possible participant in peacekeeping mission's national interest are not at stake, it means that the would-be participant nation can easily withdraw from supporting such a peacekeeping mission. In the light of such reasoning, if continuous civil war is to the interest of powerful countries it means that those powerful countries will not support the end of such a civil war. It

is mainly for this reason that we can say that the pursuit of national interests in peacekeeping operations does militate against peace and security in strife torn parts of the world.

A publicly stated concern for the suffering of others which is expressed in the form of UN peacekeeping missions is in itself a disguised pursuit of national interests and not necessarily a manifestation of sympathy as demonstrated in the case studies. David Hume is more nuanced in this trend of thought. Thus he writes that:

There is a principle, supposed to prevail among many, which is utterly incompatible with all virtue or moral sentiment; and as it can proceed from nothing but the most depraved disposition, so in its turn it tends still further to encourage that depravity. This principle states that all benevolence is mere hypocrisy, friendship a cheat, public spirit a farce, fidelity a snare to procure trust and confidence; and that, while all of us, at bottom, pursue only our private interests, we wear these fair disguises in order to put others off their guard and expose them the more to our wiles and machinations (Cited in Rogers 1997: 141-142).

Following this line of thinking, it is the prevalence of self-interests in human nature that makes peacekeeping missions some form of organised hypocrisy as it was stated in chapter five. It is the dominance that is given to self-interest at a micro-level (individual social outlook) and macro-level (international relations) that sometimes serves as a rationale behind the continuous failure in most of the UN peacekeeping missions in African countries that have been given as case studies in this thesis. If morality or a feeling of benevolence does not exist among individuals within society, what more of in the realm of international relations? Ethicists such as Peter Singer argue for the principle of equal consideration in our relationship with others or in our general life outlook.

As Singer puts it, “The essence of the principle of equal consideration of interests is that we give equal weight in our moral deliberations to the like interests of all those affected by our actions”. In this type of reasoning, the implication is that we should treat others in similar manner which we ourselves so desire to be treated. Singer went on to state that, “The principle of equal consideration of interests therefore may be a defensible form of the principle that all humans are equal, a form that we can use in discussing more controversial issues about equality” (Singer Op.Cit.: 21-23). In this regard, the principle of equal consideration implies that we should see all human beings as equal to our own humanity regardless of race, colour, sex and economic status.

In light of the arguments presented above, it is high time African leaders seriously came to terms with the fact that human beings behave differently when dealing with members of their own group compared to non-members of their group. According to Mary Maxwell (1990:118), people from within the same group tend to be altruistic, cooperative and willing to make sacrifices for others within the same group. Their behaviour towards non-members of the group is characterized by mistrust, fear and lack of sympathy and compassion for persons of an alien culture. This observation explains the organised hypocritical approach to UN peacekeeping missions in Africa that are portrayed as altruistic undertakings designed to come to the rescue of suffering populations by benevolent outsiders. This interpretation hides the true agenda of the main sponsors of UN peacekeeping that serves their interests. It follows therefore that in pursuit of their self-interests, peacekeepers are expected to effectively deal with potential spoilers bent on derailing the achievement of the ultimate objective of ensuring that a regime favourable to the big sponsors of peacekeeping is left in power in order to guarantee continued political and economic ties after the departure of the peacekeepers.

It is this researcher's view that African leaders should always be suspicious of the true intentions of powerful countries that have traditionally acted on strategic issues that enhance their strategic self-interests more than acting on moral principles and considerations when dealing with alien groups in their conduct of international relations. Whereas African countries seek self-determination, this endeavour is seriously and continuously thwarted by big powers as is the case with the Democratic Republic of Congo where the US and her allies continue to seek perpetual entrenchment of their hegemony in order to guarantee their unfettered access to Congo's abundant natural resources at the expense of the Congolese population. A politically and militarily strong and stable DRC is not in the interests of the Western powers hence the continued meddling in her internal politics through the continued and unwelcome presence of UN peacekeepers. Such behaviour highlights the role of group morality in the games that nations play at the international level. From the discussions in previous chapters, it has been observed and demonstrated that although UN missions serve the self-interests of big powers, they have been "clothed in the international moral garment of ethical righteousness" hence the general perception that UN peacekeeping missions are morally designed to serve the interests of the suffering host populations.

## **7.6 The need for African leaders to be suspicious of UN peacekeeping missions**

It has further been observed that as part of group morality, people from the same group very easily come to the belief and conclusion that certain value systems and other political or

economic arrangements agreeable to their society are equally beneficial to others. This explains why Western powers are persistently engaged in the spread of democratic values, capitalist market economic principles and neo-liberal value systems that they believe are universally acceptable and applicable to all societies across the globe based on their belief that what is good for them should be equally good for other societies. In order to minimize their direct involvement in spreading these value systems, they have been perfecting their skills of using UN missions do the donkey work on their behalf without risking their own kith and kin in dangerous missions in Africa. It follows therefore that organised hypocrisy associated and practiced by big powers manifests itself in exaggerated righteousness of UN peacekeeping towards African populations. African leaders must therefore always keep in mind that human groups always practice double standards of morality when dealing with their domestic constituencies when compared with foreign/international populations. Moreover the countries that make the highest financial contributions to UN peacekeeping expenses would naturally and undoubtedly wish to ensure that their contributions result in the promotion of their own national interests.

In a study carried out by Stojek and Tir (2015), they established that a budget of US\$7.9 billion was required to finance 16 UN missions across the globe. They further noted that out of this amount, the top five contributing countries paid 63 percent of the entire peacekeeping budget while the 11 top contributors paid up to 82 percent of the budget. The fact that very few countries pay enormous amounts of money towards meeting operational costs of UN peacekeeping missions implies therefore that their national interests come before the interests of local populations that UN peacekeepers are expected to protect. This observation led Mingst (2003) to conclude that given this scenario, national self-interests of the highest paying countries must be viewed as primary motivations for the choice and determination of regions and countries where UN peacekeepers are deployed. It is not the magnitude of suffering populations that is the primary motivation for deploying UN peacekeepers as happened in Rwanda during the genocide. It follows therefore that group mentality of powerful countries that have the resources and capacity to finance UN peacekeeping missions collectively influence where peacekeepers are deployed in a clear demonstration of selectivity that is driven by group mentality and self-interests. The case in this thesis revealed that economic interests were of paramount importance in each of the deployments covered in this study despite public rhetoric that the missions were deployed for either humanitarian reasons or to uphold

international security. The critical linkage between economic issues and world politics has been highlighted by many theorists such as Cox (1987) and Gill and Law (1993).

Considering that UN peacekeeping deployments are a very expensive undertaking, the rich and powerful nations that top the contribution list for peacekeeping expenses, would naturally expect a significant return on their investment once the conflict ends. In most cases they do not have to wait until the end of the conflict simply because the continuation of some of the conflicts provides lucrative business opportunities for these developed countries hence it is in their self-interests that the conflicts are perpetuated. At the end of the conflict, it is in their interest to ensure that a government system that is amenable to their economic and political self-interests and value systems is left in power with state institutions that would guarantee continued political and economic relations with the sponsoring powers (Stojek and Tir 2015:354). It follows therefore that countries with a geo-strategic importance and those with greater geo-economic potential for post conflict business opportunities will receive a significantly higher probability for the deployment of UN peacekeepers and not the countries where human suffering is the highest and thus requiring the most urgent international attention. Since altruistic considerations are not the primary motivators for UN peacekeeping deployments, respecting peacekeeping principles during operations is therefore not a priority especially if doing so retards the rate of progress towards the attainment of desired goals by the main sponsors.

Carr (2010:39) observed that since the end of World War I in 1918, the English speaking developed countries have formed and constituted the most dominant group in world affairs to the extent that they have crafted theories of international morality designed to perpetuate their supremacy, “policies that are expressed in the idiom peculiar to their self-interests.” A very close scrutiny reveals that indeed the English speaking countries namely Australia, Canada, the UK and the USA have been the leading countries in spearheading the formulation and designing of peacekeeping new and highly intrusive doctrines of UN peacekeeping. The doctrines sound appealing on paper yet when it comes to implementation, they are manipulated to serve the self-interests of the very big powers that sponsor and sanction the deployment of UN missions in the false name of serving humanity. Carr (2010) further notes that the fact that France has played a rather limited role in the formulation of current international morality doctrines, this has led some observers and analysts of international relations to conclude that the English speaking people are monopolists of international morality and that they are consummate international hypocrites. The crafters of UN peacekeeping doctrine have

portrayed it as a doctrine of harmony designed to serve international interests, hiding the fact that the doctrine is primarily designed to advance the interests of the big powers.

A case in point is the formulation of the doctrine of R2P that was spearheaded by Canada and Australia which has been coined a doctrine of the harmony of interests and of international solidarity. This doctrine should be seen in its proper perspective as a mockery to the suffering African masses that continue to wallow in abject poverty yet their natural resources continue to be exploited and in some cases looted by the very dominant big powers whose international policies are designed to entrench their privileged positions. All this is done at the expense of the under-privileged populations whose inferior industrial base and old-fashioned technological know-how cannot effectively compete with the developed world advocating for the adoption of such policies. This is a clear reflection of group morality and double standards practiced by the developing countries towards African populations that are considered inferior to the white race. Based on these arguments, internationalism as advocated by cosmopolitanism, is a doctrine and concept that was derived from the doctrine of harmony of states and it is extremely difficult to decouple these concepts from the self-interests of those who advocate and promulgate them (Carr 2010:41).

It should therefore not come as a big surprise that the principles of UN peacekeeping and that of state sovereignty are continuously violated with impunity by UN missions because such violations are in tandem with the advancement of sponsors' self-interests. Moreover, the remaining dominant super power (US) has mastered the strategies of using UN peacekeeping missions in a deliberate attempt to perpetuate the current status quo where her global influence prevails over mostly countries on the periphery where most peacekeeping missions are deployed. In this regard, doctrines such as humanitarianism and cosmopolitanism embraced by the UN Secretariat serve to further US hegemony across the entire globe. The ultimate objective of using UN missions to spread Western value systems is the attainment of "world union of democracies, in which the US plays a dominant role" (Streit 1998).

Rubinstein (2010) observed that UN peacekeepers' prioritization of big powers' concerns and interests ahead of those of host populations and governments is a practice reminiscent of earlier imperial policing strategies and tactics. Added to this observation is the growing practice of unequal sharing of the risk burden in UN missions that are deployed in hostile and semi-permissive theatres of operations. Cunliffe (2009) noted that the most risky missions are lopsided in favour of countries with the least ability to bear the burden, namely the poor and

weak states on the periphery. He further observed that the powerful countries that make the decisions on deployment in dangerous theatres are not the ones who carry out hazardous tasks reflecting a global governance structure that appears on the surface as organizational dysfunction yet in reality, it serves a deliberate strategic function of perpetuating US influence and that of her allies over the affairs of weak and poor countries on the periphery without being exposed to the dangers and risks of policing unruly regions and countries.

Consequently, because UN peacekeeping missions are designed to promote the self-interests of the US and her allies, Richmond (2004) concluded that the nature of peace arising from UN missions in conflict countries is “virtual peace” based on contested attempts at imposing imported neo-liberal democratic models of governance as opposed to the preferred or practiced systems on the ground as happened in Somalia where the clan system of governance was demonized by peacekeepers. Important to note is that the “virtual peace” imposed by foreign sponsored UN peacekeepers results in negative peace that is premised on externally formulated forms of governance that are alien to the local population.

### **7.7 An Afrocentric ethical critique of the UN peacekeeping operations**

The spreading of neo-liberal Western doctrines of “democratisation, globalisation and human rights” through various strategies including UN peacekeeping operations in Africa deserves a serious critique through African philosophical lenses in order to come up with strategies to ameliorate the impact of these externally imposed value systems. According to Okoye (1972) colonisation meant loss of sovereignty by colonised Africans. In the same vein neo-colonialism being perpetrated by UN peacekeepers is further entrenching the control of political and economic systems in African countries to the detriment of self-determination and national sovereignty of affected countries.

This section seeks to establish Afrocentric views about UN peacekeeping missions’ conflict resolution approaches in Africa. In African ethics, the moral imperative is to strive to achieve the right relationships between the “individuals, the community, and the environment” and this implies that it is “self-evidently right” (Hammond-Tooke 1998:8). According to African moral philosophy, community constitutes the basis for morality considering that it provides guarantees and safeguards for the well-being of both the individual members and the community (Rasheed and Olowu 1993). The African ethical concept of *Ubuntu* places emphasis on listening to all views inclusive of dissenting voices, seeking consensus derived from respect for all and the creation of a harmonious, stable and equilibrium state (Nicolson

2008:10) that prioritises the well-being of all the citizens. In this regard, traditional African practice places emphasis on collective management of family, tribal or clan issues where formal and informal rules are formulated and developed to further the primacy of collective interests (Tshikwatamba 2003:10). Post-peacekeeping environments as witnessed in Congo during the 1960s and in Somalia during the early 1990s were not conducive for the promotion and guaranteeing of “the well-being” of both the individual and the community as evidenced by the negative peace that prevailed after the departure of the peacekeepers (Lyons and Mastanduno 1995). UN peacekeeping approaches to settling disputes among belligerents in African conflict situations are significantly different from the African traditional political approach of seeking consensus on the solutions to the dispute that would be binding to all parties concerned. African traditional conflict resolution approaches put emphasis on securing a buy-in from all affected parties before adopting a binding resolution. This traditional African approach to conflict settlement was observed by Gyekye (1987:8) who said that African philosophical frameworks sought to establish consensus towards addressing political challenges, thus consensus was sought and arrived at in situations where there was opposition. This approach is unlike the foreign imposed solutions brought about by the western sponsored peacekeeping missions in Africa.

Ramose (1999:98) highlighted the major differences in dispute settlement between African and modern European approaches. He observed that African traditional parliamentary systems prioritised free and serious deliberations and consultations aimed at making laws and establishing communal solutions to the problems that triggered the disputes. Ramose (1999:94) went on to say that since colonisation up to this day, the Europeans and their US allies continue to impose upon the indigenous African population their alien views and value systems that are radically opposed to the African value systems. In the same vain, Murove (2016) observed that Africans were required to learn and embrace Western values as enshrined in Western culture, language and religion... at the same time the Africans were expected to deny and denigrate their own African values that were “the source of their identity of Umuntu.” These arguments do not totally discourage the adoption of certain positive value systems from other traditions of the world. Cultural traditions are dynamic and are bound to be influenced by other cultures as is happening within the contemporary global village.

Globalisation that has been brought about through westernisation has been embraced by most African elites to the detriment of the preservation and promotion of African value systems. In this regard, Wiredu (1980:21) lamented that “It would profit us little to gain all the technology

in the world and lose the humanist essence in our culture.” What this implies is that Africans should, where possible, only adopt positive attributes of ethical traditions from other cultures and preserve that which is positive from our traditional practices (Mazrui 2009). African traditional conflict resolution practices that seek accommodation of all belligerents in order to secure lasting community peace deserve serious attention and prioritization

Coicaud (2001) observed that UN peacekeepers accord the belligerents little room to deliberate and workout home-grown solutions to their problems as solutions prescribed and imposed from outside the continent are given preferential priority as happened in Congo, Somalia and Rwanda. The alien solutions imposed serve to promote neo-liberalism through the reconstruction and reconfiguration of African cultures to suit Western value systems. Elizabeth Schmidt (2013) observed that some conflicts on the African continent are indeed foreign instigated and sponsored, to create an opportunity for some foreign powers to apply the “divide and rule” strategy as well as creating an opportunity for them to meddle in the domestic affairs of affected countries in a bid to advance their own self-interests. This calls for an urgent need for an in-depth, self-introspection process of thought and action that is geared towards the creation of a new domestic African paradigm that is culturally relevant, morally justifiable, economically vibrant and politically geared towards attainment of real genuine liberation African liberation. (Towards a Second Liberation Africa and the World Crisis 1987:18)

## **7.8 Conclusion**

This chapter has shown that there are three main principles that govern the conduct of peacekeeping operations that have stood the test of time despite the evolution of peacekeeping that has witnessed reinterpretation of these principles and definitions emanating from the changing geo-political operating environment resulting from the end of the Cold War. Tension and conflict of interests continue to exist between Westphalian and post-Westphalian views of peacekeeping operations within the UN, especially concerning the scope of multilateral authority vis-à-vis sovereign authority, and the legitimacy of peace operations. This chapter has reiterated several cases where state sovereignty has been violated by peacekeeping operations, a development that undermines the integrity and credibility of UN peacekeeping missions.

Failure by UN peacekeepers to adhere to the three “holy trinity” principles of peacekeeping has resulted in unwarranted additional expenses to everyone involved in the mission in terms of the duration of the mission, resources required, spilt blood and lack of faith in the power of the international community (Brown 1994:602). Once admitted into the host country through

host state consent and Security Council authorization, peacekeepers should remain impartial in their dealing with parties to the conflict since any deviation from this position, real or perceived, would result in the withdrawal of consent by some of the actors leading to conflict that might trigger the use of force by the peacekeepers. Any use of force other than in self-defence risks escalating the tensions in the theatre of operations ultimately resulting in loss of lives among civilians, combatants and even peacekeepers themselves with an inevitable outcome of mission failure.

Robust peacekeeping has been likened to a kind of social engineering, where attempts are made to alter political, social and economic structures of targeted countries along Western preferences through the use of peacekeeping missions. This is a deliberate attempt at entrenching Western influence across the entire globe, a strategy influenced by group morality. In this regard, peacekeeping operations are now being used as a form of riot control by the big powers directed against unruly parts of the developing world and the global south in order to advance and uphold liberal peace. Such attempts at construction of a neo-liberal democratic peace across the third world using peacekeeping as a proxy, endangers the lives of peacekeepers and the credibility of the UN as an organization that champions peaceful co-existence of member states and peaceful resolution of conflicts. Imposed neo-liberal solutions on affected third world countries undermines the sovereignty of host countries as well as denying them the opportunity to determine their preferred development path towards economic, political and social self-determination as enshrined in the UN Charter.

## **CHAPTER EIGHT**

### **Ethical and Policy Recommendations**

#### **8.1 Prelude to ethical recommendations**

This research has established that in all the four case studies covered in this thesis, host state sovereignty was violated with impunity to the detriment of the local population. In that regard, the deployment of UN peacekeepers on the African continent should not be celebrated as a panacea for solving African problems. The responsibility for solving African problems remains with African states that have the mandate and obligation to protect their own citizens without necessarily being over dependent on foreign interventions to come to the rescue of African populations in times of conflict.

The case studies covering Congo (1960–1965) and Rwanda in 1994 demonstrate that the extent of UN peacekeepers' violation of state sovereignty went as far as the peacekeepers facilitating the overthrowing of host governments by opposition movements that were amenable to the dictates of Western powers sponsoring the missions. In the case of Somalia (1992-93), peacekeepers actively engaged in military offensive operations to kill or capture the most powerful warlord General Farah Aideed in an attempt to change the political status quo and impose a preferred warlord Ali Mohammad Mahdi in a regime change style of operation reminiscent with other case studies covered in this thesis. The attempted imposition of Western preferred Somali leaders was being done to the detriment of the Somali population that was left worse off at the time the peacekeepers departed in 1993. Many innocent civilians were killed in the crossfire when American Special Forces were attempting to capture or kill General Farah Aideed. In Darfur, the magnitude of peacekeepers' interference in the internal affairs of the Sudanese government was only limited through the demands by the Sudanese government for a UN/AU hybrid peacekeeping mission that was dominated by African troops and excluding military personnel from countries considered to be unfriendly or hostile to the Sudanese government.

The Sudanese authorities had learnt the lessons from the Congo crisis of the early 1960s and some of the outcomes of recent UN peacekeeping missions in Somalia and Rwanda. They learnt that the ultimate aim of these peacekeeping missions was not the resolution of the underlying root causes to the conflicts but to topple the host governments as happened in Congo and Rwanda.

Despite having a predominantly African peacekeeping mission in Darfur, the Western powers have successfully managed to have the sitting President of Sudan, Al Bashir indicted for prosecution at The Hague for crimes against humanity allegedly perpetrated against the Sudanese population in Darfur region. This portrays a misleading picture that Western powers are more concerned about the well-being of African populations than their governments yet the majority of conflicts that bring misery and suffering to the African masses would have been engineered and sponsored by the same foreign powers.

An ethical assessment of the conduct by UN peacekeepers in all the case studies reveals a deliberate pattern where Western powers under the leadership of the US, continue to engage in organised hypocrisy and playing double standards when deploying UN peacekeepers in Africa. What the big powers preach about the role and objectives of peacekeepers towards protecting civilian populations in conflict countries does not tally with the practice and outcomes of UN peacekeeping missions in target countries. In cases like the current deployment in the DRC, peacekeepers have been molesting local civilians through rape cases, drug and human trafficking and introduction of foreign cultural practices such as pornography that not only violate host state sovereignty but also undermine the basic human rights of affected civilian populations.

This thesis has demonstrated that UN peacekeepers' active participation in the assassination of Patrice Lumumba in January 1961; the deliberate attempt at targeting General Mohammed Farah Aideed for assassination or capture in 1992 and alleged aiding of assassins for the Rwandan and Burundian Presidents at Kigali airport that was under the effective protection of UN peacekeepers, all point towards a deliberate and consistent pattern/trend where UN peacekeepers are used as proxy forces to facilitate regime change in host countries especially in cases where the host government would have fallen out of favour with some powerful western countries. In the DRC President Laurent Kabil was assassinated whilst UN peacekeepers were deployed in the capital and in Sudan the sitting President and Head of State was indicted for prosecution with the concurrence of UN peacekeepers in the country. All these facts and examples of violation of host state sovereignty demonstrate that UN peacekeeping is a hypocritical political process with well-designed and carefully orchestrated conceptual underpinnings and underlying objectives to be attained in target countries as demonstrated in the case studies. Despite all this evidence of UN peacekeepers meddling in the internal politics of host African countries, regrettably African leaders still continue to have trust and confidence

in the ability of UN peacekeeping missions to bring about durable peace and security to the suffering African populations in conflict situations on the continent.

The resource gap between the demand for competent African troops and operational resources to assist fellow African countries in trouble and the practical inability to mobilise the required resources has regrettably always been cited as the justification for Africa's continued reliance on foreign troop assistance towards resolving African security challenges. This is indeed an unfortunate situation in that focus is diverted from empowering or assisting the affected government with the responsibility to protect its own citizens in order for it to find amicable, all inclusive political solutions to the local crises without the invitation of foreign troops. Some members of the Security Council prefer a system where UN peacekeepers deploy and meddle in the internal affairs of African countries to the extent of participating in the assassination of African leaders in the name of protecting African populations from their own leaders. The billions of dollars spent on financing expensive peacekeeping operations in Africa could produce better poverty alleviation results through development projects that would ultimately improve the well-being of affected populations. This option is not preferred because sponsoring UN peacekeeping missions in itself is big and lucrative business for developed countries.

The primary concern of this study was to establish the extent to which the African sovereign state with its internationally recognised responsibility to protect its own citizens can offer effective peace and security to its citizens without resorting to inviting foreign peacekeepers to resolve local conflicts. The study established that most of the conflicts in Africa are fuelled by foreign powers who take advantage of the ethno-tribal differences with an ultimate objective of influencing the outcome of the conflicts in their favour and not in the interest of the host population. Having been deprived of their unfettered influence over African countries through decolonization the Western powers under the leadership of the US, have crafted strategies to effectively use UN peacekeepers to re-instate western powers' political, economic and cultural influence over African countries. This is achieved through peacekeeping and peace-building operations that ensure that target countries are left under the effective control of Western political and economic influence that has little respect or concern about the impact of such foreign manipulation over the local population and host state sovereignty. UN peacekeeping missions are deployed with high sounding altruistic morally appealing objectives yet once on the ground, peacekeepers engage in immoral and unethical activities that do not only

undermine host state sovereignty but also undermine national aspirations for self-determination in sharp contrast with publicly claimed objectives of the mission.

This study has further demonstrated that some UN peacekeeping missions undermine host state sovereignty primarily to secure and guarantee Western powers' unlimited access to raw materials to keep their industries running at the same time denying the same access and influence to their competitors but not in the case of Rwanda. In light of the above, this study has further demonstrated that UN peacekeeping operations whose major financial contribution comes from the developed countries in the west, serve to promote western powers' self-interests in line with the realist school of international relations where moral and ethical considerations have no significant role to play in the conduct of international relations.

The study revealed that the deployment of UN peacekeepers in Congo during the early 1960s was primarily meant to achieve two objectives. First UN peacekeepers were to facilitate the introduction and establishment of US hegemonic geo-strategic influence in that country and region following the departure of western colonial powers through decolonization. Second, the presence of UN peacekeepers was meant to effectively deny the Soviet Union any foot hold in that country following the departure of the Belgians at independence. Both objectives had nothing to do with addressing the root causes of the conflict neither were they meant to enhance the well-being of the Congolese population. This goes to demonstrate that it is misleading to expect or entrust UN peacekeepers to effectively come to the rescue of the local population in conflict situations on the African continent.

In the case of Somalia the world was led to believe that UN "humanitarian" military intervention was motivated primarily by altruistic and moral concerns about the starving Somali population. This study has demonstrated that UN peacekeeping military intervention was launched when the effects of the drought and famine were already subsiding hence altruistic considerations were not the primary driving motivation. The hidden motive for intervention was for the US and its western allies to have effective control of Somalia whose coastline covers one of the most strategic choke points on the vital commercial sea routes that pass through the Gulf of Eden and the Suez Canal. Moreover the US was aware of the vast untapped oil reserves in Somalia that it wanted to make sure that these resources remained under its effective control whilst denying the same access to the Chinese and Russian competitors.

Instead of coming to the rescue of the Somali population, UN peacekeepers under the leadership of the US ended up killing hundreds of Somali civilians and exacerbating the war situation through the war economy that served to prolong the conflict and not to address the root causes of the conflict. It follows therefore that the military “humanitarian” intervention did not significantly alleviate the suffering of the Somali population, in actual fact it left the population and country worse off than the peacekeepers found on arrival. The same can be said for the Rwandan peacekeeping mission that set the stage for the slaughter of over 800 000 innocent civilians through withdrawal of the bulk of peacekeepers to facilitate an effective takeover of the reins of political and military power by the RPF that was supported by the Anglo-American alliance.

The Rwandan case study demonstrated that UN peacekeepers were deployed to facilitate the transfer of power from the Hutu majority government to the Tutsi minority rebel movement. The rebel movement enjoyed political, diplomatic and military support primarily from the Anglo-American alliance that wanted to dislodge French influence from the central African region. The ultimate objective for the peacekeeping mission in Rwanda was to have a strong Anglo-American foot-print established in central Africa in order to guarantee these foreign powers unlimited access to the vast natural and mineral resources in eastern DRC through Uganda and Rwanda. The deployment of a very weak and ineffective UN peacekeeping mission in Rwanda was designed not to interfere with the RPF military offensive operations to topple a legitimate government of Rwanda that was French speaking and sponsored by the French government. Based on these findings, it follows therefore that the UN peacekeeping mission in Rwanda did not prioritise the protection of vulnerable Rwandan civilian population but rather to introduce and entrench Anglo-American geo-strategic influence in the region designed to guarantee the US and its allies unlimited access to the riches of eastern DRC.

This is demonstrated by the current and ongoing looting of strategic minerals and other natural resources from that region through illegal operations orchestrated from Rwanda and Uganda, both close allies of the British and the Americans. In actual fact, instead of protecting the civilian population in Rwanda, UN peacekeepers sacrificed over 800 000 civilian lives to ensure that the rise to power of the RPF was undisturbed by the presence of a powerful UN mission in the country. This is further evidence that demonstrates that the protection of civilian population in Rwanda was never a genuine priority for the peacekeepers, it was used as a smoke screen to mask the true objective of the mission which was regime change. As a result of this

revelation, the UN mission in Rwanda has been thoroughly discredited and rebuked for its failure to protect endangered civilians facing imminent danger of mass atrocities and genocide.

The study further demonstrated that Western advocacy for a UN humanitarian military intervention in Darfur–Sudan was primarily meant to facilitate the secession of Darfur Province that is rich in untapped vast oil and gas reserves. Considering that China is the main beneficiary from the oil reserves in South Sudan, Western powers aimed at using UN peacekeepers to entrench the Darfur region under their influence and deny the Chinese and Russians the major partners of the Sudanese Government, access to the vast natural resources in Darfur. It follows therefore that the motive for launching a UN humanitarian mission in Darfur had very little to do with coming to the rescue of the Sudanese population facing crimes against humanity but rather to advance the self-interests of the western powers that have perfected the diplomatic and political skills of using UN peacekeepers as proxy forces to serve their self-interests whilst they violate host state sovereignty and undermine the well-being of the host population. The thesis highlighted the fact that rebel groups fighting the Sudanese Government in Darfur are being sponsored by some western powers thus prolonging the conflict yet the official narrative is that the Sudanese Government is not keen to engage the rebels in meaningful dialogue to address the root causes of the conflict. The Darfur case study adds credence to the argument that African countries with the responsibility to protect their own populations should do everything in their powers to resolve their internal political squabbles and desist from inviting foreign troops under the UN banner to come and help resolve their internal problems.

All the four case studies in this thesis have demonstrated that UN peacekeeping missions cannot be trusted to effectively come to the rescue of African civilian populations in conflict riddled countries. This study has further demonstrated that there is abundant and overwhelming evidence as well as growing suspicion that UN peacekeepers are being used as proxy forces to fight subtle geo-strategic and geo-political wars on behalf of some Western powers under the leadership of the US. Such activities and practices are immoral and unethical in that in trying to achieve the self-interests of the Western powers, UN peacekeepers contribute towards aggravating the conflict situation and prolonging some of the conflicts through war economies brought about by the presence of UN peacekeepers. This situation is aggravated by western sponsorship of some parties to the conflicts, thus extending the suffering of affected civilian populations yet the blame for their suffering is placed on the shoulders of the host government.

All these observations regarding UN peacekeepers' violation of host state sovereignty and undermining the well-being of host populations point towards the fact that African sovereign states with the mandate and responsibility to protect their own citizens are best placed to protect their own citizens provided African leaders prioritize the well-being and security of all their citizens irrespective of ethnicity; religion; political orientation and demographic considerations. African leaders should seriously carryout some deep self-introspections and answer the question if they truly believe that foreign powers can invest billions of dollars in UN peacekeeping and indeed come to the assistance of African populations in conflict if there is nothing for them to benefit from the peacekeeping interventions. With all the evidence about the true nature of UN peacekeeping missions as demonstrated in this study it is difficult to establish why our African leaders continue to place confidence in the capacity of UN missions to solve African problems in favour of indigenous populations. This study also revealed the need for African leaders to revisit the traditional ways of resolving local conflicts as these methods have stood the test of time.

Where internal frictions start simmering, African leaders must be empowered and assisted primarily by fellow Africans to fulfil their mandate and responsibility to protect own civilian populations rather than waiting and entrusting that responsibility to foreign UN peacekeepers whose primary mission is to entrench the geo-strategic self-interests of foreign powers and not necessarily the protection of African civilian populations in conflict situations as demonstrated in the case studies above. Having demonstrated the extent to which UN peacekeeping missions have embroiled themselves in facilitating regime change in host countries in violation of national sovereignty and their organised hypocrisy of pretending to be genuinely concerned about the plight of host civilian populations, this thesis has five major ethical and practical recommendations to make based on the outcome of this study.

## **8.2 Ethical and Policy Recommendations**

The first recommendation is that African countries should desist from investing their trust and confidence in UN peacekeeping operations on the continent simply because these missions are not meant to promote African value systems and Pan Africanism. In light of this recommendation African leaders must desist from politics of alienation and segregation along tribal, ethnic and religious lines since foreign powers bent on retaining unfettered influence over access to Africa's natural resources take advantage of these political and developmental

fault lines to fuel conflicts in resource rich African countries. Ironically, the same foreign sponsors of conflict in Africa are invited together with other foreign troops to come and “broker solutions” to the very conflicts they would have masterminded and engineered taking advantage of the political, economic, developmental and ethnic fault lines in the relations of local African populations. In light of these observations, where affected African governments fail to find local solutions to their local problems, they must seek solutions from regional African countries that have vested interests in the long term peace and stability of the entire region as they are the ones mostly affected by the spill over effects of conflicts in neighbouring countries.

Undoubtedly some regional powers could be harbouring hegemonic ambitions over their neighbours. These would be neutralized by the influence of less ambitious neighbours who have the collective security interests of the entire region as demonstrated by SADC intervention in the Mozambique and Lesotho crises. Whatever the state of the regional economic resources, African leaders must mobilise adequate logistical and financial resources from within the African coffers and channel them towards the realization of African Solutions to African Problems. It is through this approach that the continent can ultimately bring to an effective end the current practice of being over-dependent on foreign donors and so called strategic partners that prioritise their own self-interests at the expense of the well-being of the generality of local populations affected by the conflicts.

The second recommendation is based on the continued failure of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa to attain the desired objectives of durable peace and tranquillity in conflict countries and regions. Continued conflict situations in resource rich countries guarantee a continuous demand for weapons that keep the Military Industrial Complexes in continuous and profitable weapons production to meet growing demand from conflict regions. In this regard, it is not in the interest of some Western powers and their multinational corporations to have total peace in countries and regions where UN peacekeeping missions are deployed. It is therefore incumbent upon African leaders to realize that UN peacekeeping missions constitute big business for the developed countries and their multinational corporations. UN peacekeeping missions are not primarily deployed to bring about effective peace in target countries before a preferred regime has been put in power. Rather UN missions are designed to create long term business opportunities for both arms suppliers as well as those who supply combat and logistical support for the unending peacekeeping operations. In that regard, whereas African populations look forward to a post UN mission situation that addresses their political, economic and social

plight, major sponsors of UN peacekeeping missions anticipate the establishment of market economies and western liberal value systems that pay little attention to the plight of the poor populations in the host countries. In fact these market economies further lock local economies towards supplying raw materials to keep developed industries running at the long term disadvantage of the local African populations. Thus it should always be remembered that the big and powerful global powers will do everything to influence the outcome of peacekeeping missions in their favour because what they prioritise in international relations is not friendship based on altruistic ethical values but rather the promotion and maximization of their national self-interests even if it means violation of host state sovereignty or undermining the well-being and national aspirations of the host population.

The third recommendation is that African leaders should invest in the security of their countries if they are to safeguard their national sovereignty against foreign manipulation and interference. This calls for our leaders to be always alert to the big powers' actual intentions when they authorise deployment of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa. Sudan managed to effectively resist the deployment of a strong UN "humanitarian" mission because it was alert to the machinations behind the intended deployment and it was assisted by its strong political, economic and military ties to both China and Russia as well as its strong military combat capability. In the four case studies of this thesis, it is evident that where the host country's military strength was considered to be weak, UN peacekeepers took advantage of the prevailing situation to advance the political, economic and strategic self-interests of the western powers sponsoring the mission. Strong security institutions save as an effective deterrent to would-be rebel movements as they realize that their gains through the use of violence would be outweighed by their losses arising from the responses from robust security sector institutions. Having made this recommendation, it is prudent to emphasize that strong security sector institutions should not be used to ill-treat sections of the populations that have genuine grievances as the concept of sovereignty continues to evolve.

The fourth recommendation is that African leaders must agree to respect a set of African value systems which when violated they can be resolved on the basis of peer review and corrections as opposed to waiting for foreign forces from outside the continent to come and resolve African conflicts. This approach requires transparency in its conceptualization and implementation for it to succeed. Coupled to this approach, African countries must desist from donor dependency because no African country is too poor to fail to survive within its means if priorities are right. The ethical problem of donor dependency is that once a country accepts a favour it would

indirectly have accepted to be used as a proxy at some point as all donations have different degrees of conditionalities. It follows therefore that the more a country is dependent on foreign donations, the more it compromises on its national sovereignty.

Finally, Africa needs to invest in research and development so that it does not continue relying on foreign technology to drive its economic development and equipping its own military and other security sector institutions with equipment from outside the continent. Strong research and development will lead to strong economic performance and development which ultimately leads to less internal friction among different ethnic/tribal groupings. Lack of technological advancement has so far resulted in Africa having imported ethical systems that are interpreted through hermeneutical lenses. In this regard, the AU should mobilise human and financial resources towards sponsoring “trans-disciplinary research” to establish the main sources of conflict on the continent and how best they can be addressed without biased approaches to resolving them. This would guarantee that recommended solutions are both practical and implementable to the satisfaction of those affected.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Abi-Saab, G., (1978) *The United Nations Operation in the Congo 1960–1964*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Adebajo, A., (2011) *UN Peacekeeping in Africa: From the Suez Crisis to the Sudan Conflicts*, London, Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Akehurst, M., (1984) “Humanitarian Intervention”, in H. Bull (ed.), *Intervention in World Politics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Aksu, E., (2003) *The United Nations, Intra-state Peacekeeping and Normative Change*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Alden, C., (1997) *United Nations Peacekeeping in Africa: Lessons for the OAU and SADC*, Accord, African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes.
- Alozie, E.C., (2007) “What Did They Say? African Media Coverage of the First 100 Days of the Rwandan Crisis,” in A. Thompson, (ed.) *The Media and the Rwanda Genocide*, London, Pluto Press.
- Al-Qaq, R.K., (2009) *Managing World Order: United Nations Peace Operations and the Security Agenda*, New York, Taurus Academic studies.
- Anderson, K. and Rieff, D., (2005). “Global Civil Society: A Sceptical View,” in (eds.) Anheier H., Glasius, M. and Kaldor M., *Global Civil Society*, Cambridge, Polity.
- Anderson, M.B., (1999) Do No Harm: How aid can support peace—or war, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, CO.
- Annan K. A., (2000) *We the People the Role of the United Nations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, New York, United Nations Department of Public Information.
- Annan, K. A. and Mousavizadeh, N., (2012) *Interventions A Life in War and Peace*, London, Penguin Books.

Anyidoho H, (2006) “A Tale of Two Tragedies: Rwanda and Darfur” in A. Adebajo and H. Scanlon (eds.) *A Dialogue of the Deaf: Essays on Africa and the United Nations*, Johannesburg Jacana Media, Auckland Park.

Aoi, C., (2011) *Legitimacy and the Use of Armed Force Stability Missions in the post-Cold War era*, New York, Routledge.

Arnold, G., (1999) *Mercenaries: The Scourge of the Third World*, London, St. Martin's Press.

Arnold, G., (2008) *Historical Dictionary of Civil Wars in Africa* (2nd ed.), Toronto, Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Badescu, C.G., (2011) *Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect*, New York, Routledge.

Bah, A.M. and Johnstone, I., (2007) *Peacekeeping in Sudan: The Dynamics of Protection, Partnerships and Inclusive Politics*. New York, Centre on International Cooperation.

Bain, W., (2003) *Between Anarchy and Society: Trusteeship and the Obligations of Power*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Ban, K. and Konaré, A.O., (2007) *Report of the Secretary-General and the Chairperson of the African Union Commission on the Hybrid Operation in Darfur*, New York, United Nations Information Press.

Barnett, M., (2002) *Eyewitness to Genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda*, New York, Cornell University Press.

Beitz, C.R., (1979) *Political theory and international relations* (Vol. 13), Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Bell, D., (2010) *Ethics and World Politics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Bellamy, A.J., (2009) “Responsibility to Protect or Trojan horse? The crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq” in Rosenthal J.H. and Barry C. (eds.) *Ethics and International Affairs*, Washington DC, Georgetown University Press.

Bellamy, A.J. and Wheeler N., (2007) “Humanitarian Intervention in World Politics,” in J. Baylis, S. Smith, & P. Owen (eds.), *The Globalization and World Politics, An Introduction to International Relations* Oxford, Oxford University Press pp.523-39.

Bellamy, A.J., Williams, P.D. and Griffin, S., (2010) *Understanding peacekeeping*, New York, Polity Press.

Berdal, M., (1993) *Whither UN peacekeeping?* Brassey's, International Institute for Strategic Studies.

Berdal, M., (2008) "The Security Council and Peacekeeping" in Lowe V., Roberts, A., Welsh, J and Zaum D. (eds.), *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice since 1945*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Betts, R.K., (1996) "The delusion of impartial intervention", in C. Crocker, F. O. Hampson (eds.) *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict*, Washington DC, United States Institute of Peace Press.

Boutros-Ghali, B., (1992) *An Agenda for Peace: Preventative Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping*, New York: United Nations Press.

Boutros-Ghali, B., (1999) *Unvanquished, US-UN Saga*, New York, Random Publishers.

Briscoe, N., (2003) *Britain and UN peacekeeping, 1948–67*, London, Antony Rowe Ltd.

Brosché, J., (2008) *Darfur: Dimensions and Dilemmas of a Complex Situation*, Uppsala, Uppsala University Press.

Brown, C., (2003) "Selective Humanitarianism: In Defence of Inconsistency," in (eds.) D. K. Chatterjee and D.E. Scheid, *Ethics and Foreign Intervention*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, D., (1994) *The Role of the United Nations in Peacekeeping and Truce-Monitoring: What are the Applicable Norms?* Revue Belge de Droit, International Editions Bruylant Bruxells.

Burr, M. and Collins, R.O., (2008) *Darfur: The Long Road to Disaster*, New York, Markus Wiener Publishers.

Brunsson, N., (1989) *The organization of hypocrisy: talk, decisions and actions in organizations*, Chichester, John Wiley & Sons.

Carr, E.H., (2010) *The Twenty Years of Crisis 1919 1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan

Chandler, D., (2009) *From Kosovo to Kabul: Human Rights and International Intervention*, London, Pluto Press.

Chesterman, S., (2001) *Just War or Just Peace: Humanitarian Intervention and International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chesterman, S., (2004) *The Use of Force in UN Peace Operations*, New York, New York University Press.

Chijiwa, M., (2013) “What Constitutes the Rightful Authority and on What Grounds? The United Nations Security Council versus a Concert of Democracies,” in *Global Ethics after the Responsibility to Protect: Challenges and Dilemmas*, Institute for Social Ethics, Nanzan University Press.

Clark, J., (1993) “Debacle in Somalia: Failure of the Collective Response”, in L. F. Damrosch (ed.), *Enforcing Restraint: Collective Intervention in Internal Conflicts*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.

Clarke, W., & Herbst J., (1997) (eds.), *Learning from Somalia: The lessons of Armed Humanitarian Intervention*, Boulder, Westview Press.

Clement, C. and Smith, A.C., (2009) (eds.), *Managing Complexity: Political and Managerial Challenges in United Nations Peace Operations*, New York, International Peace Institute.

Cohen, S.F., (1986) Rethinking the Soviet experience: politics and history since 1917, (Vol. 816), Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Coicaud J.M., (2001) “International Democratic Culture and Its Sources of Legitimacy: The Case of Collective Security and Peacekeeping Operations in the 1990s,” in J.M. Coicaud and V. Heiskanen, (eds.) *The Legitimacy of International Organizations*, Tokyo, United Nations University Press.

Cousens, E. M., (2001) *Peacebuilding as Politics*, London: Lynne Rienner.

Cox, R.W., (1987) *Production, Power, and World Order. Social Forces in the Making of History*, New York, Columbia University Press.

Dallaire, R., (2003) *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*, Toronto, Random House.

Dayal, R., (1976) *Mission for Hammarskjold; The Congo Crisis*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Debrix, F., (1999) *Re-envisioning peacekeeping: the United Nations and the mobilization of ideology*, (Vol. 13), U of Minnesota Press.

De Coning, C., (2006) “The Future of Peacekeeping in Africa,” in H. Ojanen (ed.), *Peacekeeping – Peacebuilding: Preparing for the Future*, FIIA Report 14, Helsinki: The Finnish Institute of International Affairs.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S., (1994) (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, California, Sage.

De Witte, L., (2001) *The Assassination of Lumumba*, London; Verso.

Des Forges, A., (2007) *Leave None to Tell the Story: Genocide in Rwanda*, New York, Human Rights Watch.

De Waal, A., (1994) “Dangerous Precedents? Famine Relief in Somalia 1991–93,” in J. Macrae and A. Zwi (eds.), *War and Hunger*, London, Zed Books.

De Waal, A., (1997) *Famine Crimes: Politics & the Disaster Relief Industry in Africa*, Indiana University Press.

De Waal, A., (2005) *Famine that Kills: Darfur-Sudan*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

De Waal, A., (2007) “Darfur’s Elusive Peace” in de Waal (ed.) *War in Darfur and the Search for Peace*, Global Equity Initiative, New York, Harvard University Press.

Destexhe, A., (1995) *Rwanda and Genocide in the Twentieth Century*, New York, New York University Press.

Diamond, J., (2005) *Collapse: How societies choose to fail or succeed*, New York, Penguin Books.

Diehl, P., (1993) *International Peacekeeping*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dijkzeul, D. and Beigbeder, Y., (2003) (eds.), *Rethinking International Organizations: Pathology and Promise*, New York, Berghahn Books.

Dower, N., (2002) "Violent Humanitarianism – An Oxymoron?" in L. Mosley and R. Norman (eds.) *Humanitarian Rights and Military Intervention*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Doyle, M.W. and Sambanis, N., (2006) *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations*, Oxford, Princeton University Press.

Duffield, M.R., (2001) *Global Governance and the New Wars: the Merging of Development and Security*, New York, Zed books.

Dunbabin, J.P., (2008) "The Security Council in the Wings: Exploring the Security Council's Non-Involvement in Wars," Lowe V., Roberts, A., Welsh, J. and Zaum D. (eds.), *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice Since 1945*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Durch, W. J. (ed.), (1993) *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping: Case Studies and Comparative Analysis*, Washington DC, St Martin's Press.

Durch, W.J., (1996) "Introduction to Anarchy: Intervention in Somalia," in *UN Peacekeeping, American Policy, and the Uncivil Wars of the 1990s*, New York, St. Martin's Press.

Durch, W.J. and Berkman, T.C., (2006) *Who Should Keep the Peace? Providing Security for Twenty-First-Century Peace Operations*, Washington, DC, The Henry L. Stimson Centre.

Ekpebu L.B., (1989) *Zaire and the African Revolution*, Ibadan, Ibadan University Press.

Fetherston, A.B., (1994) *Towards a Theory of United Nations Peacekeeping*, New York, St. Martin's Press.

Findlay, T. C., (1999) *The Blue Helmets' First War? Use of Force by the UN in the Congo 1960–64*, Clementsport, Canadian Peacekeeping Press.

Findlay, T., C., (2002) *The Use of Force in UN Peace Operations*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Finnemore, M., (1996) "Constructing Norms Humanitarian Intervention," in Katzenstein (ed.) *The Culture of National Security Norm and Identity in World Politics*, New York, Columbia University Press.

Finnemore, M., (2003) *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs about the Use of Force*, New York, Cornell University Press.

Flint, J. and De Waal, A., (2008) Darfur: a New History of a Long War. African Arguments  
New York, Zed Books.

Fonteyne, J.P., (1974) *The Customary International Law Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention: Its Current Validity Under the UN Charter*, 4 CAL. W. INT'L LJ.203, 204

Francis D.J., (2006) "Peacekeeping in Africa," in R. E. Utley (ed.), *Major Powers and Peacekeeping: Perspectives, Priorities and the Challenges of Military Intervention*, Burlington, Ashgate Publishing Company.

Frederking, B., (2007) *The United States and the Security Council: Collective Security since the Cold War*, New York, Routledge.

Friend, J.H. and Guralnik, D.B., (1960) *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language*, College Edition, World Publishing.

Furley O.W., (1998) "Rwanda and Burundi: peacekeeping amidst massacres," in O.W. Furley and R. May, (eds.), *Peacekeeping in Africa*, Sydney, Ashgate.

Furley, O.W. and May, R., (1998) (eds.) *Peacekeeping in Africa*, Sydney, Ashgate.

Gourevitch, P. and Lamb, B., (1998) *Stories from Rwanda*, C-SPAN Archives.

Gowan, R. T., B., (2009) "Robust Peacekeeping and Its Limitations", in (eds.) *Robust Peacekeeping: The Politics of Force*, New York, New York University Press.

Gray, C., (2008) "The Charter Limitations on the Use of Force: Theory and Practice," in V. Lowe, A. Roberts, J. Welsh, and D. Zaum (eds.), *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice since 1945*, London and New York, Oxford University Press.

Grunfeld, F. and Huijboom A., (2007) *The Failure to Prevent Genocide in Rwanda: The Role of Bystanders*, Boston, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Gyekye, K., (1987) *An essay on African philosophical thought*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hagan, J. and Rymond-Richmond, W., (2009) *Darfur and the Crime of Genocide*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hammond-Tooke, D., (1998) "Establishing dialogue: Thoughts on 'cosmology', 'religion' and 'science'. In: C.W. du Toit (ed.), *Faith, science & African culture. African cosmology and Africa's contribution to science*, Pretoria: UNISA.

Hancock, B., (1998) *Trent Focus for Research and Development in Primary Health Care: An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, Nottingham, Trent Focus.

Hansch S., (1994) *Lives lost, lives saved: excess mortality and the impact of health interventions in the Somalia emergency*, Washington, DC, Refugee Policy Group.

Hansen W., Ramsbotham O. and Woodhouse T., (2004) *Hawks and Doves: Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution*, Berghof, Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management.

Häussler, U., (2007) *Ensuring and Enforcing Human Security: The Practice of International Peace Missions: Legal Framework, Military Operations, Political Ramification*, Nijmegen, Wolf Legal Publishers.

Heinze E., (2009) *Waging Humanitarian War: The Ethics, Law, and Politics of Humanitarian Intervention*, New York, State University of New York Press.

Heldt, B. and Wallensteen, P., (2007) *International Peacekeeping: The UN versus Regional Organizations*, Centre for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland Press.

Higgins, R., (1980) *United Nations Peacekeeping 1946–1967: Documents and Commentary. Vol. 1: The Middle East*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hill, S.M. and Malik, S.P., (1996) *Peacekeeping and the United Nations*, London, Dartmouth publishing Company.

Hirsch, J. L., and Oakley, R. B., (1995) *Somalia and Operation Restore Hope: Reflections on Peacemaking and Peacekeeping*, Washington, United States Institute of Peace.

Hirsi, A., (2011) Somali Sea-Piracy: Business Model or Resource Conflict? Wardheer Publishers.

Hobbes, T., (1962) *Leviathan*, (ed.) Michael Oakeshott, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Holzgrefe, J.L., and Keohane, R. (eds.) (2003) *Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal and Political Problems*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hoskyns, C., (1961) *The Congo: A Chronology of Events, Jan. 1960-Dec. 1961*, London, Chatham House.

Housen, R.T., (2002) *The Privatization of Warfare: Back to the Future*, Washington DC. National War College Press.

Hume, D., (1751) *Of Self-Love. An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*

Huntington, S., (1992) *The Clash of Civilization and Remaking of World Order*, New York, Simon & Schuster.

Igiri, C.O. and Lyman, P.N., (2004) "Giving Meaning to 'Never Again': Seeking an Effective Response to the Crisis in Darfur and Beyond," in *CSR No.5*, New York, Council on Foreign Relations.

Jackson, R.H., (1990) *Quasi-states. International Relations, Sovereignty and the Third World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

James, A., (1966) *Britain and the Congo Crisis, 1960–63*, London, St Martin's Press.

James, A., (1990), *Peacekeeping in International Politics*, New York, St. Martin's Press.

James, A., (1996) "Bowing to the United States II: Déroulement," in *Britain and the Congo Crisis, 1960–63*, pp. 184-195, London, Palgrave Macmillan.

James, G., J., (1998) "Nations, states, and sovereignty: meaning and challenges in post-Cold War international security," in C. Dandeker (ed.) *Nationalism and Violence*, New Brunswick and London, Transaction Publishers.

Janzekovic, J., (2006) *The Use of Force in Humanitarian Intervention: Morality and Practicalities*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Company.

Johnstone, I., (2006) "Dilemmas of Robust Operations," in *Annual Review of Global Peace Operations*, New York, Lynne Reinner.

Johnstone I., (2009) "Dilemmas of Robust Peace Operations," in *Robust Peacekeeping: The Politics of Force*, New York, Centre on International Cooperation.

Kalb, M.G., (1982) *The Congo cables: the cold war in Africa--from Eisenhower to Kennedy*, New York, Macmillan Publishing Company.

Karns, M.P. and Mingst, K.A., (1995) *The United Nations in the Post-Cold War Era*, New York, Westview Press.

Kissinger, H., (1994) *Diplomacy*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Krasner, S.D., (1999) *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Krasno J.E., (2004) “To End the Scourge of War: The Story of UN Peacekeeping,” in Krasno J.E., (ed.) *The United Nations: Confronting the Challenges of a Global Society*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Krieg, A., (2013) *Motivations for Humanitarian Intervention: Theoretical and Empirical Considerations*, London, Springer.

Küng, H., (1998) *A global ethic for global politics and economics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Kuperman, A.J., (2004) *The limits of humanitarian intervention: Genocide in Rwanda*, Brookings Institution Press.

Lang, Jr. A., (2002) *Agency and Ethics: The Politics of Military Intervention*, Albany, New York, New York University Press.

Lang Jr. A.F., (2010) “Humanitarian Intervention,” in Hayden P. (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Ethics and International Relations*, London, University of St Andrews Press.

Lefever E.W. and Joshua, W., (1966) *United Nations Peacekeeping in the Congo, 1960–1964: An Analysis of Political, Executive and Military Control*, Vols. 1–4, Washington DC, Brookings Institution.

Lewis I. and Mayall, J., (1996) “Somalia”, in James Mayall (ed.), *The New Interventionism 1991–1994: United Nations experience in Cambodia, former Yugoslavia and Somalia*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Liu, F.T., (1992) “*United Nations Peacekeeping and the Non-Use of Force*”, in *International Peace Academy Occasional Paper Series*, Boulder, Colorado, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Lowe V., Roberts, A., Welsh, J and Zaum D., (2008) (eds.), *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice since 1945*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Lowther, A.B., (2007) *Americans and asymmetric conflict: Lebanon, Somalia, and Afghanistan*, London, Praeger Security International.

Louis, W.R. and Owen, R., (1989) *Suez 1956: the Crisis and its Consequences*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Lyons, G.M. and Mastanduno, M., (1995) *Beyond Westphalia? State Sovereignty and International Intervention*, Johns Hopkins University Press.

MacQueen, N., (2006) *Peacekeeping and the International System*, London: Routledge.

Makaremi, C., (2010) *Utopias of power: From human security to the responsibility to protect. Contemporary States of Emergency: The Politics of Military and Humanitarian Interventions*, New York, Zone Books.

Maren, M., (1997) *The Road to Hell: The Ravaging Effects of Foreign Aid and International Charity*, New York, Free Press.

Maxwell, M., (1990) *Morality among Nations: An Evolutionary View*, SUNY Press.

Mayall, J., (1996) *The New Interventionism, 1991–1994: United Nations Experiences in Cambodia, Former Yugoslavia and Somalia*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mazrui, A.A., (1990) *Cultural Forces in World Politics*, New York, James Currey Publishers.

Melvern, L., (2004) *Conspiracy to Murder. The Rwandan Genocide*, London, Verso.

Meinecke, F., (1924) *Machiavellianism: The Doctrine of Raison d'Etat and Its Place in Modern History*, translated by D. Scott (1957), London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Menkhaus, K.J. and Ortmayer, L.L., (1995) *Key Decisions in the Somalia Intervention* Washington DC, Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University.

Minear, L. and Weiss, T. G., (1993) *Humanitarian Action in Times of War: A Handbook for Practitioners*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Mingst, K.A., (2001) “Domestic political factors and decisions to use military forces,” in Charlotte K. and Harold K. Jacobson (eds.), *Democratic Accountability and the Use of Force in International Law*, London, Cambridge University Press.

Morgenthau, H.J., (1985) *Politics Among Nations*, revised by Kenneth W. Thompson. New York: Knopf.

Murove M.F., (2016) *African Moral Consciousness: An Inquiry into the Evolution of Prospects and Perspectives*, Saarbruuk, Lambert Academic Publishing.

Murphy R., (2007) *UN Peacekeeping in Lebanon, Somalia and Kosovo*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Murphy, S., (1996) *Humanitarian Intervention: The United Nations in an Evolving World Order*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Natsios, A.S., (1997) *U.S. Foreign Policy and the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. Humanitarian Relief in Complex Emergencies*, Westport, CT, Praeger Publishers.

Nicolson, R., (2008) “Introduction: Persons in Community,” in R. Nicolson (ed.) *Persons in Community: African Ethics in Global Culture*, Scottsville, University of KwaZulu Natal Press.

O’Brien, C. C., (1962) *To Katanga and back: A UN case history*. New York, Grosset & Dunlap.

O’Brien, C.C., (1968) *The United Nations: Sacred Drama*. Simon and Schuster.

Okoye, F.C., (1972) International law and the new African states, London, Sweet and Maxwell.

O’Neill, J.T. and Rees N., (2005) *United Nations Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War*, New York, Routledge.

Orford, A., (2003) *Reading Humanitarian Intervention: Human Rights and the Use of Force in International Law*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Peou, S., (2007) *International Democracy Assistance for Peace building*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Power, S., (2003) *A Problem From Hell: American and the Age of Genocide*, New York,

Harper Collins.

Prunier, G., (1995) *The Rwanda crisis: History of a genocide*, Columbia, Columbia University Press.

Prunier G., (1997) *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide 1959-1994*, London, Hurst and Company.

Prunier, G., (2009) *From Genocide to Continental War: the Congolese Conflict and the Crisis of Contemporary Africa*, New York, Hurst & Company.

Ramose, M.B., (1999) *African Philosophy through Ubuntu*, Harare, Mond Books Publishers

Ramsbotham, O., and Woodhouse, T., (1996) *Humanitarian Intervention in Contemporary Conflict*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Rieff, D., (1996) *Slaughterhouse: Bosnia and the Failure of the West*, New York, Simon & Schuster.

Rikhye, I. J., (1984) *The Theory and Practice of Peacekeeping*. London, C. Hurst & Co.

Roberts, A., (1996) Humanitarian action in war: aid, protection and impartiality in a policy vacuum, Adelphi Paper 305, Oxford University Press.

Roberts A., (1998) “Communal Conflict as a Challenge to International Organization: The Case of Yugoslavia,” in Otunnu O.A. and Doyle M.W. (eds.), *Peacemaking and Peacekeeping for the New Century*, New York, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Roberts, A., (2004) “The Politics and Practice of Humanitarian Intervention” in J. Welsh (ed.), *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Roberts, A., (2008) Proposals for UN Standing Forces: A Critical History in Lowe V.; Roberts A.; Welsh J. and Zaum D. (eds.), *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice since 1945*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Rosegrant, S. Watkins, M.D., (1996) *A ‘seamless’ transition: United States and United Nations operations in Somalia 1992–1993*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Rourke, J. and Boyer, M., (1998) *World Politics: International Politics on the World Stage, Brief*, Dushkin, McGraw Hill.

Rasheed, S. and Olowu, D., (1993) (eds.) *Ethics and Accountability in African Public Service*, Addis Ababa, AAPAM.

Saksena, K.P., (1974) *The United Nations and collective security: a historical analysis*, New Delhi, DK Publishing House.

Sanderson, J., (1998) *The incalculable dynamic of using force. UN Peacekeeping Trouble: Lessons Learned from the Former Yugoslavia*, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Schmidl, E.A., (2000) *Peace Operations between War and Peace*, Vol. 10, No. 2 Psychology Press

Schmidt, E., (2013) *Foreign intervention in Africa: From the cold war to the war on terror,* "Vol. (7), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Shawcross, W., (2001) *Deliver Us from Evil: Warlords & Peacekeepers in a World of Endless Conflict*, London, Bloomsbury.

Shukri M.A., (1986) *An Introduction to General International Law in the Time of Peace*, Damascus, Dar Al Fikr, Fonteyne, Jean Pierre.

Siekmann, R.C., (1985) *Basic documents on United Nations and related peace-keeping forces*, Martinus, Nijhoff Publishers.

Simmonds, R., (1968) *Legal Problems Arising from the United Nations Military Operations in Congo*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff.

Simons, P., (2001) *Humanitarian Intervention: A Review of Literature*, Project Ploughshares.

Singer, P., (1981) *The Expanding Circle*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Sisk, T.D., (2001) *Peace-making in Civil Wars: Obstacles, options, and opportunities*, Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame.

Sitkowski, A., (2006) *UN Peacekeeping: Myth and Reality*, Westport, Praeger Security

Sorenson, D.S. and Wood, P.C., (2005) (eds.), *The Politics of Peacekeeping in the post-Cold War era*, New York, Routledge.

Stewart, R.W., (2003) *The United States Army in Somalia, 1992-1994*, Washington DC, Government Printing Office.

- Stockwell, J., (1978) In search of enemies: A CIA story, New York, Norton, WW.
- Tanner, F., (1996) “Weapons control in semi-permissive environments: A case for compellence,” in International Peacekeeping, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 126-145.
- Tardy, S.T. and Wyss, M., (2010) *Peacekeeping in Africa. The Evolving Security Architecture* Abingdon: Routledge.
- Tatum D.C., (2010) Genocide at the Dawn of the Twenty First Century: Rwanda, Bosnia, Kosovo and Darfur, New York, St. Martin’s Press.
- Terry, F., (2002) *Condemned to Repeat: The Paradox of Humanitarian Action*, Ithaca: New York, Cornell University Press.
- Urquhart, B., (1987) *A Life in Peace and War*, London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Urquhart, B. and Heisbourg, F., (1998) *Prospects for a Rapid Response Capability: A Dialogue. Peacemaking and Peacekeeping for the New Century*, pp.189-99.
- Utley, R.E., (2006) (ed.) *Major Powers and Peacekeeping: Perspectives, Priorities and the Challenges of Military Intervention*, Burlington, Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Valentino, B., (2004) “Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century” in *Cornell Studies in Security Affairs*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Vogel, T., (1996) *The Politics of Humanitarian Intervention*, New York, Praeger.
- Weiss, T.G., (ed.), (1993) *Collective Security in a Changing World*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner.
- Weiss, T. G., (2009) *What's Wrong with the United Nations and How to fix it*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Weiss, T.G., Forsythe, D.P. and Coate, R.A., (2004) *The United Nations and Changing World Politics*, Boulder, CO, Westview Press.
- Weissman, S.R., (1974) *American foreign policy in the Congo, 1960-1964*, Cornell, Cornell University Press.
- Welsh, J., (2008) “The Security Council and Humanitarian Intervention,” in Lowe V., Roberts, A., Welsh, J and Zaum D. (eds.), *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice since 1945*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Wheeler, E. and Roberts, C., (2012) *Doorway to Hell: Disaster in Somalia*. Frontline Books.
- Wheeler, N., (2000) *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Wiredu, K., (1980) *Philosophy and an African Culture*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Woodhouse, T. and Ramsbottom, O., (1996) *Peacekeeping: Terra Incognita: Here be Dragons: Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution in Contemporary Conflict: Some Relationships Considered*, London, Incore.
- Yorke, E., (2001) “Regional Initiatives and Non-UN Forms of Intervention in Sub-Saharan Africa,” in D.S. Gordon and F. H. Toase, (eds.), *Aspects of Peacekeeping*, London, Frank Cass.
- Zacarias, A., (1996) *The United Nations and International Peacekeeping*, New York, Tauris Academic Studies.
- Zaum D., (2008) “The Security Council, the General Assembly, and War: The Uniting for Peace Resolution” in Lowe V., Roberts, A., Welsh, J and Zaum D. (eds.), *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice Since 1945*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

## **United Nations Documents**

- Anand, S., (1994) “Human Development Index: Methodology and Measurement (No. HDOCPA-1994-02),” *Human Development Report Office (HDRO)*, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
- Brahimi, L., (2000) Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, United Nations.
- Carlsson, I., Sung-Joo, H. and Kupolati, R.M., (1999) Report of the Independent Inquiry into the actions of the United Nations during the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda. Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 5-121.

Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, Preventing Deadly Conflict (1997) New York: Carnegie Corporation.

International Commission on Intervention, State Sovereignty and International Development Research Centre (2001) *The Responsibility to Protect*: Research, Bibliography, Background: Supplementary Volume to the Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) (2001), The Responsibility to Protect, Ottawa, International Development Research Centre.

UNSC Resolution 143, dated, 14 July 1960

UNSC Resolution 145, dated, 22 July 1960

UNSC Resolution 161, dated 21 February 1961

UNSC Resolution 169, dated 24 November 1961

UN Doc S/4387, of 14 July 1960

UN Doc S/4417, of 6 August 1960

UN Doc S/RES/912 (1994), 21 April 1994.

The Blue Helmets (1996) A Review of United Nations Peacekeeping (third edition) New York: United Nations, pp. 149-50.

UN General Assembly, Doc. S/1995/1, A/50/60 (Jan.3, 1995). The Secretary-General, Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization: Supplement to an Agenda for Peace: Position Paper of the Secretary General on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations delivered to the UN General Assembly.

UN Doc. S/2005/740 dated 28 November 2005, Available at [www.un.org/Docs/sc/sgrep05.htm](http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/sgrep05.htm). Accessed on 12 July 2015.

United Nations (2008) *Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines*, DPKO/DFS, New York, United Nations.

United Nations (1999a) 'Report of the Independent Inquiry into the Actions of the United Nations during the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda', United Nations Security Council Report

S/1999/1257.

Available

at:

<http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/395/47/IMG/N9939547.pdf?OpenElement>

Accessed 18 July 2015.

United Nations (2000), Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (New York: United Nations). Available at: [http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace\\_operations/](http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations/) Accessed on 18 July 2015.

United Nations Report (1999) The Independent Inquiry into the Action of the United Nations during the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda, New York. Available at: [http://www.un.org/News/ossr/rwanda\\_report.html](http://www.un.org/News/ossr/rwanda_report.html) Accessed on 12 December 2015.

United Nations Report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (2004) ‘A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility’. Report of the Secretary General’s High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (New York: United Nations). Available at: <http://www.un.org/secureworld/> Accessed on 15 December 2015.

United Nations Security Council Letter dated 5 June 2007 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council. UN Doc. S/2007/301/Rev.1 dated 5 June 2007.

United Nations Security Council Report of the Secretary-General on Darfur UN Doc. S/2006/591 dated 28 July 2006.

United Nations Security Council Report of the Secretary-General on the deployment of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur UN Doc. S/2007/759 dated 24 December 2007.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1769 UN Doc. S/RES/1769 (2007) dated 31 July 2007.

United Nations, Report of the Independent Inquiry into the Actions of the United Nations during the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda, 15 December 1999.

## **JOURNAL ARTICLES**

Abass, A., (2007) “The United Nations, The African Union and the Darfur crisis; Of Apology and Utopia,” in *Netherlands International Law Review*, pp. 415-440.

Abu al-Haj, A., (2013) “Principle of the State’s Sovereignty and the Phenomenon of Humanitarian Intervention under Current International Law,” in *Canadian Social Science*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 116-134.

Adada, R., (2008) “The UN Is Making a Difference in Darfur,” in *The Wall Street Journal*, 25 June.

Adebajo, A. and Landsberg, C., (2000) “Pax Africana in the Age of Extremes” in *South African Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 7, No.1, pp.11-26.

Adebajo A., and Landsberg C., (2007) “Back to the Future: UN Peacekeeping in Africa,” in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 7, No.4, pp.161-188.

Adekanye, B., (1997) ‘Arms and Reconstruction in Post-Conflict Societies’, in *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.34, No.3, pp. 359–66.

Ademola, A., (2005) “Consent Precluding State Responsibility: A Critical Analysis,” in *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, Vol. 53, No. 1, pp. 211-225.

Anderson, K., (2004) “Humanitarian Inviolability in Crisis: The Meaning of Impartiality and Neutrality for U.N. and NGO Agencies Following the 2003-2004 Afghanistan and Iraq Conflicts,” in *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 41, pp. 41-74.

Andreas M. R., (2003) "Validity and reliability tests in case study research: a literature review with “hands-on” applications for each research phase," in *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp.75 – 86.

Atack, I., (2002) “Ethical objections to humanitarian intervention,” in *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 33, No. 3, pp. 279-292.

Ayoob, M., (2002) “Humanitarian intervention and state sovereignty,” in *International Journal of Human Rights*, London, Routledge Publisher, Vol.6, No.1, pp.81–102.

Badescu, C.G. and Bergholm, L., (2009) “The Responsibility to Protect and the Conflict in Darfur: The Big Let-Down,” in *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 287-309.

Ball, M. M., (1961) “Non-Intervention vs. Human Rights and the Preservation of Democratic Institutions,” in *International Organization*, Vo. 15, pp. 21–37.

Barnett, M., (1997) “The politics of indifference at the United Nations: the Security Council, peacekeeping, and genocide in Rwanda,” in *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 3, No.2, pp.193-237.

Beck, K., (2011) The Challenges of Consent: Policy Recommendations for Maintaining Host State Consent for United Nations Peacekeeping Missions, in *Diplomacy and World Affairs*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 1-52.

Berman, E. and Sams, K., (2000) “Keeping the peace in Africa,” in *Disarmament Forum*, Vol. 3, pp. 21-31.

Binder, M., (2009) “Humanitarian Crises and the International Politics of Selectivity,” in *Human Rights Review*, 10: 327.

Blocq, D.S., (2006) “The fog of UN peacekeeping: Ethical issues regarding the use of force to protect civilians in UN operations,” in *Journal of Military Ethics*, Vol. 5, No, 3, pp. 201-213.

Blumenthal, S., (1995) “Why are we in Somalia?” in *New Yorker*, 25 October 1995, pp. 52–53.

Boutros-Ghali, B., (1992) “Empowering the United Nations,” in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 71, No. 4, pp.

Boutros-Ghali, B., (1993) “An Agenda for Peace: One Year Later,” in *Orbis*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 323–32

Bowen, G.A., (2005) “Preparing a qualitative research-based dissertation: Lessons learned,” in *The Qualitative Report*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp.208-222.

Buchanan, A. and Keohane, R.O., (2004) “The preventive use of force: a cosmopolitan institutional proposal,” in *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol.18, No. 1, pp.1-22.

Branch, A., (2005) “American Morality over International Law: Origins in UN Military Interventions, 1991–1995,” in *Constellations*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp.....

Chandler, D., (2008) “The revival of Carl Schmitt in international relations: The last refuge of critical theorists?” in *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 27-48.

Chatterjee, D.K. and Scheid, D.E., (2003) *Ethics and foreign intervention*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Chossudovsky, M., (2003) “The US was behind the Rwandan Genocide: Rwanda: Installing a US Protectorate in Central Africa,” in *Global Research*. May, 8.

Coleman, K.P., (2011) “Innovations in African solutions to African problems‘: the evolving practice of regional peacekeeping in sub-Saharan Africa” in *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 04, (December) pp. 517 – 545.

Collins, C., (1992) Fatally flawed mediation: Cordier and the Congo crisis of 1960. in *Africa Today*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 5-22.

Collins, C.J., (1993) “The Cold War Comes to Africa: Cordier and the 1960 Congo Crisis,” in *Journal of International Affairs*, pp. 243-269.

Collinson, S. E. S. and Muggah, R., (2010) “States of fragility: stabilisation and its implications for humanitarian action,” in *Disasters*, Vol. 34, No.3), pp. 275-296.

Cunliffe, P., (2009) “The Politics of Global Governance in UN Peacekeeping” in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 16, No.3, pp. 323-336.

Dallaire, R. and Poulin, B., (1995) “Rwanda: From Peace Agreement to Genocide” in *Canadian Defence Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 7-11.

Dandeker, C and Gow, J., (1997) “The future of peace support operations: strategic peacekeeping and success,” in *Armed Forces and Society*, Vol. 23, pp. 327–47.

De Haas, H., (2008) “The myth of invasion: the inconvenient realities of African migration to Europe,” *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 7, pp. 1305-1322.

De Waal, A., (2005) —Briefing: Darfur, Sudan: Prospects for Peace, in *African Affairs*, Vol. 104, No. 414 pp. 127-135.

Diehl, P.F., (1988) “Peacekeeping operations and the quest for peace,” in *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 103, No. 3, pp. 485-507.

Diehl, P.F., (1994) “International peacekeeping,” in *Mershon International Studies Review* John Hopkins University Press.

Donald, D., (2002), “Neutrality, Impartiality and UN Peacekeeping at the Beginning of the 21st Century,” in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 21-38.

Dorn, W., (2013) “The UN’s First Air Force: Peacekeepers in Combat, Congo 1960–64,” in *Journal of Military History*, George C. Marshall Library, Virginia Military Institute, pp.1-27.

Doss, A., (2014) “In the Footsteps of Dr. Bunche: the Congo, UN Peacekeeping and the Use of Force” in *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 37, No.5, Oct 2014, pp. 703–735.

Douzinas, C. (2003) “Humanity, Military Humanism and the New Moral Order,” in *Economy and Society*, Vol.32, No.2, pp. 159-183.

Dowty A., and Loescher G., (1996), “Refugee Flows as Grounds for International Action”, in *International Security*, Vol. 21, No. 1, (summer) pp. 43-71.

Duffield, M., (2010) “The Liberal Way of Development and the Development; Security Impasse: Exploring the Global Life-Chance Divide,” in *Security dialogue*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 53-76.

Durward, R., (2006) “Security Council Authorization for Regional Peace Operations: A Critical Analysis,” in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 13, No. 3, September, pp. 350-365.

Ebegulem, J.C., (2011) “The Failure of Collective Security in the Post World Wars I and II International System,” in *Transcience*, Vol. 2, Issue 2, pp. 23-30.

Enabulele, A.O., (2010) “Humanitarian Intervention and Territorial Sovereignty: the Dilemma of two Strange Bedfellows,” in *The International Journal of Human Rights*, Vol. 14, No. 3, (May), pp. 407-424.

Eriksson, J., Adelman, H., Borton, J., Christensen, H., Kumar, K., Suhrke, A., Tardif-Douglin, D., Villumstad, S. and Wohlgemuth, L., (1996) *The international response to conflict and genocide: Lessons from the Rwanda experience. Synthesis Report*. Copenhagen, Steering Committee for the Joint Evaluation of Emergency assistance to Rwanda.

Evans G. and Sahnoun, M., (2002) “The Responsibility to Protect,” in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 6, pp. 99-110.

Evans, G. and Sahnoun, M., (2001) ‘Intervention and state sovereignty: breaking new Ground’, in *Global Governance*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Apr.–June).

Fabian, L.L., (1971) “Soldiers without enemies: preparing the United Nations for peacekeeping,” in *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 586-588.

Farer, T., (2005) “Cosmopolitan Humanitarian Intervention: A Five-part Test Roundtable Humanitarian Intervention after 9/11,” in *International Relations*, Vol.19, No.2, pp. 211–220.

Farrell, T., (1995) “Sliding into war: The Somalia imbroglio and us army peace operations doctrine” in *International Peacekeeping*, Volume 2, Issue No. 2, pp. 194-214.

Fink, J.E., (1995) From Peacekeeping to Peace-Enforcement: The blurring of the Mandate for the Use of Force in Maintaining International Peace and Security, 19 MD in *J. INT'L L. & TRADE* (spring) pp. 1-46.

Fortuna, V.P., (2003), “Inside and Out: Peacekeeping and the Duration of Peace After Civil and Interstate Wars,” in *International Studies Review*, Vol.5, No. 4, pp. 97-114.

Frost, A., (2009) “The Collective Security Treaty Organization, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and Russia’s Strategic Goals in Central Asia,” in *China and Eurasia Forum Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 83-102.

Gberie, L., (2004) —The Darfur Crisis: A Test Case for Humanitarian Intervention, in *KAIPTC Paper*, No. 1, (September), pp. 1 – 11.

Gelot, L. and Söderbaum F., (2012) "Rethinking intervention and interventionism," in *Development dialogue*, Vo. 58, pp. 131-150.

Gibbs, D.N., (2000) “The United Nations, international peacekeeping and the question of ‘impartiality’: revisiting the Congo operation of 1960,” in *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 03, pp. 359-382.

Gill, S. and Law, D., (1993) “Global hegemony and the structural power of capital,” *Cambridge Studies In International Relations*, Vol. 26, pp.93-93.

Goulding, M., (1993) “The Evolution of United Nations Peacekeeping,” in *International Affairs*, Vol. 69, No. 3, pp. 451-464.

Graybill, L., (2002) “Responsible... by Omission: The United States and Genocide in Rwanda,” in *Seton Hall Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, Vol. 3, p. 86.

Greig, J.M., and Diehl P.F., (2005) “The Peacekeeping-Peacemaking Dilemma,” in *International Quarterly Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 4, pp. 621-645.

Grovogui, S.N., (2002) "Regimes of sovereignty: International morality and the African condition," in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 315-338.

Haass, R., (1994) "Military Force: A User's Guide," in *Foreign Policy*, Fall, pp.

Hampson F.O. and Malone, D.M., (2002) "Improving the UN's Capacity for Conflict Prevention," in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 77-98.

Hazem, G., Huth, A.P. and Russett, B., (2003) "Civil wars kill and maim people—long after the shooting stops," in *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 2, pp. 189-202.

Hintjens, H.M., (1999) "Explaining the 1994 genocide in Rwanda," in *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 02, pp. 241-286.

Hobsbawm, E., (2004) 'Spreading Democracy', in *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 144, pp. 40–1.

James, A., (1993) "Internal Peace-keeping: A dead end for the UN?" in *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 359-368.

James, A., (1994) "The Congo Controversies", in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 1 No.1, spring, pp. 44–58.

Jefferson, N., (1992) "Rwanda: The War Within," in *Africa Report*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 62.

Johnson J.T., (2006) "Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq: Just War and International Law Perspectives," in *Journal of Military Ethics*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp.114-127.

Jonah, J. and Undersecretary-General, U.N., (2012) "The Tragic Triplets: The UN in West Africa," in *UN Peacekeeping in Africa: From Suez Crisis to the Sudan Conflicts*

Kabau, T., (2012) "The Responsibility to Protect and the Role of Regional Organizations: An Appraisal of the African Union's Interventions." in *Goettingen Journal of International Law*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 49-92.

Kapteijns, L., (2013) "Test-Firing the 'New World Order' in Somalia: the US/UN Military Humanitarian Intervention of 1992–1995," in *Journal of Genocide Research*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 421-442.

Keller E.J., (1995) "African Conflict Management and the New World Order," *Policy Paper* No.13, May 19, Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation.

Latif, M.I., (2010) “Peacekeeping Operations and State Sovereignty: Dilemma of Host State Consent,” in *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, Vol. 30, No. 2, December 2010, pp.235-243.

Latif, M.I. and Khan, R.A., (2010) “Peacekeeping Operations and State Sovereignty: Dilemma of Host State Consent” in *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 235-243.

Leurdijk, D.A., (1997) “Before and after Dayton: the UN and NATO in the former Yugoslavia” in *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 457-470.

Levine, D.H., (2011) “Peacekeeper Impartiality: Standards, Processes, and Operations” in *Journal of International Peacekeeping*, Vol.15, No.3-4, pp. 422-450.

Lippmann, W., (1961) “Dag Hammarskjöld: United Nations pioneer,” in *International Organisation*, pp. 18–23.

Lipson, M., (2007) “Peacekeeping: Organized Hypocrisy?” in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 5–34.

Lucas Jr. G.R., (2009) “This Is Not Your Father’s War” – Confronting the Moral Challenges of “Unconventional” War, in *Journal of National Security Law & Policy*, Vol. 3, Issue No. 329, pp. 329-340.

Luttwak, E.N., (1999) “Give War a Chance,” in *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 1999, pp. 36–44.

Malone D.M., and Wermster K. (2000), “Boom or Bust? The Changing Nature of UN Peacekeeping” in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 37-54.

Mayall, J., (2000) “Democracy and international society,” in *International Affairs*, Vol. 76, No. 1, pp. 61-75.

McClean, E., (2008) The Responsibility to Protect: The Role of International Human Rights Law in *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 123 – 153.

McNulty, M., (1996) “France, Rwanda and the genocide: a review of the literature,” in *Modern & Contemporary France*, Vo. 4, No. 4, pp.497-503.

Melvern, L., (2001) “Missing the story: The media and the Rwandan genocide,” in *Contemporary Security Policy*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 91-106.

Mindzie, A. M., (2010), "Intervention and Protection in African Crisis Situations: Evolution and Ethical Challenges," in *Criminal Justice Ethics*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp.174-193.

Mingst, K., (2003) "Troubled Waters: The United States-United Nations Relationship," in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 10, No, 4, pp. 82-93.

Møller, B., (2009) "The Somali Conflict: The Role of External Actors," in *Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS)*, Copenhagen, Vol. 3, pp. 1-34.

Mullenbach, M.J., (2005) "Deciding to Keep Peace: An Analysis of International Influences on the Establishment of Third-Party Peacekeeping," in *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.49, No. 3, pp. 529–555.

Murithi, T., (2009), "The African Unions Evolving Foray in Peace Operations: The African Union Mission in Burundi, the Africa Union Mission in Sudan and the Africa Union Mission in Somalia", in *Africa Security Review*, No. 1, pp. 70-82.

Murove, M.F., (2005) "The Empirical Contradiction of Globalization: A Quest for a Relational Ethical Paradigm," in *Journal of Theory for Southern Africa*, Vol. No. pp. 4-18.

Neethling, T., (2009) "Whither peacekeeping in Africa: Revisiting the evolving role of the United Nations," in *African Security Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 1-20.

Nicholas, H., (1963) "UN Peace Forces and the Changing Globe: the Lessons of Suez and Congo," in *International Organization*, Vol. 17, No. 2, Spring, 1963, pp. ....

Orend, B., (1999), 'Kant's Just War Theory,' in *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 323–53.

Organization of African Unity, International Panel of Eminent Personalities to Investigate the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda and the Surrounding Events, Rwanda: The Preventable Genocide, Addis Ababa: OAU, (2000).

Osmançavuşoğlu, E., (2000) "Challenges to United Nations Peacekeeping Operations in the Post-Cold War Era," in *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 4, No. 4.

Ottaway, M. & Lacina, B., (2003) "International Interventions and Imperialism: Lessons from the 1990s," in *SAIS Review*, Vol. 23, No. 2 pp. 71-92.

Paris, P., (1997) “Peace-building and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism,” in *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 2 pp. 54-89.

Paris, R., (2001) “Echoes of the Mission Civilisatrice: peacekeeping in the post-Cold War era,” in *The United Nations and Human Security*, pp. 100-118.

Paris, R., (2003) ‘Peacekeeping and the Constraints of Global Culture’, in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 441–73.

Pelz, T. and Lehmann, V., (2007) “The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping Reforming DPKO,” in *Dialogue on Globalization*, Fact Sheet. November.

Piiparinen, T., (2007) The Lessons of Darfur for the Future of Humanitarian Intervention, in *Global Governance*, Vol. 13, pp. 365–390.

Power, S., (2001) “Bystanders to genocide,” in *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 288, No. 2, pp. 84-108.

Prunier G. (2006), “Wilful Impotence: Darfur and the International Community,” in *Current History*, Vol. 105, No 691, (May) pp. 105-130.

Pugh, M., (2005) “The Political Economy Of Peace-building: A Critical Theory Perspective, in *International Journal of Peace Studies* Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 23-42.

Pugh, M., (2007), “Peacekeeping and Critical theory,” in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 1 Issue No. 1, pp. 39-58

Reiff, D., (1998) “The humanitarian illusion,” in *New Republic*, (16 Mar), pp. 27–32.

Richardson, J.A., (1997) “Defining the Post-Cold War National Interest, in *National Forum Journal*, Vol. 1, No.1.

Richmond O.P., (2004) “UN Peace Operations and the Dilemmas of the Peacebuilding Consensus,” in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 83-101.

Rieff, D., (1995) “The Humanitarian Trap” in *World Policy Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp.1-11.

Roberts, A., 1994 “The crisis in UN peacekeeping,” in *Survival*, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp. pp.93-120.

Rogers, K., (1997)“Beyond self and other” in *Social Philosophy and Policy*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp.1-20.

Rosenau, J., (1969), "The Concept of Intervention", in *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 165–76.

Rupp, L.J., (1994) "Constructing internationalism: The case of transnational women's organizations, 1888-1945," in *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 99, No. 5, pp. 1571-1600.

Scorgie, L., (2004) "Rwanda's Arusha Accords: A Missed Opportunity," in *Undercurrent*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp.67-76.

Sloan, J., (2014) "The Evolution of the Use of Force in Peacekeeping" in *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol.37, No.5, Oct. 2014, pp. 674–702.

Solomon, H., (1996) "Democratising the United Nations: A view from the South", in *Journal for the Political Sciences* (Pretoria: UNISA), Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 1-10.

Sørensen, A., (2002) "Value, Business and Globalisation—Sketching a Critical Conceptual Framework," in *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 39, No. 1-2, pp. 161-167.

Sørensen, G., (2006) "Liberalism of restraint and liberalism of imposition: Liberal values and world order in the new millennium," in *International Relations*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 251-272.

Spooner, K.A., (2009) "Just West of Neutral: Canadian "Objectivity" and Peacekeeping during the Congo Crisis, 1960-61," in *Canadian Journal of African Studies/La Revue Canadienne des études Africaines*, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 303-336.

Stanton, G. H., (2004), "Could the Rwandan Genocide Have Been Prevented?" in *Journal of Genocide Research*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 211-228.

Stedman, S. J., (1997) "Spoiler problems in peace processes", in *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (fall), pp. 5-33.

Stevenson, J., (1993) "Hope Restored in Somalia?" in *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 91, pp. 138-154.

Storey, A., (1999) "Economics and ethnic conflict: structural adjustment in Rwanda," in *Development Policy Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 45–6.

Straus, S., (2005) "Darfur and the Genocide Debate," in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 84, No. 1, Washington, Council on Foreign Relations, pp. 123–133.

Tanner F., (2010) “Addressing the Perils of Peace Operations: Toward a Global Peacekeeping System,” in *Global Governance*, Vol. 16, pp. 209-217.

Tardy, T., (2007), "The UN and the Use of Force: A Marriage against Nature," in *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 49-70.

Teson, F.R., (1995) “Collective humanitarian Intervention,” in *Michigan Journal of International Law*, Vol. 1, No. 17, pp.323-371.

Teson, F.R., (2006) “Eight Principles for Humanitarian Intervention,” in *Journal of Military Ethics*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 93-113.

Tsagourias, N., (2006). “Consent, Neutrality/Impartiality and the Use of Force in Peacekeeping: Their Constitutional Dimension,” in *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 465—482.

Tshikwatamba, N.E., (2003) “African Values in Perspective and the Reconstruction of Bridges for Contextual Development,” Unpublished article.

Vohra, S. (1996), “Impartiality in United Nations Peacekeeping”, in *Leiden Journal of International Law*, pp. 63-85.

Watson, C., (1992) “Rwanda: war and waiting,” in *Africa Report*, Vol. 37, No. 6, pp. 51.

Wedgwood, R. (1995) “The Evolution of United Nations Peacekeeping,” in *Cornell International Law Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 631-644.

Western, J., (2002) “Sources of humanitarian intervention: beliefs, information, and advocacy in the U.S. decisions on Somalia and Bosnia,” in *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 112–42.

Williams, J., (1999) “The ethical basis of humanitarian intervention: the Security Council and Yugoslavia,” *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 6 No. 2, (summer), pp. 1–23.

Williams, P.D., (2008) “Keeping the peace in Africa: why “African” solutions are not enough,” in *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 309-329.

Williams, P.D. and Bellamy, A.J., (2005) “The Responsibility to Protect and the Crisis in Darfur,” in *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 27-47.

Woodhouse, T. and Ramsbotham, O., (2005) “Cosmopolitan Peacekeeping and the Globalization of Security” in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp.139-156.

## Internet Sources

Aboagye F. (2007), “The Hybrid Operation for Darfur: A Critical Review of the Concept of the Mechanism”, *ISS Paper 149*, August, 2007 Available at: [http://www.issafrica.org/index.php?link\\_id=502&link\\_type=12slink](http://www.issafrica.org/index.php?link_id=502&link_type=12slink) Accessed on 03 November 2014.

Adada, R., (2008) “Statement by the AU/UN Joint Special Representative for Darfur, to the UN Security Council, April 2008.” Available at: [http://unamid.unmissions.org/sites/default/files/old\\_dnn/0/Article\\_NewsDocuments/JSRstatement](http://unamid.unmissions.org/sites/default/files/old_dnn/0/Article_NewsDocuments/JSRstatement) Accessed on 23 April 2016.

Adam, H.M., (1995) “Clan conflicts and democratization in Somalia. Ethnic conflict and democratization in Africa,” at [https://Adam%2C+H.M.%2C+%281995%29+Clan+conflicts+and+democratization+in+Somalia&btnG=&hl=en&as\\_sdt=0%2C5](https://Adam%2C+H.M.%2C+%281995%29+Clan+conflicts+and+democratization+in+Somalia&btnG=&hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5) Accessed on 11 October 2014.

Annan, K. (2000) “*Millennium Report by Secretary General.*” Available at: <http://www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/full.htm> Accessed March 22, 2013.

Barber, B., (1997), “Feeding Refugees, or War: The Dilemma of Humanitarian Aid” in King’s College London, Vol. 76, No.4, pp. 8-14. Available at: <https://kcl.rtl.talis.com/link?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.jstor.org> Accessed on 26 May 2016.

Barber, R. (2009) “Facilitating humanitarian assistance in international humanitarian and human rights law,” in *International Review of the Red Cross*. Available at: [http://www.icrc.org/Web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/review-874-p371/\\$File/irrc-874-Barber.pdf](http://www.icrc.org/Web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/review-874-p371/$File/irrc-874-Barber.pdf) Accessed on 25 March 2014.

Barnett, M., (2014) “The United Nations Security Council and Rwanda, International Decision-Making in the Age of Genocide 1990-1994,” the George Washington University Press. Available at: <http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB472/Barnett,20Michael20United%20Nations%20SecurityRwanda.pdf> Accessed on 12 January 2014.

Bellamy, A. J. and Williams, P. (2004) "Conclusion: What future for peace operations? Brahimi and beyond," in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 183-212. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1353331042000228517> Accessed March 22, 2014.

Berdal, M., (2003) Ten Years of International Peacekeeping' in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 5-11. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13533310308559344> Accessed on 22 March, 2014.

Birikorang, E., (2009), —Towards Attaining Peace in Darfur: Challenges to a Successful AU/UN Mission in Darfur, KAIPTC Occasional Paper No. 25, October. Available at: [www.kaiptc.org/Publications/Occasional-Papers/Documents/no\\_26.aspx](http://www.kaiptc.org/Publications/Occasional-Papers/Documents/no_26.aspx) Accessed on 05 September 2014.

Black, C., (2014) "Rwanda and the Criminalisation of International Justice: Anatomy of War Crimes Trials," in *Global Research*, October. Available at: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/rwanda-and-the-criminalisation-of-international-justice-anatomy-of-war-crimes-trials/5408604> Accessed on 13 July 2014.

Boutros-Ghali, B. (1992). An Agenda for Peace, Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping. Available at: <http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agpeace.html>. [Accessed March 22, 2010].

Clough, M., (2008) Darfur: Whose Responsibility to Protect?¶ Available at: <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org>. Accessed on March 21, 2016.

Cohen, R. and O'Neill, W. (2006) Last Stand in Sudan? Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, March/April Available at: [www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00963402.2006.1146099](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00963402.2006.1146099) Accessed on 03 March 2015.

Coulon, J. and Liégeois, M., (2010) "Whatever Happened to Peacekeeping? The future of a Tradition," Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute. Available at: [www.cdfai.org](http://www.cdfai.org) Accessed on 12 January 2013.

Dallaire, R.A., (2004) Looking at Darfur, Seeing Rwanda,¶ in New York Times, 4 October 2004. Available at: [www.nytimes.com/2004/.../looking-at-darfur-seeing-rwanda.htm](http://www.nytimes.com/2004/.../looking-at-darfur-seeing-rwanda.htm) Accessed on 05 March 2015.

Davenport and Stam, (2009) “What Really Happened in Rwanda” Available at: [www.miller-mccune.com/culture\\_society](http://www.miller-mccune.com/culture_society) Accessed on 06 October 6, 2014.

de Kerckhove, F., (2008) Multilateralism on Trial: From the 2005 UN Summit to Today’s Reality. Can the World be Governed, p.199.

Economy, E.C., (2007) “The great leap backward? The costs of China's environmental crisis,” in *Foreign Affairs*, pp. 38-59. Available at: <https://scholar.google.co.za/scholar?q=Elizabeth+Economy+2007+US+and+China+relations> Accessed on 29 March 2014.

Engdahl, W. (2007) “Darfur? It’s the Oil, Stupid...” in *Geopolitics – Geoeconomics*, 20 May. Available at: <http://www.firstencastfinancial.com/pdfs/1346.pdf> Accessed on 02 February 2014.

Erlinder, P., (2010)“US/UK Allies Grab Congo Riches and Millions Die. Genocide/War-Crimes Cover-up and UN Falsification of History: The Untold Story of Suppressed UN Prosecutors' Memoirs and the Realpolitik of the UN International Criminal Tribunals.” Available at: <https://scholar.google.co.za/scholar?q=Erlinder+2008+and+American+involvement+in+civil+wars> Accessed on 07 February 2014.

Del Ponte, C, and Chuck S. (2011) Madame Prosecutor: Confrontations with humanity's worst criminals and the culture of impunity. Other Press, LLC. Available at:

<https://scholar.google.co.za/scholar?q=Carla+Del+Ponte+2009+MADAME+PROSECUTOR+CONFRONTATIONS+WITH+HUMANITY%27S+WORST+CRIMINALS> Accessed on 13 September 2014.

Ejibunu, H.T., (2008) “Sudan Darfur Region’s Crisis: Formula for Ultimate Solution,” *EPU Research Paper*, Issue 09/08. Available at: <http://poti-media.s3.amazonaws.com/theses/dunne.pdf> Accessed on 03 June 2013.

Evans E., (1993) “Peacekeeping: Two Views: The U.S. Military and Peacekeeping Operations” in *World Affairs* Vol. 155, No. 4 (Spring 1993), pp. 143-147 Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20672359>. Accessed on 07 January 2003.

Felski, R., (2011) “Suspicious Minds,” in Poetics Today, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 215-234. Available at: <http://content.ebscohost.com/ContentServer.asp>? Accessed on 13 September 2015.

Fox, J.G., (2000) “Approaching Humanitarian Intervention Strategically: The Case of Somalia,” Thesis, Washington, DC, National Defence University. Available at: <http://www.aut.researchgateway.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10292/1028/CherkaouiT.pdf?sequenc> Accessed on 02 June 2014.

Frost, M., (2012) “Ethics, Foul play and War in International Relations,” Research Seminar University of Hull. Available at: <https://scholar.google.com/scholar>? Accessed on 17 June 2015.

Gowan, R. (2009). “The Strategic Context: Peacekeeping in Crisis, 2006-08” in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol.15 No.4, pp. 453-469. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13533310802239618>. Accessed 25 March 2013.

Harrington, A.R., (2009) “Policing Against the State: United Nations Policing as Violative of Sovereignty,” Dissertation, McGill University.

Hoar, J.P., (1993) A CINC's Perspective. National Defence University Washington DC Centre for Counter Proliferation Research. Available at: <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a427267.pdf> Accessed on 02 June 2015.

Holt, V., Taylor, G. and Kelly, M., (2009) “Protecting Civilians in the Context of UN Peacekeeping Operations,” Available at: <https://scholar.google.co.za/scholar?q=Victoria+K.+Holt+and+Glyn+Taylor+with+Max+Kelly%2C+Protecting+civilians+UN+peacekeeping+operations> Accessed on 03 January 2013.

HRW (2007) Darfur 2007: Chaos by Design Peacekeeping Challenges for AMIS and UNAMID. Available at <http://hrw.org/reports/2007/sudan0907/sudan0907web.pdf> Accessed on 09 April 2016.

HRW, (2004) “Darfur Destroyed: Ethnic Cleansing By Government and Militia Forces in Western Sudan,” New York, Human Rights Watch. Available at: <https://www.hrw.org/reports/2004/sudan0504/> Accessed on 06 April 2014.

HRW, (2004) Darfur in Flames: Atrocities in Western Sudan, New York, Human Rights Watch. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17502970903541721> Accessed on 23 March 2016.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), (2001) The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada. Available at: [www.iciss.ca/report-en.asp](http://www.iciss.ca/report-en.asp) Accessed 19 December 2015.

Jehl, D., (1994), “Officials Told to Avoid Calling Rwanda Killings ‘Genocide’,” in The New York Times, June 10, 1994. <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/06/10/world/officials-told-to-avoid-calling-rwanda-killings-genocide.html> Accessed on 13 April 2013.

Jett, D.C. (2001). Why Peacekeeping fails? New York: Palgrave Publishers. Available at: <http://site.ebrary.com.libproxy.dundee.ac.uk/lib/dundee/Doc?id=10023011&ppg=57> Accessed on 10 November 2014.

Jibril A., (2010) Past and Future of UNAMID: Tragic Failure or Glorious Success? in Human Rights and Advocacy Network for Democracy (HAND), *Briefing Paper July 2010*. Available at: [Http://www.migs.concordia.ca/links/.../Past\\_and\\_Future\\_of\\_UNAMID.pdf](Http://www.migs.concordia.ca/links/.../Past_and_Future_of_UNAMID.pdf) Accessed on 28 May 2015.

Kindiki, K., (2007) “Intervention to Protect Civilians in Darfur: Legal Dilemmas and Policy Imperatives,” Available at <https://www.issafrica.org/.../monograph-131-intervention-to-protect-civilians-in-darfur> Accessed on 09 April 2014.

Magnarella, P., (2002). “Explaining Rwanda’s 1994 genocide,” in *Human Rights and Human Welfare*, Vol. 2, pp. 25-34. Retrieved November 124, 2016, Accessed at <http://www.du.edu/gsis/hrhw/volumes/2002/2-1/magnarella2-1.pdf>

Mersiades M., (2006) “Peacekeeping and Legitimacy: Lessons from Cambodia and Somalia,” in International Peacekeeping, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 205-221. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13533310500066487>. Accessed March 2, 2015.

Mgbeoji, I. (2003). Collective Insecurity: The Liberian Crisis, Unilateralism, and Global Order, Vancouver: UBC Press. Available at: <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/dundee/Doc?id=10130618&ppg=119> Accessed on 12 November 2014.

Newman, E. and Richmond, O.P. (2001). United Nations and Human Security, Gordonsville: Palgrave Macmillan. Available at:  
<http://site.ebrary.com.libproxy.dundee.ac.uk/lib/dundee/Doc?id=10044856&ppg=15>  
Accessed 12 November 2014.

Pasqualini, M.G. (2006) "Tradition of the Italian Carabinieri Corps in Peace-keeping Reconstruction Missions from Crete to Sarajevo and Nassirya. Future Task: Afghanistan, Area of Herat Region?" Miloslav Čaplovič Mária Stanová. Available at:  
<http://www.vhu.sk/data/files/220.pdf#page=21> Accessed 10 June 2013.

Peou, S. (2002). "The UN, Peacekeeping, and Collective Human Security: From an Agenda for Peace to the Brahimi Report." in International Peacekeeping, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp.51-68. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/714002728> Accessed on 22 November 2014.

Power, S., (2004) Dying in Darfur: Can the Ethnic Cleansing in Darfur be Stopped? in The New Yorker, 30 August 2004 Available at: [www.newyorker.com/magazine/2004/08/30/dying-in-darfur](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2004/08/30/dying-in-darfur) Accessed on 06 April 2014.

Prunier, G., (2006) —The Politics of Death in Darfur in Current History. Available at: <https://files.pbworks.com/download/a5ja9enKTu/mshanson/21866635/The%20Politics%20of%20Darfur.pdf> Accessed on 19 March 2016.

Prunier, G., (2007). Sudan: genocide in Darfur. Le Monde Diplomatique, pp.155-160.

Reeves, E., (2007) Darfur peace talks in Libya produce only an emboldened Khartoum Available at: <http://www.sudantribune.com/spip.php?article24721> Accessed on 08 April 2016.

Report by the UN Under-Secretary-General for UN Peacekeeping; UN General Assembly. UN Doc. GA/SPD/382, dated 31 October, Available at: [www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2007/gaspd382.doc.htm](http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2007/gaspd382.doc.htm) Accessed on 08 April 2016.

Rubinstein, R.A., (2010) "Peacekeeping and the Return of Imperial Policing," Available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232930222> Accessed on 05 August 2015.

Simon, O.B., (2008) "Human Security and the Responsibility to Protect Approach: A Solution to Civilian Insecurity in Darfur" in Human Security Journal, Vol. 7, (summer) Available at: <http://www.securitehumaine.univ-cezanne.fr/fileadmin/IEHI/Documents/REVUE> Accessed on 24 April 2014.

Stojek, S and Tir, J., (2015) “The Supply Side of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Trade Ties and Locations of UN Led Deployments.” In *European Journal of International Relation*, Available at<https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm> Accessed on 12 August 2016.

Thakur, R., (1994) “Peacekeeping to Peace Enforcement: The UN Operation in Somalia,” in The Journal of Modern African Studies, Vol. 32, No. 3 (Sep., 1994), pp. 387-410. Published by: Cambridge University Press Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/161981> Accessed on 28 August 2014.

UN Doc SG/SM/9197 AFR/893 HR/GN/1077, April 7, 2004. Available at: [www.un.org/events/rwanda](http://www.un.org/events/rwanda) Accessed on 16 March 2016.

Manual, US Army Field Manual, (1994. 100-23) *Peace Operations*, Available at:

Vayrynen, R., (1996) “The age of humanitarian emergencies” No. 25. Available at: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/fth/wodeec/25.html> Accessed on 22 August 2015.

Viloria, J., (1999), “Evaluating the politics of humanitarian military interventions in complex emergencies: reflections from the case of Somalia,” in Working Paper, Australian National University, Asia Pacific Press. Available at: <https://digitalcollections.anu.edu.au/.../3/cem99-8.pdf> Accessed on 09 April 2013.

Weissman, F., (2008) “Humanitarian dilemmas in Darfur” in CRASH, Fondation Médecins Sans Frontières. Available at: <http://www.msf.fr/sites/www.msf.fr/files/> Accessed on 13 June 2015.

World Development Report (2011) Available at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org> Accessed on 25 March 2016. [www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,3604,1273982,o.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,3604,1273982,o.html) Accessed on 22 March 2016.

Zhang, Z., (2006) “China’s Hunt for Oil in Africa in Perspective.” East-West Centre. Available at: [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=939076](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Papers.cfm?abstract_id=939076) Accessed on 05 April 2014.

## Newspaper Articles

Boutros-Ghali, B., (1993) “UN Peace-keeping in a New Era: A New Chance for Peace,” in The World Today, April 1993.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001) The Responsibility to Protect Ottawa: International Development Research Centre). International Herald Tribune, 2 November 1994.

Jakus, L.J., (2005) “The Participation of the Hungarian Armed Forces in Peace Support and Crisis Management Operations,” in *Miloslav Čaplovič Mária Stanová* Available at: <http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documentsdisposition> Accessed on 02 June 2013.

Jehl, D., (1994), “Officials Told to Avoid Calling Rwanda Killings ‘Genocide’,” in The New York Times, June 10, 1994. Available at:

<http://www.nytimes.com/1994/06/10/world/officials-told-to-avoid-calling-rwanda-killings-genocide.html> Accessed on 12 January 2014.

Kristof, N., (2005) “The secret genocide archive,” New York Times, 23.

Moffett III, G.D., (1992) “White House Hints Change in Stance against Putting UN Peacekeepers in Somalia,” in Christian Science Monitor, August 6, 1992.

Peterson, S., (1992) “UN Seeks Solution to Anarchy in Somalia,” in Christian Science Monitor, December 21, 1992.

Philpot, R., (2005) “Boutros-Ghali: CIA Role in the 1994 Assassination of Rwanda’s President Habyarimana?” in Counter Punch, February 26, 2005.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Letter of Informed Consent to Participants



Dear Sir/Madam

June 2014

#### Letter of Informed Consent

Dear Participant

Sir/Madam, my name is Herbert Chingono, a PhD Candidate at the School of Religion, Philosophy and Classics in the Department of Ethics Studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa. The title of my thesis is, Ethical Challenges to United Nations Peacekeeping Missions and National Sovereignty: A Critical Study of the United Nations Missions in Africa with Specific Reference to Somalia, Rwanda, Democratic Republic of Congo and Sudan.

I am kindly requesting you to participate in an interview process in your individual capacity as an accomplished Academic/Bureaucrat/Civil Society Practitioner/Diplomat/Politician/Political Analyst, conversant with the political and strategic dynamics of the United Nations peacekeeping operations. I hope to learn and benefit a lot from your rich experience as I endeavour to satisfy the objectives of my study. It is estimated that the interview will last for about 45-60minutes.

Sir/Madam, you may be aware that since the end of the Cold War peacekeeping has taken centre stage at both the academic and policy levels in an endeavour by the UN and regional groupings such as the AU and EU to promote collective international peace and security.

According to the UN Charter, nation states are sovereign within their territories and are immune to external interferences except in grave circumstances such as war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity. The same UN organization sometimes deploys peacekeepers without invitation or full consent from affected member states in violation of its Charter in situations that fall far short of the grave circumstances enshrined in its Charter. This practice presents ethical dilemmas since the sovereignty of a country and its responsibility to protect its own citizens would have been suspended the moment peacekeepers are deployed in a country.

Experience has demonstrated that in some cases peacekeepers have left the country previously under UN peacekeeping with a new government following a regime change masterminded by peacekeepers and their sponsors. In other cases, former government officials have been sent to the International Criminal Court (ICC) or International Court of Justice (ICJ) for trial.

Sir/Madam, you may want to note that Somalia was left to deteriorate into a failed state after the withdrawal of UN peacekeepers following the departure of US forces that had turned the UN peacekeeping mission into an offensive military operation to assassinate one of the warlords General Mohamed Farrah Aidid. In the Ivory Coast a UN peacekeeping mission evolved into an offensive military operation whose objective was overthrowing a sovereign government whose leader had fallen out of favour with some permanent members of the UN Security Council namely USA, France and the UK. In the DRC, operation Artemis was launched primarily to satisfy French and EU interests and not to resolve the crisis in that country. In Rwanda, the UN Security Council ordered the bulk of UN peacekeepers to abandon the endangered Rwandans at the height of the genocide.

These big powers appear to be using peacekeeping missions to promote and advance their own geo-strategic and national interests at the expense of the suffering populations they purport to be protecting. Thus the concept of UN peacekeeping missions in Africa has come under serious scrutiny in a bid to determine the real motives behind these multinational deployments. The UN interventions in Somalia, Sudan and DRC have demonstrated that military interventions are not an alternative to diplomacy neither are they the only and unavoidable alternative to end intra-state conflicts.

Sir/Madam, you may arguably note that the practice of peacekeeping interventions is not being applied evenly across similar situations in Africa. In Rwanda the UN Security Council watched hopelessly as approximately one million Tutsis and moderate Hutus were butchered during the 1994 genocide. In neighbouring DRC the same UN Security Council deployed one of the

largest peacekeeping missions in Africa, yet the situation in that country was far less volatile compared to what transpired in Rwanda, a clear manifestation of deliberate selectivity and preferential deployments. In Sudan, the USA has been calling for the labelling of the Darfur conflict, “genocide” with the intention of finding an excuse for deployment of a robust UN peacekeeping mission to safeguard its national and allies’ interests in clear violation of that nation’s state sovereignty. It is this ethical dilemma of deploying UN peacekeeping missions in Africa in violation of national state sovereignty that has led the researcher to embark on this fieldwork to satisfy research objectives outlined below.

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To critically explore the extent to which the African state with its UN mandate of responsibility to protect its own citizens can offer effective peace and security to its citizens rather than outside peacekeeping interventions.
2. To analyse why UN peacekeeping missions in Africa, specifically in Somalia, Rwanda, Sudan and the DRC have failed to attain the desired objectives.
3. To proffer scholarly and policy options on how sovereign states particularly in Africa, with the UN mandate of responsibility to protect, can offer effective peace and security to their citizens rather than UN peacekeeping interventions.

Sir/Madam, if you agree to my request for an interview, I will be asking you some questions to address each of the objectives stated above and would appreciate it if you could answer as honestly and factually as possible. In the event that you are not comfortable to answer some of the questions, you are free to decline answering such questions. Your honest views and opinions are what I look forward to getting from you as there is no right or wrong answers. Please note that I will be taking down notes during the interview to help me correctly capture your input. The notes will ultimately help me in the consolidation, analysis and presentation of collected data in order to come up with correct and informed findings of the research.

Your participation in this interview process is absolutely voluntary and you may choose to withdraw from the interview process anytime. I wish to rest assure you that there will not be any negative implications if you choose to withdraw.

I equally wish to assure you that your confidentiality will be seriously safeguarded since the results of this research could be published in international journals. The completed thesis could

be used by other university students undertaking similar studies as well as form the basis of presentations at academic seminars and conferences. In that regard, none of your personal identification information will be released in any form as the interview scripts will be fully secured under lock and key and will be destroyed after a period of five years.

Sir/Madam, if you have any questions or areas for clarification regarding this study, you can contact me at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, School of Religion, Philosophy and Classics. My contact number is (+27 837 614 816) or you may contact my supervisor, Dr. Felix Munyaradzi Murove at the same university campus as above, his contact number is (+27 332 606 056). My e-mail address is 212562201@stu.ukzn.ac.za OR chingonoh@yahoo.com

I look forward to your participation, and will be very grateful for your contribution.

Sincerely

Herbert Chingono

PhD Candidate

Important contact details you may want to use are as follows:

Researcher	Supervisor
Herbert Chingono	Dr. Felix Munyaradzi Murove
University of KwaZulu-Natal	University of KwaZulu-Natal
School of Religion, Philosophy and Classics	School of Religion, Philosophy and Classics
Private Bag X01	Private Bag X01
Scottsville, 3209	Scottsville, 3209
Pietermaritzburg	Pietermaritzburg
Republic of South Africa	Republic of South Africa
Tel: +27 837 614 816	Tel: +27 332 060 056
Fax: +27 332 605 858	Fax: +27 332 605 858
E-mail: 212562201@stu.ukzn.ac.za OR chingonoh@yahoo.com	E-mail: murovem@ukzn.ac.za

Consent

I ----- (full name of respondent)

Hereby confirm that I understand the contents and nature of this study and agree to participate. I understand that I am participating freely and without being forced to do so whatsoever. I also understand that I can withdraw from this interview at any point should I not wish to continue.

I understand my name will remain confidential.

---

Signature of Respondent

Date

---

Signature of Researcher

Date

## Appendix 2: Questionnaire

Questionnaire for Diplomats, Academics, Politicians, Political Analysts, Bureaucrats, Security Personnel and Civil Society/NGOs

### Questionnaire/ Interview guide

#### Section A. Target groups and designation.

1. Diplomats
2. Academics
3. Politicians
4. Political Analysts
5. Bureaucrats
6. Civil Society/NGOs

#### Section B. Objective Number 1

To critically explore the extent to which the African state with its UN mandate of responsibility to protect its own citizens can offer effective peace and security to its citizens without outside peacekeeping interventions.

Q1.1. In your view, to what extent can African states, effectively guarantee peace and security to own citizens without outside peacekeeping intervention?

Q1.2. Why are African countries prone to internal conflicts that are taken advantage of by the international community to intervene in their internal affairs?

Q1.3. In your view, why has the international community, specifically at the level of the UN sanctioned the deployment of peacekeeping missions in some conflict countries in Africa without prior consideration of the ethic of state sovereignty?

Q1.4. The concept of “African solutions to African problem” appears to be ineffective in resolving internal conflicts in Africa necessitating the deployment of UN peacekeepers. In your view, why is it so? What can be done to effectively operationalize the concept of “African solutions to African problems?

## Section B. Objective Number 2

To analyse why UN peacekeeping missions in Africa, specifically in Somalia, Rwanda, DRC and Sudan have failed to attain the desired objectives.

Q2.1. Why have peacekeeping missions in Africa and more specifically in Somalia, Rwanda, DRC and Sudan failed to achieve the desired objectives of durable peace and security?

2.2. It has been observed that UN peacekeeping missions in Africa violate host nations' state sovereignty. What are your views regarding the ethical challenges associated with violation of state sovereignty with specific reference to the following countries?

- Somalia
- Rwanda
- DRC
- Sudan

Q2.4. What measures would you recommend for adoption in order to enhance the individual capacity of countries with internal conflict to be able to resolve their problems without UN peacekeeping interventions.

Q2.5 Who are the major beneficiaries of peacekeeping missions in Africa?

## Section C. Objective Number 3

To proffer scholarly and policy options and recommendations on how particularly in African states, with the UN mandate of responsibility to protect, can guarantee peace and security to their citizens rather than UN peacekeeping interventions.

Q3.1 Using UN peacekeeping experience in Somalia, Rwanda, DRC and Sudan, what ethical scholarly solutions can be suggested to enable African states to effectively guarantee peace and security to their citizens rather than depend on outside interventions?

Q3.2. In your view, what are the major ethical challenges that may be encountered in an effort to address the contradictions and dilemmas associated with state sovereignty and peacekeeping missions.

Q3.3 What long term suggestions can you proffer to minimize and ultimately eliminate the AU's over dependence on outside assistance that includes funding, material resources and peacekeepers in trying to implement the concept of "African solutions to African problems"?

Q3.4 In your view, what additional ethical policy solutions can be proffered to enable African states to guarantee effective peace and security to their citizens rather than depend on UN peacekeeping interventions in the future?

### Appendix 3: List of Interviewees

#### Ethiopia

Ambassador Mr Albert Ranganai Chimbindi, (Head of Zimbabwe Mission to Ethiopia) 08 September 2015.

Dr Ato Kwamena Onoma (Head African Centre for Peace and Security Training Institute of Security Studies), 12 September 2015, Addis Ababa.

Mr Simon Badza, (Political Officer, African Union Peace and Security Council), 09 September, 2015.

Lieutenant Colonel Mike Chipoyi (Special adviser AU Peace Support Centre), on 09 September 2015.

Mr Musifky Mwanasali (Special Adviser for Defence and Security: AU Headquarters) 12 September 2015.

Dr Gomesh (Senior Political Officer at AU Headquarters) 15 September 2015.

Dr. N. Mlambo (Expert in the Common African Defence and Security Policy (CADSP) Issues) on 23 September 2015.

#### South Africa

Mr Isaac Moyo, Ambassador (Head of Zimbabwe Mission in Pretoria) on 12 November 2015.

General (retired) Paulino Macarique, (Former Commander Mozambique Defence Forces, 15 November 2015.

#### Zimbabwe

Dr. Ibbo Mandaza (Political Analyst and Executive Director, SAPES Trust) 15 July 2015

Ambassador Maupanga (DRC Ambassador to Zimbabwe) 05 October 2015.

Lieutenant General M. Nyambuya (retired) (Former Deputy Force Commander in Somalia) on 13 October 2015.

Ambassador Boniface Chidyausiku (Former Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations) on 17 October 2015.

Ambassador Machivenyika Mapuranga (Former Zimbabwe's ambassador to the United States) on 19 November 2015.

Ambassador Mtetwa (Former Zimbabwe Ambassador to Ethiopia) on 25 November 2015.

General Constantino Guvheya Chiwenga (Commander Zimbabwe Defence Forces) 28 November 2015.

Ambassador Manzou (Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Zimbabwe) On 17 June 2015.

Professor Madhuku; (Dean Faculty of Law: University of Zimbabwe) on 18 August 2014.

Professor Manyeruke; (Dean Faculty of Social Sciences: University of Zimbabwe)

Professor J. Moyo, (Minister of Higher and Tertiary Education: Government of Zimbabwe)

Dr. R. Uriga (Great Zimbabwe University) 10 March 2014.

Dr. J. Mukusha (Great Zimbabwe University) 10 March 2014.

Colonel Masanganise (retired) (Former head of Zimbabwean peacekeeping contingent in Rwanda during the genocide) 11 March 2014.

And several serving officers who (requested to remain anonymous)served in UNAMIR during the Rwanda genocide