

INTERNATIONAL PEACE-KEEPING OPERATION: A BREACH OF INTERNATIONAL LAW ON SOVEREIGNTY OF STATES?*

Abstract

This article examines the legal implications of the international peace keeping operation on the sovereignty of states under International Law with insight into the meaning, origin, nature and structure of peace keeping operations. This work chronicled many peace-keeping operations already undertaken by the United Nations including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) peace keeping operation in Yugoslavia. It further examines whether the sovereignty principle accorded every independent state in International Law had been infringed by such peace keeping operations and came to conclusion that the peace keeping operation is legally justified under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, Self-defence; Resolution of the United Nations and Humanitarian intervention principle among others.

Introduction

The United Nations peace-keeping operation is a unique and dynamic instrument developed by the organization as an avenue to assist countries torn by conflict creates conditions for lasting peace. The first United Nations peace-keeping mission was established in 1948, when the Security Council authorized the deployment of the United Nations Military observers to the Middle East to monitor the Armistice Agreement between Israel and its Arab neighbours.¹ Since then, there had been a total of more than sixty four peace-keeping operations including the 2010 operations in Sudan, Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and 2011 intervention in Cote D'Ivoire to install Alassane Quattara as President.

Observer group activity was resumed after the wars of 1956, 1967 and 1973. The United Nations may engage in conflicts between states as well as in struggles within states. The United Nations acts as an impartial third party in order to prepare the ground for a settlement of the issues that have provoked armed conflict. If it proves impossible to achieve a peaceful settlement, the presence of the UN forces may contribute to reducing the level of conflict.²

The United Nations peace-keeping forces may only be employed when both parties to a conflict accept their presence. Accordingly they may also be used by the warring parties to avoid having conflict escalate and in the event also to have the combat called off.

The peace-keeping forces are subordinate to the leadership of the United Nations. They are normally deployed as a consequence of a Security Council decision. However, on occasion, the initiative has been taken by the General Assembly.³

* **I.O. Obijiaku** LLB(Hons) UNN, B.L. (Hons), LL.M; M.Sc (Pol.Sc) Unilag; Lecturer, Faculty of Law, Anambra State University, Igbariam Campus, Igbariam, Anambra State. 08033912693, E-mail ijglaw@yahoo.com

¹ <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping> accessed 1pm November, 10, 2010

² Fortna, Virginia” Does Peacekeeping keep peace” <http://nobllprice.org/noble-prices/peace/laureates/1988/un-history.html> accessed 7am November 15, 2010

³ Fortna Virginia *op cit* p.292

Operational control of the peace-keeping belongs to the Secretary-General and his secretariat.

The Definition and Nature of Peace keeping Operations

Peace-keeping is defined by the United Nations as “a unique and dynamic instrument developed by the organization as a way to help countries torn by conflict create the conditions for lasting peace.”⁴ It is distinguished from both peace building and peace making. International peace-keeping operations are intended to create peaceable relations by civil and military means. They are generally based on the United Nations mandate, and are as a rule guided by the principles of impartiality, the consent of the conflicting parties to the deployment of the peace-keeping troops and minimal use of force.⁵

We distinguish between two kinds of peacekeeping operations, namely unarmed observer groups and lightly-armed military forces. The latter are only allowed to employ their weapons for defence.⁶ The unarmed observer group is saddled with the responsibility of gathering information for the United Nations about the actual conditions prevailing in the area as to whether both parties adhere to an armistice agreement. The military force is entrusted with more extended tasks such as keeping the parties to a conflict apart and maintaining order in the area.⁷

The term “peacekeeping” is not found in the United Nations Charter. Dag Hammarskjöld, the second UN Secretary-General, referred to it as belonging to “Chapter Six and Half” of the Charter, placing it between traditional methods of resolving disputes peacefully, such as negotiation and mediation under chapter VI, and more forceful action as authorized under chapter VII.⁸

Peace-keeping is anything that contributes to the furtherance of peace process, once established. This includes but not limited to the monitoring of withdrawal by combatants from a former conflict area, the supervision of elections and the provision of reconstruction aid. Peacekeepers are often soldiers but they do not have to be. Similarly, while soldiers-peacekeepers are sometimes armed, they are not obligated to engage in combat.⁹

Peacekeepers were not at first expected to fight. As a general rule they are deployed when cease fire is in place and the parties to the conflict have given their consent. They are deployed to observe from the ground and report impartially on adherence to the ceasefire. This gives time and breathing space for diplomatic efforts to address the underlying causes of conflict. Thus, a distinction must be drawn between peacekeeping and other operations aimed at peace.¹⁰ A common misconception is that activities such as North Atlantic Treaty Organization, (*NATO*) intervention in the Kosovo war is peacekeeping operation, when it is in reality peace

⁴ United Nations peacekeeping (<http://www.Un.org/en/peacekeeping/> accessed 2pm 5/11/10

⁵ <http://www.ed.Admin/Ch/eda/en/home/topics/peasec/peac/intpo.html> accessed 2pm 5/11/10

⁶ *Ibid*

⁷ <http://en.Wikipedia.Org/wiki/peacekeeping> accessed 2pm 4/2/11

⁸ <http://www.tand.Co.uk/journals/titles/13533312.asp> accessed 2pm 4/2/11

⁹ <http://nobelprice.org> accessed 12/12/2010

¹⁰ United Nations peace keeping Fatalities By, year up to 31 December, 2008 (<http://www.un.org/dents/dpko/tataliteis/staes> by year% 201 pdf) accessed 2pm 5/11/10

enforcement. That is, since *NATO* was seeking to impose peace rather than maintain peace, it was not peace-keeper rather peace maker.¹¹

Aims and Scope of the International Peacekeeping Operation

International peacekeeping examines the theory and practice of peace-keeping as an instrument of policy at an international level. From a broad perspective, international peace-keeping reflects debates about peace building and monitoring of agreements, preventive deployment, sanctions, international policing, protection of aid in internal disputes and relationships between peacekeepers, state authorities, rival factions, civilians and non-governmental organizations.

The international peacekeeping is a veritable instruments in the areas of international politics, military studies, international law and development studies.¹²

The maneuvers and intrigues in the international peace-keeping effort underscore the world interests particularly that of the United States government. The collapse of the Soviet Union accentuates the United State dominance in the peace-keeping initiative just to maintain its grip on the world.

Process and Operational Structure of the International Peacekeeping Operations

Once a peace treaty has been negotiated, the parties involved might ask the United Nations for a peace-keeping force to oversee various elements of the agreed plan.

This is often done because a group, controlled by the United Nations is less likely to follow or tilt towards the interests of any one party, since it is controlled by many groups, namely the 15- member Security Council and the internationally-diverse United Nations secretariat.¹³

If the Security Council approves the creation of a mission, then the Department of peace-keeping operations begins planning for the necessary elements. At this point, the senior leadership team is selected. The department will then seek contributions from member nations. Since the UN has no standing force or supplies, it must form adhoc coalitions for every task undertaken. Doing so results in both the possibility of failure to form a suitable force and a general slowdown in procurement once the operation is in the field.¹⁴ Romeo Dallaire, force commander in Rwanda during the Rwandan Genocide, described the problems posed by the companion to more traditional military deployment thus;

He told me the UN was a “pull” system, not a “push” system like I had been used to with NATO, because the UN had absolute no pool of resources to draw on. You had to make a request for everything you needed and then you had to wait while that request was analysed for instance, soldiers everywhere have to eat and drink. In a push system food and water for the number of soldiers deployed is

¹¹ *Ibid*

¹² <http://en.wikipedia>. accessed 4/2/11

¹³ *Ibid*

¹⁴ R. Dallaire, **Shake Hands with the Devil**, Cambridge University press, USA: 2004 p.99-100

automatically supplied. In a pull system, you have to ask for those rations and no common sense seems to ever apply.¹⁵

The United Nations Peace-keeping mission has three power centres.¹⁶ The first is the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, the official leader of the mission. This person is responsible for all the diplomatic and political activity of the mission. The second is the Force Commander who is responsible for military forces deployed and the Administrative Officer.

What is Sovereignty of State in International Law?

The question raises another important question, what is “state” also in the international law? International law is predominantly concerned with the rights, duties and interests of States. The norms and rules of conduct that it prescribes are rules which States are to observe and treaties where applicable can only be signed by the States although individuals can qualify as a legal person under the international law.

States can be properly so called when they exhibit certain approved legal features such as permanent population, defined territory, government and capacity to forge relations with other States.¹⁷ These characteristics are not sacrosanct as some states are known to be deficient in some of them and yet they are recognized as such at the international fora. They may however possess all the features required and still remain unrecognized as states.¹⁸

According to Kelson, the concept of State is used to express in technical language legal situations in which individuals alone are bound to do certain acts or receive certain benefits in the name of the collectivity of human beings to which they belong. He further stated that there is no real distinction between State law and international law. Both systems bind individuals although international law as a matter of technique does so only immediately and through the concept of State.¹⁹

Political independence is an essential ingredient of statehood. It primarily means the legal power of the state to take decisions that is final as regards to its domestic matters whether relating to government policies, individuals or institutions without recourse to any external authority or influence. The International Court of Justice characterized independence in **Austro-German Customs Unions Case**²⁰ as “sole right of decision in all matters economic, political, financial or otherwise with the result that the independence is not violated.”

Independence is synonymous with sovereignty. In **Island of Palmas case**²¹, Judge Huber defined sovereignty thus;

Sovereignty in the relations between states signifies independence. Independence in regard to a portion of the

¹⁵ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/peace_keeping, accessed 5/6/11 at 1pm

¹⁶ U.O. Umzurike, **Introduction to International Law**, Spectrum Law Publishing, Benin, 1999 p.38

¹⁷ **Salimotto Co v Standard Oil Co of New York** (1933) 262 Ny22D

¹⁸ J.G. Stark, **Introduction to International Law**, 9th ed. Butter Worths, London, 1984 p.57

¹⁹ PCJ Ser. A/B (1931)

²⁰ 22 AJI (1928) 875

²¹ Coke, 4 inst. 36 cited in DD. Aihe and P.A. Oluyede, **Cases and Materials on Constitutional law in Nigeria**, Durapress Ltd, Ibadan, 1979, p.25

globe is the right to exercise therein to the exclusion of any other state the functions of a State.

Coke and Sir Erskine saw only the legislative sovereignty of a state as one that can be absolute which is in line with Judge Huber's though narrow in its concept.²² This all important attribute of a State is guarded by the United Nations in its Article 2 as follows:

All members (of the United Nations) shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.²³

The United Nations went further to strengthen the foregoing provisions on the sovereignty of independence states by making any infraction thereto a crime.²⁴

Although Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter is addressed to only the members of the United Nations, the prohibition on the use of force against a sovereign state from outside its territory by another state is now regarded as a principle of customary international law which binds every member of the international community. This position was approved by the International Court of Justice in the case concerning military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua.²⁵ The United Nations further tightens the noose on non-members of the United Nations in its Charter. It provides;

The organization shall ensure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.²⁶

Despite these provisions, Independent sovereign nations had witnessed and are still in the throes of invasion of their territories by the United Nations and other States in various devices to wit, wars, terrorism, counter-terrorism, feigned peace makers, economic sanctions and peace-keeping among others.

Is Peace-keeping operation justified under the inter-national law of non-intrusion in the internal affairs of an independent state?

Before this question is answered, one has to outline albeit in a summary manner some of the peace-keeping operations under the auspices or supervision of the United Nations or other regional bloc authorized or supported in through commission or omission by the world body.

²² Article 2 para 4 of the United Nations Charter.

²³ Article 19 of International Law Commission, ILC. Draft Articles.

²⁴ I.C.J. Reports, 1986 p.100

²⁵ Article 2(6) of the United Nations Charter

²⁶ Contribution to the United Nations Peace-keeping Operations (<http://www.un.org/depts/dpko/contributions/2008/moro8-1.pdf>) accessed 3.40pm 6/8/10

The first peace-keeping operation was launched in 1948. This mission, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (*UNTSO*), was sent to the newly created state of Israel where a conflict between the Israelis and Arab States over the creation of Israel had just reached a cease fire. The *UNTSO* remains in operation to this day although the Israeli-Palestine conflict has certainly not abated. Almost a year later, the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan, (*UNMOGIP*), was authorized to monitor relations between the two nations, which were split off from each other following the United Kingdom's decolonization of the India subcontinent.²⁷

As the Korean War entered a ceasefire in 1953, the United Nations forces remained along the Southern side of demilitarized zone until 1967 when American and South Korean forces took over.²⁸

There is a new dimension to peace-keeping since the cessation of cold war. The Security Council established a peace-keeping outfit whose trust among others is to enforce peace agreement between conflicting factions in intra state conflicts and civil wars. Peace-keeping moved principally to non-military elements like elections. The United Nations Department of Peace-keeping Operation was created in 1992, to support this increased demand for such mission.²⁹

On December 9, 1992, 1,800 United States marines landed in Mogadishu, Somalia, a spearhead of a multinational force aimed at restoring order in the conflict-ridden country. In early December 1992, the outgoing United States President, George Bush, sent the contingent of marines aforesaid to Mogadishu as part of a mission dubbed Operation Restore Hope backed by the United States troops, and international aid workers to restore peace and food distribution to the community.³⁰

In El Salvador and Mozambique, peace-keeping operations intervened successfully. It provided ways to achieve self-sustaining peace. The experience of Rwanda in 1994 genocide and 1995 massacre in Srebrenica, Bosnia and Herzegovia gave out the United Nation peace-keeping operation as not always answer to peace solving institution of the international community.³¹

The United Nations peace-keeping efforts as stated earlier have been in not less than one hundred and sixty nations since its inception in 1948. It has been in Congo in November, 1961, Eritrea in 2005 and it is presently in Afghanistan, Sudan, and Cote D'Ivoire in 2011 among other nations including North Atlantic Treaty Organization involvement in the Yugoslavian crisis.³² In Cote D'Ivoire the United Nations and African Union, *AU* are bent on removing Laurent Gbagbo and installing Allassane Quartarra at all costs using soldiers on peace-keeping operation.

²⁷ *Ibid*

²⁸ *Ibid*

²⁹ Phillip Nwosu, "U.S. Marine Storm Mogadishu, Somalia," **Nigeria Daily Sun Newspapers**, December 9, 2010 p.17

³⁰ "Monthly, Summary of Contributors to UN peacekeeping Operations" (<http://www.org/en/peacekeeping/contributors 2002/Sept 10 2.pdf>) IPDF

³¹ Dick A. Iecrdijk, *The United Nations and NATO in former Yugoslavia, 1991-1996 Limits to Diplomacy and Force*, the Hague: Netherlands Atlantic commission/Netherlands Institute of International Relations "Clingendael 1966.

³² Year Book of the United Nations, 1950, p.193-5

Justification of the International Peace-keeping Operations under International Law

Contemporary international law may prohibit the intrusion of another State or the United Nations or any other regional block in the internal affairs of the independent state but the superior interest of the world peace may compromise the rule. International law basically derives at controlling the use of force when meddling in the internal affairs of the independent or other states to attain its goals of creating and sustaining world peace and order. It is pertinent to state that there is a distinction between legitimate and illegitimate use of force. Nevertheless, prohibition of the use of force remains the general rule with the exceptions admitted by the international law which were clearly outlined.³³ In the international law, force does not only refer to armed force. It could be political, social or economic. A critical look at the provisions of Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter already reproduced reveal that the use of force mentioned under the Article does not foreclose other categories of force. This dichotomy also reflects the conflicting understanding of the meaning of 'force' by the developed and developing states. "The latter would have interpreted force to encompass economic and political force, while the former maintained that it was only armed force that was outlawed. In the **Nicaraguan case**, the International Court of Justice denied that American economic sanctions against Nicaragua constituted "a breach of the customary law principle of non-intervention".

Today, sovereignty of the independent states can legitimately be interfered with in the international law under the underlisted circumstances, namely;

- (a) Self-defence, either individual or collective, in accordance with Articles 51 and 53 respectively of the United Nations Charter.
- (b) Actions authorized by the Security Council under Chapter VII of its Charter and on its directive.
- (c) Collective measures taken under the auspices of the United Nations.
- (d) Humanitarian Intervention.

Peace-keeping operations fall within paragraph (a) (b) (c) and (d) above and therefore lawful under the international law. The Security Council of the United Nations has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security under Article 24(1) of the United Nations Charter. Under Chapter VII thereof, the Council is empowered to take actions and make recommendations in respect of threats to peace, breaches of peace and acts of aggression as determined by the Council, such measures may involve the use of force by air, sea, or land³⁴. Member Nations are obliged to contribute armed forces, facilities and transit right in furtherance of the peace-keeping initiatives of the United Nations. The economic relations, communications and diplomatic relations of the victim states may be tampered with in the course of the peace-keeping operation³⁵. Where there exists controversy within the Security Council over its primary role of securing world peace, the United Nations may work through the General Assembly exercising its general

³⁴ A.L. Raimi, "The Use of Force and Regional Arrangement in International Law: NATOS involvement in Former Yugoslavia" *op cit*, p.33

³⁵ IF. Lanterpachti, **The International Protection of Human Rights**, 1950 p.16

power to “discuss any questions or matters within the scope” of the Charter³⁶ and make recommendations and this includes matters relating to the maintenance of the international peace and security.³⁷ The United Nations encapsulated the circumstances under which it can evoke its superior powers over the Security Council to ensure and sustain world peace in its Uniting For Peace Resolution 377(v) of November 1950 as follows:

If the Security Council because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of peace or act of aggression in the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security. If not in session at the time, the General Assembly may meet in an emergency session within twenty-four hours of the request thereof. Such emergency special session shall be called if requested by the Security Council on the vote of any seven members, or by a majority of the members of the United Nations.³⁸

Although the principle of sovereignty is a shield to sovereign nations against external intrusion, the principle had been expanded to allow intrusion other than peace-keeping where the state leadership degenerates into gross human rights abuse. The right of humanitarian intervention was thus validated by many jurists though there were some dissents.³⁹

The meaning of intervention in this respect includes “dictatorial intervention amounting to a denial of the independence of a state. It implies peremptory demand which if not complied with involves a threat or recourse to compulsion”.⁴⁰ On the United States. intervention in Cuba in 1961 over its gross human rights abuse, the then United States “president, McKinley explained the situation thus;

We intervened because of humanity and to put an end to barbarous bloodshed, starvation and horrible miseries....⁴¹

Also, Britain, France, and Russian intervened in 1827 in the Greco/Turkish struggle in reaction to widespread atrocities against Christian minorities who were being exterminated from the community. In the case of Corfu Channel the court held that Albania was liable for the destruction of British lives and war-ships through

³⁶ Fitzgobbon, *Cuba and the United States, 1900-1935* p.12

³⁷ O. Umozurike *op cit* p. 202

³⁸ Article 14 United Nation Charter

³⁹ Article 14 *Ibid*

⁴⁰ ICJ Rep. (1966) p.22

⁴¹ U.O Umozurike *Ibid*

failure to notify of the presence of mines. It held that the obligation to notify was based “on certain general principles” *inter alia* “elementary consideration of humanity, even more exacting in peace than in war.”⁴²

The Charter of the International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg formulated a number of offences “against humanity namely, murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhuman acts committed against humans.”⁴³ This means that sovereignty of states can be compromised when one more crimes are committed under the above heading by the municipal government.

Further under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, a state can be attacked by an individual or collective states, the sovereignty of the independent state notwithstanding. The Charter provides as follows;

Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of the individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a member state of the United Nations until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain International Peace and Security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility to the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.⁴⁴

Although the inherent right referred to in the Article is not covered by the Charter but acknowledged as being customary, the Article formed the bases of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (*NATO*); intervention in Yugoslavia. It was against this background that the members of *NATO* have by Article 5 of North Atlantic Treaty Organization agreed that “armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them”.⁴⁵

Obviously, there is no definition of self-defence either in International Law or in International Customary Law but the traditional ground for self-defence stated in the correspondence between the former American Secretary of State, Webster and the then British Foreign Secretary, Ashburton in the **Caroline case** is instructive. It states;

There must be shown a necessity of self-defence, instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation (Nothing must be done that was) unreasonable or excessive, since the act, justified by the

⁴² Article 51 of the United Nations Charter

⁴³ D. A. Leurdijk, “The United Nations and *NATO* in former Yugoslavia 1991-1996, Limits to Diplomacy and Force,” The Hague: Netherlands Atlantic Commission/Netherlands Institute of Relations “Clingendel, 1996, p.462

⁴⁴ Cited in U.O. Umozurike, **Introduction to International Law**, *op cit* p.209

⁴⁵ Kaurim P.M. “War Stories, Narrative, Identity and Military Ethics” <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/peacekeeping> accessed 7/6/11

necessity of self-defence, must be limited by that necessity and kept clearly within.⁴⁶

Challenges of peace-keeping operations

International peace-keeping operation creates and sustains the world peace that was wrecked in the first and second world wars. It is a collective initiative of the world leaders underlined by the Charter of the United Nations.

The cost of peace-keeping especially since the end of the cold war has risen astronomically. In 1993, annual United Nations Peace-keeping cost peaked at \$3.6 billion.⁴⁷ By 1998, the cost dropped to under \$1 billion⁴⁸. With the resurgence of larger scale operations, cost for the United Nations peace-keeping rose to \$3 billion in 2001.⁴⁹ In 2004, the approved budget was \$2.8 billion, although the total amount was higher than that.⁵⁰ For the fiscal year which ended June 30, 2006, the United Nations peace-keeping costs were about US \$5.03 billion. All member states contribute to the costs under a formula that they themselves have established.

Apart from the huge cost of peace-keeping, there is some concern about the harm caused to troops as peace-keeping can be very stressful. The keepers are exposed to dangers caused by the warring parties and often in an unfamiliar climate. This gave rise to different mental health problems, suicide, and substance abuse as shown by the percentage of former peace keepers with those problems.⁵¹

There were reported cases of rapid increase in prostitution among peace-keepers in Cambodia, Mozambique, Bosnia and Kosovo. Furthermore, the oil-for-food programme of the peace-keeping operation suffered a widespread corruption and abuse. Throughout its existence, the programme was dogged by accusation that some of its profits were unlawfully diverted to the government of Iraq and to the United Nations officials.⁵²

Peace-keeping operations have also political undertone like the United Nations presence in Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan, Sudan and Cote D'Ivoire among others spearheaded by the United States government.

Media coverage of the peace-keeping operations is also inadequate and needs every segment of media from Nations taking part in the exercise to ensure balance and accurate reporting of events particularly Nigerian media.

Recommendations

- (i) The global peace is paramount to the world economic order in line with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of the United Nations. In consequence therefore, efforts should be made towards reformation of the Department of Peace-Keeping Operation in various Ministry of Foreign

⁴⁶ *Ibid*

⁴⁷ Worboys K, "The Traumatic Journey from Dictatorship to Democracy: Peace keeping Operations and Civil Military Petitions". (<http://www.Lielentrveys.Taini fi/cipunoita/2003-2/09.htm>) Retrieved 9-3-2007. accessed 1pm 7/11/10

⁴⁸ *Ibid*

⁴⁹ *Ibid*

⁵⁰ *Ibid*

⁵¹ "Oil-for-food chief 'took bribes'" (<http://news.Bbc.Co.Uk/2/hi/middle east/4131602.stm>) accessed 1pm 7/11/10

⁵² Dele Anofi, *The Nation Newspaper*, February 2, 2011 p.44

Affairs of the participating members. This will include increase in personnel, harmonization of the conditions of service of field and headquarters staff, development of guidelines and standard operating procedures and improving partnership arrangement between Department of Peace-Keeping Operations and the United Nations Development Programme, *UNDP*, *NATO*, African Union, *AU*, European Union, and regional and sub regional bodies or institutions.

- (ii) The Brahimi Report to strengthen Peace-Keeping Operation should be implemented.
- (iii) To avoid the disastrous delay as witnessed in Rwanda rapid reaction force should be instituted which force will include a standing group administered by the United Nations and deployed by the Security Council.
- (iv) The United Nations Secretariat should be restructured to empower the New Department of Field Support, (*DFS*).

Conclusion

Despite all the problems and short-comings of the peace-keeping operations, it is no doubt lawful and desirable in the present crisis-ridden world. It does not violate the doctrines of the sovereignty of states as states cannot thrive and practice their independence in isolation of the community of states that make up the international community. However, the world leaders particularly the developing states should be on their guard on the selfish interests of some countries like the United States and Britain when taking decisions on peace-keeping.

