

The background of the slide features a close-up of a globe showing the continents of Africa and Europe. In the foreground, a large, light-colored chess piece, possibly a king or queen, is visible on the left side. The overall lighting is soft, and the colors are muted, giving it a professional and academic feel.

ΚΕΔΙΣΑ KEDISA

ΚΕΝΤΡΟ ΔΙΕΘΝΩΝ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΙΚΩΝ ΑΝΑΛΥΣΕΩΝ  
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STRATEGIC ANALYSES

# **The Transformative Power of the United Nations Peacekeeping in the Protection of Civilians - Part 1**

**Evangelos Koulis**

**Research Paper No. 12**

# **The Transformative Power of the United Nations Peacekeeping in the Protection of Civilians**

## **Part 1**

**Evangelos Koulis**

**Analyst KEDISA**

**Research Paper No. 12**

### **Board of Directors**

Andreas Banoutsos, Founder and President  
Dr. Spyros Plakoudas, Vice President  
Omiros Tsapalos, Secretary General  
Giorgos Protopapas, Executive Director  
Argetta Malichoutsaki, Financial Officer  
Dimitris Kiouisis, Member of BoD  
Konstantinos Margaritou, Member of BoD

# **The Transformative Power of the United Nations Peacekeeping in the Protection of Civilians**

## **PART 2**

### **1. Introduction**

“It is the duty of an individual, moreover a soldier and a peacekeeper, to ensure the protection of a defenceless civilian population under imminent threat of physical violence. Avoiding this responsibility is to avoid one’s obligation to go to the assistance of someone whose life is under threat.”

(Former Force Commander, 2003 cited in OCHA, 2009: 227)

On 17<sup>th</sup> September 1999, a few years after the world witnessed the genocide in Rwanda (1994), ethnic cleansing in Bosnia (1995) and the tragic events in Somalia (1994), the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) passed Resolution 1265 on the Protection of Civilians (POC) in armed conflicts (UN, 1999). Before 1999, the United Nations (UN) repeatedly condemned atrocities towards non-combatants in armed conflicts. However, 1999 marks the year where the UN expressed a willingness to take robust measures to protect civilians and to explicitly address the issue within peacekeeping mandates (ibid). Having already admitted its responsibilities and criticised its own policies for failing to protect civilians in the past, the UNSC introduced Resolution 1265 to address this complex issue at a high policy level, and consequently at an operational level. Thus, until today, UN operations (e.g. Burundi (ONUB), Liberia (UNMIL), Sudan (UNAMID), the DRC (MONUC/MONUSCO) and others) have all been mandated under the Chapter VII to use ‘all necessary means’ to protect civilians in armed conflicts (Bellamy & Williams, 2011). These global events highlight an important shift that occurred in the international community with the UNSC responding to the systematic civilian atrocities with robust mandates to protect non-combatants (Wills, 2009; Hultman, 2013). Human protection has become the fundamental drive in the way which armed conflicts are being framed (ibid).

This essay examines how the UN has transformed its policies and operations in terms of responding to POC issues in armed conflicts after 1999. The term ‘transformative power’ refers to the effort of the UN to address, adapt, inform, and respond to the issue of protecting civilians in armed conflicts. Shifting away from notions of success and failure, the epitome of this essay is to trace the developments and the progression of POC policies/ theory and how they have been implemented in the field/ practice. To achieve this, this essay explores UN policy documents as well as the creation, interpretation, and implementation of three UN POC mandated missions since 1999: (i) the case of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) (MONUC) from 1999 until 2014, (ii) the peace operation in Ivory Coast (UNOCI) which commenced in 2004 and until 2014, and (iii) the case of the Libyan civil war in February 2011 which lasted for 11 months. All three case studies are analysed through focusing on the chronological implementation of POC mandates to trace the development of the UN POC policies and practices.

## **1.1 The Importance of POC Issues**

Exploring the POC issues in armed conflicts is by no means an obsolete issue. It consists of a colossal challenge for the world and it cuts to the core of the purpose of contemporary UN peace operations (OCHA, 2009; Stock, 2011). By 2009, approximately 100,000 UN peacekeeping personnel were operating under POC mandates aiming to reduce imminent threat of physical violence against non-combatants (OCHA, 2009). Additionally, POC issues have great repercussions for the existence of the UN as an organisation. On the one hand, the legitimacy and credibility the organisation exerts is subjected on its ability to provide security for civilians in peacekeeping missions. As Hurd (2002) argued the only practical power that the UN possess is its legitimacy which other actors confer to it. More importantly, the legitimacy of the UN is the utmost element towards building peace and security in war-torn countries. Failing to do so might lead the missions to falter or even collapse (OCHA, 2009). On the other hand, civilian protection mandates and the 'use all means necessary' phrase has sparked numerous debates within the UN and the academic world as it 'clashes' with the UN's peacekeeping principles (SCPO, 2013). Nevertheless, what is more pertinent regarding the POC issues in UN peace operations is the fact that systematic violence and mass atrocities against civilians still constitute a pressing phenomenon in various part of the globe. The mass atrocities against civilians in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Syria and the Gaza strip illustrate that two decades after Rwanda's genocide POC issues are still as relevant as they were then (ibid).

Drawing back in relation to this specific essay, POC issues demonstrating a transformative power of the UN seems to be either under-researched or not given enough attention in Academia. One reason for that is that a large number of researchers engage the issue in terms of how successful or unsuccessful each UN mission has been. Nonetheless, as this essay argues, judging by success or failure might not capture the progress made in the UN's policies and practices so far, as every armed conflict in unique (UN, 2014). Moreover, nowadays UN peace operations have come to signify a great array of tasks, from peace-building to civilian protection, making it obsolete to be judged as a whole. Thus, this essay seeks to fill an identified gap in the literature of peacekeeping and/or give a different perspective on how to analyse the UN missions beyond success and failure.

## **1.2 Organisation of the essay**

This essay is organised in four sections. Section II provides an overview of the terms peacekeeping and civilian protection and their history. Furthermore, it maps peacekeeping to the broader literature of International Relations, and situates the challenges that POC issues pose to the UN's peacekeeping principles. Section III will analyse both UN documents in terms of the development of POC policies and the aforementioned case studies to explore how the POC mandates and the UN's policies have been implemented. In Section IV, focus will be drawn on the findings of the

analysis and discuss whether the UN peacekeeping has a transformative power in terms of the progress of the POC policies and practices.

## **Section 2**

### **Peacekeeping and International Relations Literature**

Within this section, the most important and relevant academic resources relating to peacekeeping in relation to this essay's purpose are considered. The section is divided in three sections. A brief history of the UN peacekeeping alongside a differentiation between peacekeeping operations and peace-building, is presented in Part One. This is followed by an exploration of the theoretical perspectives on peacekeeping through the lenses of conflict resolution and International Relations (IR) theories, in Part Two. Thereafter, focus is drawn on the POC, elucidating its definition, types of operations, and their relation to the UN's fundamental peacekeeping principles.

#### **2.1 Defining Peacekeeping**

Peace operations consist of a wide range of peace missions performed by troops and organised by international and regional organisations, or multinational groupings. These can be traditional peacekeeping, robust peacekeeping, peacebuilding and peace observation missions (Diehl & Druckman, 2010). Given this multidimensional character of peace operations, this essay limits its scope to robust peacekeeping missions, composed by military personnel. Although the essay focuses on UN peacekeeping, it needs to be noted that UN peacekeeping missions are not static, nor comprised by UN troops only. To ensure that mandates are achieved, many other countries (e.g. the French mission Lancorne in Ivory Coast) or international and regional organisations (e.g. NATO intervention in Libya) accompany the UN on its missions. Unlike peacebuilding which epitomises on tasks like police training and monitoring elections, peacekeeping consists of UN missions in armed conflicts aiming to monitor cease-fires, separating hostile forces, and maintaining buffer zones to prevent violence and protect civilians (UN, 2000b). 'Robust' peacekeeping signifies a contemporary approach to peacekeeping missions after 1999. Peacekeeping rests on three fundamental principles, namely the consent of the parties involved in a conflict, impartiality, and the non-use of force except in self-defence and defence of the mandate (UN, 2014).

The literature on peacekeeping can be divided into three waves (Fortna & Howard, 2008). The first wave concerns the period between the creation of the UN in 1945 until the end of the Cold War where the UN was primarily a monitoring body between warring parties in armed conflicts (ibid). The second wave of peacekeeping is situated between the end of the Cold War until 1999. Drawing on the tragic events in Rwanda, Somalia, and Bosnia, academics during that period concentrated on the failures and dysfunctions of UN peacekeeping in providing security and preventing mass atrocities.

Generally, both the first and the second waves were somewhat negative or pessimistic towards the implications of peacekeeping in armed conflicts (ibid). The new millennium signifies the third wave in the academic literature. It is characterised by the application of more rigorous and systematic research methods to analyse peacekeeping missions in terms of their effectiveness, or successes and failures (ibid). Additionally, within the UN and Academia, the third wave is inextricably correlated with conceptual debates over peace enforcement, the legitimacy of the UN, and the relation between peacekeeping and peace-building.

## **2.2 Mapping United Nations' Peacekeeping to Theory**

### **2.2.1 Conflict Resolution Approaches**

Between the 1980's and 1990's the literature on peacekeeping increased more than 350%. Despite this increase though, as some prominent academics have argued, international peacekeeping still lacks a genuine theory (Paris, 2000; Featherston, 2000). For example, Featherstone (2000) argued that due to the limited theoretical underpinnings there is a lack of knowledge in terms of improving analysis, effectiveness, and successes in the field of peacekeeping. The lack of a main theory resides in the fact that to date most of the literature focuses on implementation and policy-related issues in peacekeeping (Paris, 2000). Thus, while the design, conduct, and outcomes of different peacekeeping operations have extensively been analysed, the conceptualisation of peacekeeping as a concept has been neglected (Bures, 2007).

One of the first attempts to conceptualise peacekeeping operations was made by Diehl in the early 1990's. Diehl's sought to find theoretical explanations looking at why peacekeeping missions were successful or not (Diehl, 1993). He concluded that peacekeeping operations were successful based on two standards comprised by several indicators, namely (i) limitations of armed conflicts, and (ii) conflict resolution (ibid). However, his criteria were criticised for 'measuring' peacekeeping based on an ideal notion of peace and conflict resolution (Johansen 1998). In 1998, Diehl, Druckman and Wall (1998) placed peacekeeping in a conflict resolution framework to enhance understanding and contribute to the resolution of conflicts. Additionally, Featherstone (1995) linked peacekeeping to conflict resolution, which is based on the idea of removing the roots of conflict to achieve long-lasting peace (Bures, 2007). Thus, the aim was to increase the effectiveness of intervention strategies in conflicts while linking the wider political contexts to the very specific (ibid).

In the late 1990's prominent academics raised serious questions regarding the fundamental ideas and the effectiveness between conflict resolution and peacekeeping in a post-Cold War era. For example, Shearer (1997) criticised conflict resolution arguing that most civil wars have been resolved by the victory of one side over the other and not by political negotiations. Similarly, Luttwak (1998) argued that war in itself can only resolve the political conflicts and create lasting peace, and instead of resolving conflicts, peacekeeping is actually exacerbating the effects of war. Clapham (1998) criticised the 'fundamentally misconceived' western perceptions of neutrality by arguing that in the case of Rwanda's genocide neutral bystanders facilitated the

conditions that allowed extremists to organise the genocide. Lastly, Duffield (1997a; 1997b) denounced the assumptions of conflict resolution approaches towards civil wars and concluded that Western-style interventions are a new form of imperialism to regulate Third World countries.

### **2.2.2 Peacekeeping and International Relations Theory**

Until the 21<sup>st</sup> century although many authors linked international norms, values, and rules to international politics (Johansen 1998; Langille 2002), only a few explicitly utilised IR theories to broaden the scope of peacekeeping. Influenced by the narratives of postmodern critical theories, some academics questioned conflict resolution approaches and their relevance to peacekeeping in the post-Cold War era. Although critical theory is an ‘umbrella’ for many theories, in terms of peacekeeping, authors like Duffield (1997b), Richmond (2001), Paris (2002, 2004) and Bellamy (2004) are similar in their critical stance against liberal peace theory and conflict resolution. In their view, liberal peace operations strengthen political, social and economic structures that create and exacerbate armed conflicts (Bellamy, 2004).

For Paris (2000:44) “students of peace operations apparently preoccupied with the practical problem of improving the effectiveness of future missions have neglected broader macrotheoretical questions about the nature and significance of these operations for our understanding of international politics”. Paris dichotomised the theoretical underpinnings of peacekeeping in ‘microtheories’ and ‘macrotheories’, which are currently limited (Paris, 2000). ‘Microtheories’ monopolised the literature in peacekeeping until the late 1990’s, are based on conflict resolution, and have a limited scope of inquiry. Examples of such theories consist of Stedman’s (2000) study on the role of intransigent local parties (“spoilers”) and Zartman’s (1997) concept of “mutually hurting stalemate”.

Alternatively, Bellamy (2004) and Pugh (2004) proposed a deconstruction of peacekeeping operations based on a critical theory view of the world. Building on Cox’s classification (1981), Bellamy (2004) dichotomised the theoretical framework that governs peacekeeping operations in ‘problem-solving’ and ‘critical’ theories. Their views on the three issues below differentiate these two theories.

1. *Purpose*: Whereas problem-solving theories are based on implicit normative assumptions, critical theories have an explicit normative agenda.
2. *The view of the world*: Problem-solving theories retain an objectivist view of the world treating problems as pre- given, whereas critical theories perceive them as socially constructed.
3. *The connection between theory and practice*: While problem-solving theories neglect this dynamic, critical theories deconstruct dominant theories and seek for alternatives (Bures, 2007).

Bellamy (2004) argued that although somewhat useful for future actions, problem-solving approaches restrict the scope of creative thinking and practice. On the contrary, critical theories seek to interrogate dominant liberal approaches and are based on ideas promoting human security and/or emancipation (ibid). Although highly contested by academics (Paris 2000; Thomas and Tow 2002), the notion of emancipation, “understood as the freeing of individuals from constraints that prevent them pursuing their own vision of the good life in ways that do not inhibit others from doing likewise” (Bellamy 2004: 26), is a key element for critical theorists (Bures, 2007). For Pugh (2004), critical theories offer many alternatives (e.g. more focus on social responsibility and local public authorities, broader social participation, regulation of corporations and better control of capital and investment). However, for all these to be achieved, peacekeeping needs to move away from the state-centric system and become a permanent military volunteer force recruited directly from individuals (ibid). This will result in a more accountable, democratic, and transparent missions (ibid).

Lastly, Vayrynen (2004) a postmodern feminist, critiques the current state of international peacekeeping. Peacekeeping, according to her, has contributed to the marginalisation of women based on gender. She argues that the recent attempts of the UN to integrate gender discourse in peace operations are futile as it is the UN that “produces certain types of femininities and masculinities as hegemonic” (Vayrynen 2004: 125). To alter this constructed way of thinking, Vayrynen (2004) proposes stronger engagement between the UN and non-governmental organisations (NGO’s) and more openness towards ‘voices’ of masculinity and femininity from the Islamic world.

Both conflict resolution approaches and IR theories offer important perspectives in international peacekeeping. However, whereas “microtheories” offer a limited scope of inquiry and mainly focus on informing policy-makers, “macrotheories” seem to go too far when it comes to very specific issues like the POC. Given the huge diversity in key issues like definition, categorisation, conceptualisation, and criteria to evaluate peacekeeping missions, a mid-range theory might be a most realistic ‘solution’ to bridge the vast ‘gap’ between ‘microtheories’ and ‘macrotheories’ (Bures, 2007).

## **2.3 The Protection of Civilians Concept: Definition, Theory and Measurement**

Having explored the theoretical perspectives on peacekeeping the focus is now drawn to the POC issues, the challenges they pose to UN peacekeeping principles and the complexity of judging by success and failure.

### **2.3.1 Defining the Concept of Protection of Civilians**

As stated in Section 1, 1999 marks a fundamental shift in how the global security agenda framed the issue of civilian casualties in armed conflicts (Carpenter, 2005). This shift in rethinking the role of UN peacekeeping missions is rooted in the tragic events in Rwanda and Bosnia, which depicted the inability of the UN to live up to its ambitions



(Wills, 2009). UNAMSIL in Sierra Leone in 1999, mandated to protect civilians, constitutes the first example of this shift. Before 1999 peacekeeping missions did contain human rights components in their mandates. However, it was almost unthinkable for a mission to have the POC as a core objective (Bellamy & Williams, 2004). Today the POC retains a central concern for most international and regional peace operations like NATO and the African Union (AU) (Lilly, 2012). This is because despite the dramatic decrease in the number of deaths and casualties in armed conflicts, the number of civilian deaths has significantly risen (ibid). Despite the prominence of the POC concept in the last 15 years there is no UN accepted definition for the concept. Even the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) in its 'Operational Concept on the Protection of Civilians' adopted in 2010 did not include one (OCHA, 2009). Nevertheless, independent UN studies have shown that the POC is usually associated with the 'protection of civilians from imminent threat of physical violence' (ibid).

In practice, the POC concept in the context of UN peacekeeping operations is easier to conceptualise. Peacekeeping operations have specific tasks aimed at protecting civilians in armed conflicts. These tasks are: (i) physical protection of non-combatants, (ii) facilitation of security conditions for humanitarian assistance, (iii) human rights monitoring, (iv) child protection, and (v) sexual abuse protection (Lilly, 2012). The POC concept can be dichotomised into 'proactive' and 'reactive' or alternatively into 'direct' and 'indirect' measures of protection. Both strands are based on military protection of civilians. Direct or proactive protection implies peacekeepers' actions designed to protect civilians under imminent threat, such as patrolling, and guarding and demilitarising camps for refugees and internally displaced persons (IDP) (Bellamy Williams & Griffin, 2010). Indirect or reactive measures of protection concentrate on the establishment of a safer environment for civilians in armed conflict. Although seemingly vague, they are very important as they entail actions like disarmament, demobilisation, and enforcement operations against groups that threaten the lives of civilians (ibid). Whilst in theory the aforementioned dichotomisation is significant, it is imperative to argue that in real-life combat situations the lines are not clear-cut. As the UN's 'Peacekeeping Principles and Guidelines' of 2008, better known as the 'Capstone Doctrine' observed, UN peacekeepers are often required to have an active role in contemporary missions including enforcement of action to protect civilians (Lilly, 2012).

Furthermore, it is important to note that although the UN's role is catalytic, it does not and cannot 'own' the concept. Civil-military coordination and partnerships are seminal aspect of POC missions (Rofle, 2011; UN/DPKO, 2008). United Nations, humanitarian agencies, and NGO's also undertake a broad range of activities in support of the POC. Close coordination with these actors is therefore essential (ibid). This is not to say that the UN transfers its responsibilities of protecting the civilians to other organisations or states. On the contrary, it means that its resources, intelligence, and peacekeepers alone cannot be everywhere to protect every living human being in an armed conflict (Lilly, 2012).

Finally, a contextualisation of the POC concept would be inadequate without referring to the UN principle of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). R2P was adopted at the 2005

World Summit. It rests on three equally important and non-sequential pillars: (i) states have the primary responsibility to protect their population from crimes such as genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity; (ii) the international community has a responsibility to assist states to fulfil their responsibilities; and (iii) where states manifestly fail to protect their population from these crimes, the international community has a responsibility to take timely and decisive action (Bellamy, 2010). Despite the disagreements and criticisms referring to R2P as dangerous and imperialistic for states' sovereignty, R2P remains an important principle. It has served as an important diplomatic language tool for governments, international organisations, and NGO's demanding action in cases of humanitarian emergencies (ibid). The prominence of R2P in the international community has increased the role for the UN peacekeeping missions to protect civilians, especially in situations of intra-state armed conflicts (SCPO, 2013). Although R2P and the POC concept are similar they should not be equated. One major difference between the two is that R2P serves as a tool for the UN to influence and remind states and the international community of their responsibilities in a given situation (Bellamy & Williams, 2004). On the contrary, POC is more operationally focused on specific UN peacekeeping missions' mandates.

### **2.3.2 The Protection of Civilians Concept and the Challenges to the United Nations' Principles**

Although the POC concept signifies an important positive shift in how armed conflicts are framed by the UN (ibid), it has raised issues with some of the UN's fundamental principles. Either at a policy level or at an implementation level, POC mandates have shown a conflicting relationship with the UN peacekeeping principles of impartiality, neutrality, and sovereignty, sparking issues of legitimacy for the UN as a whole.

As noted above, UN peacekeeping rests on the principles of impartiality, non-use of force, and the consent of the state. Impartiality was first introduced in 1957 by Dag Hammarskjöld in a report on the UN Emergency force I (Yamashita, 2008). According to the report, the use of force should be: "impartial, in the sense that it does not serve as a means to force settlement, in the interests of one party, of political conflicts or legal issues recognized as controversial" (Findlay, 2002: 29). Thus, based on the aforementioned quote, impartiality at that time was generally understood as neutrality and equidistance of the UN peacekeepers in a conflict (Yamashita, 2008). The UN peacekeepers had to use force only in cases of self-defence. The conceptual understanding of impartiality as equal to neutrality drastically changed during the 1990's. First, the events of Bosnia, Rwanda, and elsewhere generated heavy criticism over the inability of the UN to protect civilians in situations where genocide was imminent and there was a sense of impunity for the perpetrators of such crimes. Second, during the same period, the UN peacekeeping came to signify more than just monitoring tasks. This evolution of peacekeeping into a multidimensional mode of international involvement in humanitarian crises, led the UN to authorise mandates under Chapter VII to use 'all necessary means' and revisit the principle of impartiality (ibid).

The 2000 report by the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations chaired by Lakhdar Brahimi was the beginning of the ‘new impartiality’ (ibid). The report reaffirmed the importance of the UN peacekeeping principles but it re-introduced impartiality. Brahimi argued that impartiality meant adherence to the principles of the Charter and to the objectives of the mandate and distinguished it from neutrality, which means equal treatment of all parties in all cases (UN, 2000a: viii). Brahimi further argued, “where one party to a peace agreement clearly and incontrovertibly is violating its terms, continued equal treatment of all parties by the United Nations can in the best case result in ineffectiveness and in the worst may amount to complicity with evil” (ibid). Thus, based on the new conceptual basis of impartiality as loyalty to the mission’s mandate, peacekeepers were enabled to use force against those who act contrary to the mandates and the UN principles (Yamashita, 2008). Additionally, a number of commentators and analysts expanded this distinction between impartiality and neutrality. For example, Donald (2002) distinguished between impartiality as an active and independent action based on a judgement of a situation and neutrality as more passive limited actions and abstention from the conflict. Others distinguished impartiality and neutrality arguing that “being neutral means that you stand there and you say well, I have nothing to do with it”, while being impartial means that “you stand there, you judge the situation as it is and you take charge” (Jackson, 2007: 1).

In the post-Brahimi era this ‘new impartiality’ was translated into robust mandate implementation and helped frame armed conflicts as POC issues. However, it also created complexities and issues of legitimacy, as it seems to contravene with the rest of the UN’s fundamental principles. The inclusion of the “adherence to the principles of the Charter” in the ‘new impartiality’ definition seems to have complicated the issue (Yamashita, 2008). The ‘new impartiality’, advocates in favour of the use of force when the situation demands it and potential interference in the balance of power in a conflict. However, this contravenes with the UN’s principle of using force only in self-defence. Additionally, in the case of Libya in 2011, the increased willingness of the UN to use force for the POC complicated the issue even more as it acted against the consent of the state. Whilst this ‘new politics of protection’ (Bellamy & Williams, 2011) signifies a commitment of the UN to respond to human protection issues, it raised legitimacy issues. The willingness to use force raised fears over the UN becoming a Western-led hegemonic or interventionist force to manipulate post-conflict societies (Andreopoulos, 2010).

These normative concerns depict a sword of Damocles that hangs over the UN today. On the one hand, where civilians remain at risk, peace and security is unsustainable and the credibility and legitimacy of the UN as a whole is being challenged (OCHA, 2009). On the other, a willingness to use robust mandate in peacekeeping operations raises concerns over its legitimacy to act beyond state sovereignty.

### 2.3.3 Evaluating Peacekeeping Operations

This essay seeks to explore whether the POC concept in peacekeeping operations after 1999 can be seen as a continuous effort by the UN to improve and respond to civilian atrocities. In doing so, it moves away from techniques that evaluate peacekeeping missions judging by their success and failure. However, it is seminal justify this choice. As this section will demonstrate, until today although a number of academics have sought to find the 'golden ratio' of a successful peacekeeping operation, there is little consensus on what constitutes a successful peacekeeping operation, let along the best criteria to judge one as successful (Bures, 2007).

One of the first attempts to explore the issue of success and failure in peacekeeping operations was made by Diehl (1993). For Diehl, a successful peacekeeping operation consisted of two main criteria: (i) one that prevents the renewal of warfare and at the same time limits the deaths and atrocities in a conflict; and (ii) one that facilitates the resolution of the armed conflict by political means (ibid). To determine that, Diehl considered three factors in a number of case studies: (i) the characteristics of the peacekeeping force; (ii) the nature of the mission (e.g. the mandate under which it was authorised) itself; and (iii) the political and military context along with an analysis of the actors taking part in a conflict (ibid). Although Diehl's criteria and factors were useful, they did not provide any hardcore data that could lead to a new theoretical explanation. Furthermore, his work has been criticised as being too idealistic in the way he perceived peace and conflict resolution (Johansen 1998).

Other examples of criteria put forward by academics in seeking what constitutes a successful mission are:

1) *The successful fulfilment of the peacekeeping mandate* (Bratt 1996). Despite the fact that this consists of a useful guide of judging by success and failure, this criterion has been criticised on the basis of not being able to accommodate other exogenous factors that might occur in a mission beyond the mandate (Druckman & Stern, 1999). Moreover, specific accomplishments of the mission still leave open the question of how many specific achievements are needed for a peacekeeping operation to be successful (ibid).

2) *The contribution of peacekeeping to larger values* (Pushkina 2006). These values can be world peace, and prevention of human suffering and justice. This criterion is useful, but too idealistic and it would be very difficult to 'measure' the success of peacekeeping and the UN as a whole based on these values.

3) *The impact of the peacekeeping mission to the local population* (Durch 1995). As Bures (2007) argues that whilst this is an important criterion, it raises the question of 'compared to what'. Furthermore, according to Druckman and Stern (1999), this criterion ignores the wider political processes.

What all the above criteria demonstrate is a lack of consensus on what constitutes a successful operation. Despite the usefulness of such attempts when considering UN peacekeeping missions, the POC concept is even harder to be 'measured' as there can be no absolute criteria when the issue is human lives. Since the only absolute fact is that civilian casualties occur in every conflict, for such a criterion to exist one would

need to clarify how many civilian deaths constitute a success. Are 1,000 civilian deaths a failure? Or is it a success if one calculates that instead 500,000 civilians were saved? What these cynical questions portray is how futile such a criterion would be when considering people's lives. Without dismissing the importance of efforts to judge peacekeeping missions by success and failure, this essay re-situates the focus on how and whether the peacekeeping POC mandates have been transformed since 1999 at a policy and implementation level. Thus, this essay epitomises on exploring the UN policy and implementation developments to respond to POC issues rather than judging whether they were successful or not.

## REFERENCES

- Andreopoulos, G. (2010) 'Collective security and the responsibility to protect', In: Peter G Danchin & Horst Fischer ed. 2010, *United Nations Reform and the New Collective Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bellamy, A.J. (2004) 'The "Next Stage" in Peace Operations Theory?', *International Peacekeeping*, 11(1), pp. 17–38.
- Bellamy, A.J. (2010) 'The Responsibility to Protect — Five Years On', *Ethics & International Affairs*, 24(2), pp. 143-169.
- Bellamy, A.J. & Williams, P.D. (2004) 'Conclusion: What future for peace operations? Brahimi and beyond', *International Peacekeeping*, 11(1), pp. 183-212.
- Bellamy, A.J. & Williams, P.D. (2011) 'The new politics of protection? Côte d'Ivoire, Libya and the responsibility to protect', *International Affairs*, 87(4), pp. 825-850.
- Bellamy, A.J., Williams, P.D. & Griffin, S. (2010) 'Understanding Peacekeeping', 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Polity Press.
- Bratt, D. (1996) 'Assessing the Success of UN Peacekeeping Operations', *International Peacekeeping*, 4(4), pp. 64–81.
- Bures, O. (2007) 'Wanted: A Mid-Range Theory of International Peacekeeping', *International Studies Review*, 9, pp. 407-436.
- Carpenter, C.R (2005) 'Women, children, and other vulnerable groups: Gender, strategic frames and the protection of civilians as a transformational issue', *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(2), pp. 295–334.
- Clapham, C. (1998) 'Rwanda: The Perils of Peacemaking', *Journal of Peace Research*, 35, pp. 193–210.
- Cox, R. (1981) 'Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', *Millennium*, 10(2), pp. 126–155.
- Diehl, P.F. (1993) 'International Peacekeeping', Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, p. 3.
- Diehl, P.F, Druckman, D. & Wall, J. (1998) 'International Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution: A Taxonomic Analysis with Implications', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42, pp. 33–55.
- Diehl, P.F. & Druckman, D. (2010) 'Evaluating Peace Operations', Lynne Rienner Pub, 1st edition.
- Donald, D. (2002) 'Neutrality, Impartiality and UN Peacekeeping at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century', *International Peacekeeping*, 9(4), pp.26–7.
- Druckman, D. & Stern, P.C (1999) 'Perspectives on Evaluating Peacekeeping Missions', *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 4(1), pp. 79-86.

Duffield, M. (1997a) 'Evaluating Conflict Resolution Contexts, Models, and Methodology', In: Sorbo, G.M., Macrae, J. and Wohlegemuth, L., *NGOs in Conflict – An Evaluation of International Alert*, Bergen, Norway: Chr. Michelsen Institute.

Duffield, M. (1997b) 'NGO Relief in War Zones: Towards an Analysis of the New Aid Paradigm', *Third World Quarterly*, 18, pp. 527–542.

Durch, W.J. (1995) 'UN Peacekeeping, American Politics, and the Uncivil Wars of the 1990s', New York: St. Martin's Press.

Featherston, A.B. (1995) 'Towards a Theory of United Nations Peacekeeping', New York: St. Martin's Press.

Featherston, A.B. (2000) 'Peacekeeping, Conflict Resolution, and Peacebuilding: A Reconsideration of Theoretical Frameworks', In: Ramsbotham, O. and Woodhouse, T. ed. 2000, *Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution*, Portland, OR: Frank Cass.

Fortna, V.P. & Howard, L.M. (2008) 'Pitfalls and Prospects in the Peacekeeping Literature', *Political Science Annual Review*, 11(1), pp. 283-301.

Hultman, L. (2013) 'UN peace operations and protection of civilians: Cheap talk or norm implementation?', *Journal of Peace Research*, 50(1), pp. 59–73.

Hurd, I. (2002) 'Legitimacy, power, and the symbolic life of the UN Security Council', *Global Governance*, 8(1), pp. 35–51.

Jackson, P. (2007) 'When the Gloves of Peace Come Off', *BBC online*, [online], 18 April, p.1, Available at: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in\\_depth/6542399.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in_depth/6542399.stm) (Accessed 2 July 2016).

Johansen, R.C. (1998) 'Enhancing United Nations Peace-Keeping', In Alger, T. ed 1998, *The Future of the United Nations System: Potential for the Twenty-First Century*, Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Langille, P.H. (2002) 'Bridging the Commitment-Capacity Gap: A Review of Existing Arrangements and Options for Enhancing UN Rapid Deployment', Wayne, NJ: Center for UN Reform Education.

Lilly, D. (2012) 'The Changing Nature of the Protection of Civilians in International Peace Operations', *International Peacekeeping*, 19(5), pp. 628-639.

Luttwak, E.N. (1998) 'Give War a Chance', *Foreign Affairs*, 78(4), pp. 36–44.

OCHA (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs), (2009), 'Protecting Civilians in the Context of UN Peacekeeping Operations: Successes, Setbacks and Remaining Challenges', United Nations, [online], p. 227, Available at: <https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/Protecting%20Civilians%20in%20the%20Context%20of%20UN%20Peacekeeping%20Operations.pdf> (Accessed 10 April 2016).

- Paris, R. (2000) 'Broadening the Study of Peace Operations', *International Studies Review* 2(3), pp. 27–44.
- Paris, R. (2002) 'Peacebuilding in Central America: Reproducing the Sources of Conflict?', *International Peacekeeping*, 9(4), pp. 39–68.
- Paris, R. (2004) 'At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict', Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pushkina, D. (2006) 'A Recipe for Success? Ingredients of a Successful Peacekeeping Mission', *International Peacekeeping*, 13, pp. 133–149.
- Pugh, M. (2004) 'Peacekeeping and Critical Theory', *International Peacekeeping*, 11, pp. 39–58.
- Richmond, O. (2001) 'A Genealogy of Peacemaking: The Creation and Re-Creation of Order', *Alternatives*, 26(3), pp. 317–348.
- Rolfe, J. (2011) 'Partnering to Protect: Conceptualizing Civil–Military Partnerships for the Protection of Civilians', *International Peacekeeping*, 18(5), pp.561–76.
- SCPO (Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations), (2013) 'Purview of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations', [pdf], [http://www.amun.org/uploads/Handbooks/2013/issues/Issues\\_Ch5\\_SCPKO.pdf](http://www.amun.org/uploads/Handbooks/2013/issues/Issues_Ch5_SCPKO.pdf) (Accessed 20 March 2017).
- Shearer, D. (1997) 'Exploring the Limits of Consent: Conflict Resolution in Sierra Leone', *Millennium*, 26, pp. 845–860.
- Stedman, S.J. (2000) 'Spoiler Problems in Peace Processes', In: Stern, P.C. And Druckman, D. ed 2000, *International Conflict Resolution after the Cold War*, Washington, DC: National Academic Press.
- Stock, C. (2011) 'New Horizons and Old Problems for UN Peacekeeping', *Friedrich Ebert Stiftung*, pp. 1–14.
- Thomas, N. & William, T. (2002) 'The Utility of Human Security: Sovereignty and Humanitarian Intervention', *Security Dialogue*, 33, pp.177–192.
- United Nations, (1999) 'Security Council resolution 1265', 17 September, S/RES/1265.
- United Nations, (2000a) 'Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations', A/55/305-S/2000/809, p.viii.
- United Nations, (2000b) 'We the Peoples', United Nations: New York.
- United Nations, (2014) 'Protection of Civilians', [online], Available at: <https://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/issues/civilian.shtml> (Accessed 30 February 2017).
- UNDPKO (United Nations, Department for Peacekeeping Operations), (2008) 'United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines', New York: UN DPKO.



Wills, S. (2009) 'Protecting Civilians: The Obligations of Peacekeepers', Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vayrynen, T. (2004) 'Gender and UN Peace Operations: The Confines of Modernity', *International Peacekeeping*, 11, pp. 125–142.

Yamashita, H. (2008) '“Impartial” Use of Force in United Nations Peacekeeping', *International Peacekeeping*, 15(5), pp. 615-630.

Zartman, I.W. (1997) 'Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques', Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace Press.