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Purpose

An increasingly globalized society has made practicing effective conflict resolution crucial in maintaining balance and security within the international community. Countries can no longer afford to stand alone and declare themselves immune from conflicts occurring thousands of miles away, as the stability of one country can affect the stability of many. One of the largest threats to international peace and security today is the conduct of belligerent non-governmental actors within a state, and it is in conditions of internal chaos that these actors flourish. Therefore, it is important that we turn our attention to the ways in which intrastate conflicts can be successfully resolved.

Civil wars that are brought to an end through negotiated settlements usually require some sort of international organization to oversee the peace process. Usually this duty includes monitoring a cease-fire agreement, or if a peace agreement has been reached, overseeing its implementation (Greig et al. 2005). Given that the main purpose of peacekeeping missions is to “prevent resumption of civil conflict” (Fortna, 2004, 271), peacekeeping, especially United Nations (UN) peacekeeping, has become the most common and sought after form of conflict intervention (Howard 2008). However, a distinction must be made between peacekeeping missions in the pre and post-Cold War eras, because UN peacekeeping missions have changed greatly, both in size and scope, since they were first formally deployed in 1956 (Bellamy et al. 2004). The end of the

---

1 It is important to note here that the UN is not the only organization that partakes in peacekeeping operations. Other organizations, such as NATO, and various regional bodies, also conduct their own peacekeeping missions. However, for the purposes of this project, I am going to focus on UN peacekeeping, because it is the most widely used organization.
Cold War marked a stark change in the conduct of international conflict, and this was mirrored by a change in the way peacekeeping missions were carried out.

The evolution of peacekeeping in and of itself is an interesting phenomenon to examine, and is worth briefly exploring here. First, peacekeeping is not explicitly mentioned in the UN Charter, and therefore was not one of the original tasks the UN was charged with performing (Wills, 2009). However, the UN believed there were instances, mainly involving disputes between states, where it could be of some assistance in bringing about peace. Therefore, using Chapter VI of the UN Charter, which calls for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes (which will be addressed more fully later), the UN began deploying small groups of peacekeepers to various regions, to help with such duties as overseeing ceasefire agreements, or monitoring the implementation of peace accords. The UN was relatively successful at these tasks, because it was a neutral body that was there to make sure fighting and violence did not break out between groups of people who wanted peace.

Although still present in the post-Cold War era, interstate wars are far less common, and have come to be replaced by intrastate disputes (Jett 1999). Unlike missions in the pre-Cold War era, where, as previously mentioned, the main goal would have been to quell the violence between two states in an interstate dispute (also known as traditional peacekeeping), peacekeepers are now asked to become much more involved, and essentially act as nation builders, thus partaking in multidimensional peacekeeping. Multidimensional peacekeeping usually requires peacekeepers to perform such tasks as monitoring elections, building a civilian police force, distributing humanitarian aid, reforming the justice system, etc. This is in sharp contrast to the type of peacekeeping
activities the UN was originally designed to handle, and when the UN began to use multidimensional peacekeeping with relative regularity in the 1990s, it encountered some of its worst failures to date. These failures not only tarnished the reputation of the organization, but also called into question its usefulness and overall abilities in the area of peacekeeping.

While it is true that not every UN mission has been successful, it is also true that UN peacekeeping has experienced its fair share of accomplishments. This raises the question, why does the UN sometimes succeed, but other times, fails miserably? This is a question worth answering for two reasons. First, UN peacekeeping missions require large amounts of money and resources. The UN is an extremely large and expensive organization, and peacekeeping alone can cost anywhere from millions, to even billions, of dollars per mission (un.org). This means that when peacekeeping missions are unsuccessful, money, resources, and the lives of some of the peacekeepers are essentially wasted. Therefore, it is in every country’s interest to try to make sure all necessary conditions for successful peacekeeping are met before deployment, because then money and resources can be used wisely, and lives of deployed peacekeepers will not be sacrificed in vain. Secondly, as previously suggested, the condition of a failed state can provide breeding grounds for terrorism, piracy, human rights violations, or any number of other dangerous or illegal activities. By learning under what conditions UN peacekeeping is most effective, the Security Council can do its best to create those necessary conditions. If the mission is then able to succeed, there will be one less state with the potential for disrupting international peace and security.
It is with these considerations in mind that I aim to look at the effectiveness of UN post-Cold War peacekeeping missions. Specifically, I am looking at the combined effect of five independent variables on the level of success of the mission. I want to know what the effect is of the presence or absence of these variables, in conjunction with each other, on the level of success the mission experiences. The five variables whose impact I will investigate are the cooperation of the combatants during the mission, the clarity of the mission, scope of the mission mandate, adequacy of resources (including equipment and funding), and the mission’s command and control capabilities.

Literature Review

Much research has been done to examine what factors influence the outcome of a mission, and several factors have been identified as the sources of success or failure. I have created six broad categories that include what many scholars believe to be the most important of these factors. They are the rules of peacekeeping, Security Council interests, aspects of the mandate, resources, command and control capabilities, and personnel competence. In the following section I will address each of these factors individually.

Rules of Peacekeeping

Traditionally there have always been three cardinal rules of peacekeeping: peacekeepers may only intervene in situations in which the government of the host country gives consent; the peacekeepers must maintain impartiality in the conflict; and the use of force can only occur in situations requiring self-defense. Scholars have generally believed that for a mission to be successful, these rules must be followed.
While it is true that traditional peacekeeping would have required adherence to these rules, the nature of current intrastate conflicts has led many scholars to argue that it is actually necessary for some of these rules to be broken in order for a mission to succeed (Matheson [2006] and Jett [1999]). Jett states that “while [these rules] may have been true in classical peacekeeping efforts in interstate conflicts, there is reason to doubt these assumptions in today’s intrastate wars” (38). Matheson also points to the shortcomings associated with each rule, finally reaching the conclusion that in today’s wars, it is indeed sometimes necessary to break these rules.

I am in partial agreement with these two authors about the necessity of breaking traditional peacekeeping rules. On one hand, if peacekeepers were to enter a country, displaying both clear favoritism to one party and a willingness to use a heavy amount of force to achieve their goals, they would not generate lasting, if any, peace. Rather, they would fuel the conflict by strengthening one party, while greatly angering and offending the other(s). On the other hand, as shown below, it is also true that there are instances when the rules associated with impartiality and the use of force cannot be strictly followed because of unique situational factors in the conflict. Therefore, because it is sometimes deemed necessary to break the rules of impartiality and use of force for the purpose of achieving peace, the breaking of these rules cannot be used to predict the outcome of a mission.

However, Lise Howard (2008), as well as myself, attach special importance to the rule of consent. As Howard claims, “adherence to the rules (with the exception of “consent”[of the warring parties]) does not appear to have a direct effect on the eventual outcome” (14), and therefore, while all the rules need to be followed to some degree, “the
consent of the warring parties appears to be the most decisive” in determining the outcome of a mission (10). Furthermore, Howard draws a distinction between initial consent and continued consent by saying, “if consent diminishes after the mission begins, it must be…re-created in order for the operation to succeed” (11).

Matheson (2006) addresses the issue of governments withdrawing their consent for a mission, and notes that when peacekeeping missions were deployed under Chapter VI of the UN Charter, the government hosting the mission retained the power to revoke its consent at any point and require the peacekeepers to leave.2 This was true with the First United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF I), the mission deployed to the Sinai in 1956. In this case, after initially giving its consent, the Egyptian government withdrew it and ordered the peacekeepers to leave, after which war immediately resumed (Matheson, 2006, 120). In order to avoid giving governments that option, many UN peacekeeping missions are now deployed under Chapter VII of the UN charter. Because these missions technically are then considered peace enforcement missions, they are protected “from any withdrawal of consent or restrictions on the forces’ activities” (Matheson, 2006, 121) by the host country. Therefore, Chapter VII missions can both be deployed without a country’s consent, and can also legally forbid a government to revoke its consent if it was initially given, therefore allowing the mission to carry on fulfilling its mandate to the end.

Overall, I agree with Howard that the operation will be more likely to succeed if it has consent from the government, because that implies that the involved parties are willing to cooperate with the peacekeepers. It would be incredibly difficult to have a
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2 Peacekeeping missions are either deployed under Chapters VI or VII of the UN charter. Operations that require the consent of the host countries are authorized under Chapter VI, which provides for peaceful settlement of disputes, while peace enforcement missions are authorized under Chapter VII and “do not necessarily require the consent of the belligerents” (Fortna, 2004, 270).
successful mission when the host country is not providing favorable conditions for achieving peace. However, with regard to diminished consent, I believe peacekeepers should work to reestablish it, but if it cannot be created, I do not believe they should leave the country. I do not deny that if the government becomes uncooperative during the mission that chances for success are greatly diminished, but they become completely unattainable if the mission is forced to leave. The way around this problem seems to be to have missions be deployed under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Impartiality, however, (as previously mentioned), is one rule that sometimes must be broken. In 1990, impartiality was taken to mean that “the [peacekeeping] operations must not… in any way favor one party against another” but this meaning has since changed (Matheson, 2006, 123). In 2000, being impartial referred to “adherence to the principles of the Charter and to the objectives of the mandate that is rooted in these Charter principles,” meaning legally, missions under Chapter VII have no requirement to “avoid ‘taking sides’” (Matheson, 2006, 124). This is because Chapter VII missions are authorized to “impose peace by force,” and when force is allowed to be used against parties in a conflict, it becomes harder to remain impartial (Fortna [2004,] Howard [2008]). In other words, when peacekeepers use force against one of the sides in a conflict, they are in effect breaching their role as an impartial third party. Berdal et al. (2007) believes this is sometimes necessary given the fact that most of the conflicts UN peacekeepers become involved in are not interstate in nature, but rather violent civil wars. Civil wars generally inflict severe humanitarian disasters, and it is necessary for the peacekeepers to take sides against those who are creating the atrocities. He states that “it is increasingly argued that in humanitarian catastrophes, it is inappropriate to rely on the
traditional peacekeeping doctrine of impartiality” (25). Therefore, although impartiality
would be present in an ideal situation, it may not always contribute to the success of a
peacekeeping force, and is therefore not a good measure to use when accounting for a
mission’s success or failure.

Last is the rule of peacekeepers only being allowed to use force in self-defense. After the Cold War, when the conflicts peacekeepers were confronted with had escalated
in violence, the Security Council expanded the circumstances under which force can be
used (Matheson, 2006). Increasingly, post-Cold War mandates have contained phrasing
authorizing peacekeepers to “take all necessary measures” to accomplish their objectives,
meaning force can be used, when necessary, to both defend the troops and the provisions
of the mandate (Matheson, 2006, 141). Therefore, the theory behind this rule is the same
as that behind impartiality: a more traditional situation would allow the peacekeepers to
remain lightly armed and unable to use force, but the realities of conflicts in the post-
Cold War era rarely make such an option viable. However, just because many missions
under Chapter VII were allowed to use force does not mean that it was always effective.
Matheson (2006) notes that for the use of force to produce results, it must also be
accompanied by “adequate resources and command, a strong and clear mandate, and
robust rules of engagement” (143). For these reasons, I do not believe using force in
more instances than self-defense would cause a mission to be unsuccessful; variables
such as resources, command, and the clarity and strength of the mandate play a more vital
role in affecting the mission’s outcome.

In analyzing each of these rules, it becomes clear that the one concerning consent
of a country to deploy a mission is the most important. I believe the status of initial
consent is the best indicator of a mission outcome, and if it is not met, the mission can be predicted to be unlikely to succeed. At the same time, “continued consent,” meaning that consent is maintained throughout the duration of the mission, also acts as a good predictor of the overall success of a mission. With this point there is a caveat, however, because although I believe it is important to mission success, I also believe that if consent does dwindle, the host country cannot be allowed to order the peacekeepers to leave, because that would result in utter failure. The mission should therefore be able to stay and complete its mandate to the best of its abilities before leaving.

Although impartiality and limited use of force are good rules of thumb to follow when possible, the breaking of these rules cannot ultimately be used to predict mission success or failure because the nature of violent intrastate conflicts create circumstances when it is sometimes necessary to break them to achieve mandate goals.

Security Council Interests

The politics within the Security Council (SC) have also been frequently cited as being crucial to a mission’s success (Matheson [2006], Bellamy et al. [2004], Howard [2008], Sitkowski [2006]). The most important identified factor is “political will among the five permanent (P5) members (US, UK, France, Russia, and China), of the SC” (Howard, 11, 2008). The main reason for the UN’s ineffectiveness in deploying peacekeeping missions during the Cold War was the gridlock and tension among the P5. However, just as the conflicts within the SC prevented it from exercising the full scope of its powers, so, too, can it can create problems for a mission. Matheson (2006), for example, argues that it does not necessarily matter if a mission mandate allows the use of force under Chapter VII, because it will only be effective if there is not “a fundamental
difference of political interest and perspective among the permanent members” (165). When these differences exist, focus on the problem at hand vanishes and it is back to “the chaos of the Cold War system,” which involves a power struggle among the P5 (Matheson, 2006, 166). Bellamy et al. (2004) also points to the fact that when certain members of the SC are not invested in a mission, they will not match their “rhetorical commitment with intellectual and material resources,” leaving peacekeepers “poorly equipped” and forced to “apply old [peacekeeping] techniques to very different circumstances” (81). Another consequence of lacking political will among the P5 reveals itself in the mission mandates. Sitkowski (2006) asserts that the politics of the SC usually result in “delayed, weak, ambiguous, or unrealistic mandates and/or inadequate means for peacekeeping missions” (23). Again, when the national interests of the permanent members interfere with their objective to bring peace to a region, the resulting mission will not be adequately equipped to handle the conflict on the ground. After Howard’s analysis (2008) of the role of SC interests in the outcome of a peacekeeping mission, she concludes, “moderate levels of SC interest… are necessary but not sufficient conditions for success” (13).

Although I do not directly look at the levels of SC interest as an independent variable, I am looking at variables that are related to SC cooperation. For example, unity and interest among the P5 can be expected to produce stronger and clearer mission mandates than a divided SC could. Furthermore, if the P5 are interested in a mission, they will be more likely to make sure the mission is adequately equipped with the necessary resources. Therefore, I am looking at the expected manifestations of the
relationships among the members of the SC as my variables that can be used to predict mission success.

_Aspects of the Mandate_

One of the most critical aspects of a mission is its mandate, because it is there that the objectives of the mission can be found. Furthermore, the achievement of those objectives is the most common way for people to measure if the mission was successful or not, so it is extremely important to have clear goals. However, several mandates suffer from certain inadequacies, such as having unclear or unattainable goals (Berdal et al. (2007), Jett (1999), Howard (2008), Sitkowski (2006)). In terms of clarity, Jett (1999) says failed mandates are often too vague. For example, vagueness is cited as a criticism of the UNOSOM mandate in Somalia (1993-1995). When the UN conducted an assessment of the Somali peacekeeping mission, it concluded that the mandate was “vague… and was open to myriad interpretations” (Jett, 1999, 40). In this case, there was no clear direction for the mission to follow because several different actors had different interpretations of the goals of the same mandate.

Furthermore, Jett (1999) argues that it could be impossible to achieve the perfect mandate, because “SC mandates, by their very nature, will continue to embody political compromises reflecting competing interests of member states” (42). In other words, ambiguity in a mandate will always exist because it is the product of bargaining. Another problem he notes with mandate clarity is the phenomenon of “mission creep,” which occurs when the mission’s goals are constantly redefined and enlarged (16). When that occurs, it is next to impossible for the peacekeeping troops to accomplish their mission because it is continually changing, and the goals are not readily known. In all of these
ways unclear mandates can result, and the mission cannot possibly succeed in achieving its goals.

The scope of the mandate, meaning the “relevance of [the] mandate to the realities of the conflict” (Sitkowski, 2006, 23) is also absolutely essential in determining the fate of a mission. Problems can arise under scope when the mandate is unrealistic and/or unsupported (Jett, 1999). For instance, the mandate for the UN mission in Bosnia (1992-1995) only authorized the deployment of 7,000 troops, although experts projected that 34,000 soldiers would be needed to protect the safe havens the mission had constructed (Jett, 1999). In this case, the provisions in the mandate were not appropriate to the situations on the ground, and although it did call for the constructions of safe areas, it did not provide the means to actually keep them safe. The mandate in Bosnia was also charged with being “unrealistic” because despite dealing with a genocide, the mandate only authorized the peacekeepers to provide humanitarian relief and forced them to remain neutral in the conflict, not allowing them to distinguish “between the aggressors and victims” (Jett, 1999, 40). In this case, the realities of this particular conflict required more forceful action on the part of the peacekeepers and a need to break their standard stance of impartiality, but the mandate did not allow for these necessities.

The scope of the mandate can also be considered inappropriate if it is weak. A weak mandate, as was present for the mission in Western Sahara (1991-present), generally refers to the peacekeeping forces being given a very limited role in the conflict, so these mandates require much more cooperation from all sides (Jett, 1999). Therefore, weak mandates give more power to the parties involved in the conflict rather than to the peacekeeping troops, and so by design, do not give the peacekeepers very much authority
or power to bring about peace. Therefore, the UN needs to continue learning what “considerations are unique to a particular situation and what are common to all” (Berdal et al. 2007, 21) in order to formulate mandates that are appropriate to each mission.

*Resources*

How the peacekeepers are equipped during their deployment has also been argued to be a key factor in determining the success of a mission. Matheson (2006) and Sitkowski (2006) note that adequate resources, including staff, equipment, and finances, must be present and readily available for a mission to be a success. Equipment given to the troops must be appropriate to the situation on the ground, and there are several instances, such as with UNOSOM II in Somalia (1993-1995), where this was not the case (Berdal et al. 2007). Furthermore, there is the issue of funding these resources. Payments for UN peacekeeping “are in addition to the annual membership fee” that countries pay to the regular budget of the UN, and it is the major powers (USA, UK, France, etc) that are shouldering most of the burden (Sandler and Shimizu, 2002, 653). This is problematic because these countries tend to “pursue an agenda in keeping with their preferences,” and so even if funding could technically be considered adequate, this could affect the scope of the mandate because those financing the missions would want a larger say in its objectives.

There is also the problem of inadequate funding. UN peacekeeping missions are extremely expensive, (for example, the mission in Somalia cost $1.6 billion) and while the UN is anxious to become involved in international conflicts, there is always more than one conflict going on (un.org). Because of this, the UN could have trouble funding
its missions because there are too many missions to fund (Berdal et al., 2007). Even when funds are not being spread too thin, it is still possible that a mission will not receive adequate funding, resulting in the absence of “even basic equipment” (Bellamy et al., 2004, 81). This problem is generally tied to the interests of member states, because if the members, especially the P5, do not have a direct interest in the matter at hand, they will be less willing to provide funds for the mission (Berdal et al., 2004, 2007). A lack of funds also impacts third world countries because although they supply most of the troops, they are not receiving much financial compensation from first world countries. This is especially true with regards to the US, which is considered “the primary debtor state,” because when the US does not pay its peacekeeping assessments, the burden of the debt spreads to third world countries (Gordon et al. 2001, 34). As a result, those troop-contributing countries lose their enthusiasm for the peacekeeping mission (Jett, 1999, 12). Low funding can also jeopardize the command and control capabilities, because the mission becomes understaffed (Gordon et al., 2001). Resources, both physical and monetary, are therefore critical to a mission’s success because the troops must be adequately equipped and the missions adequately staffed. Furthermore, who provides the funds and resources can hugely influence the course of the mission. There can be a heavy regional influence, (usually Western, since they provide the bulk of the funding) in the mandate goals and in some cases, it is possible that the goals of those Western countries may not be line with what is best for the country undergoing the intervention.
Command and Control Capabilities

A UN mission mandate for a multidimensional peacekeeping mission contains several smaller mandates within it. For example, the main mandate could call for relief in a humanitarian disaster, formation of a civil police force, and the monitoring of elections. Each of those goals then requires its own task force and set of rules to follow, making multidimensional peacekeeping operations especially complex. Many scholars have thus argued that an effective central command and control structure is vital for success, because during several of the failed missions of the 90s, “planning… remained divided between several departments” with “little systematic cooperation” and coordination between all of those involved in the mission (Bellamy et al. 2004, 81).

Because there are several actors involved in the planning and execution of a peacekeeping mission, it is critical to have effective command and control capabilities in place at the start of the mission. This means there needs to be both “vertical and horizontal integration throughout the intervening organization” (Gordon et al. 2001, 21). Vertical integration refers to the relationships within the hierarchy of the organization, while horizontal integration refers to coordination among the varying non-hierarchical divisions of the mission.

Vertical integration is important in the relationships between the Security Council and various bodies of the mission, including the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General (SRSO) and the force commanders (Gordon et al. 2001). One of the largest problems with vertical integration is that there is not a direct link between influence and accountability within headquarters and those carrying out the mandated mission. For example, on the bottom level of the hierarchy there are the force
commanders who are assumed to be in charge of, and therefore responsible for, the actions and decisions of their troops. However, this is not often the case. Although the force commanders are held accountable for the actions of the troops under their command, they commonly “find they have not been given sufficient control over the troops assigned to them,” mainly because the troop-donating countries do not wish to relinquish control of their troops to the UN (Gordon, et al., 2001, 22). It is extremely difficult to establish a cohesive UN force, because each individual country supplying the troops has its own political agenda. If the agenda of a troop-supplying country does not match with that of the UN, force commanders from that country bypass UN institutions and go by the instructions given from their national government (Gordon, et al. 2001). The line of accountability therefore blurs because while the troops are accountable to the UN force commanders, they are acting under the influence of their own country’s agenda. At the next point in the hierarchy is the SRSG, (the special representative of the Secretary-General). Despite being “clearly subordinate to… the wishes of the Security Council,” and having “little real influence over policy formulation in the Security Council,” the SRSG acts as the “executive director of the mission” (Gordon et al. 2001, 32). This means the SRSG is held accountable for the field operations that are taking place, but he had no say in the formulation of those measures that are being carried out. As Gordon states, it is naïve to believe the SRSG can resolve problems “generated by an inappropriate and under-resourced mandate” (Gordon, et al. 2001, 32) when he in no way influenced the mandate and cannot be sure what the intentions of the SC were when it was written. This disconnect in influence and accountability means there is not a clear
unity of purpose between those making the policy for the mission and those charged with carrying it out.

Horizontal integration is the other aspect of command and control that must be present for a mission to be successful. This applies to cooperation among the various UN agencies involved in the mission, and also to coordination among the “multitude of political, humanitarian and military organizations” that are involved in the mission (Gordon et al. 2001, 35). The main problem that arises when there is not horizontal integration is “a reduction in unity of purpose,” because the various segments of a mission are not working together toward a common goal. (Gordon et al., 2001, 36). It is hard to have effective horizontal integration because when there are several different actors, including governments, various UN agencies and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s), working together in a multidimensional peacekeeping mission, there is not a central source of accountability. Without one main source that maintains control over several UN bodies, nobody is playing by the same rules or being held to the same standards. Again, this reduces the unity of the mission and hinders its ability to be successful.

Howard (2008) took all of these ideas into consideration in the formulation of her theory, which stipulated that the main determinate of the success of a mission is “organizational learning,” or the ability of the troops and commanders to learn from the situation on the ground and make appropriate recommendations for change to the mandate objectives (41). In other words, when there are effective command and control capabilities in place, the peacekeepers would be able to make the mandate appropriate to the situation on the ground. According to Howard, for organizational learning to be
effective, it must start with the SRSG and his/her staff to change the “organizational structures on the ground” (15).

*Personnel Competence*

The last major point discussed in the literature involves the actual abilities of the troops and their commanders. Jett (1999) argues that the selection of the SRSG is a fundamental step in insuring mission success, because he is, in essence, the leader of the Peacekeeping Operation (PKO). The SRSG must have the ability to keep the parties engaged in the peace process, make the mandate goals achievable on the ground, keep international interest alive in the mission, and make sure each element of the mission is working toward a unified objective (Jett, 1999). However, it is not only the SRSG that is important in the personnel lineup. The troops themselves must be adequately trained. Commonly, most troops sent to a peacekeeping mission are from third-world countries, because the UN pays the governments of those countries, who are then allowed to decide how much money to pay the troops. This is a major incentive for third-world governments to provide troops, but this also means troop training and overall quality is not as high as those of first-world soldiers (Jett, [1999], Shimizu and Sandler, [2002]). The fact that contributed troops come from several different countries is also a problem, because there is no uniform equipment, doctrine or training among them (Bellamy, et al. 2004). There is also the issue of peacekeepers causing problems during a mission, because the UN “lacks the authority to discipline those who serve in its name” (Jett, 1999, 50). This links back to command and control capabilities because the troops are not accountable to one central command. Although I do not have a variable designated
for personnel competence, I believe it is important to mission success, and have incorporated it into my other variables. For instance, quality of the troops falls under resources, and the role and leadership of the SRSG can be considered part of command and control capabilities.

**Theory of This Essay**

My theory takes into account most of the explanations for success found in the literature review, but I argue that no one variable accounts for the success or failure of a peacekeeping mission. Rather, I believe that there are five criteria that are crucial for success, and that the more of these criteria that are met, the more successful the mission will be.

*Cooperation of Combatants*

The first variable is related to the previously discussed rule of “consent” for peacekeeping. The reason I have chosen cooperation of the combatants rather than consent is because combatants in a civil war could agree to host a UN peacekeeping mission, but not necessarily be dedicated to the idea of peace. As many previous researchers have argued, and I agree, if those responsible for causing the violence do not actually desire peace, then they will do anything in their power to hamper the progress of a peacekeeping mission. The peacekeepers could have the best mandate and resources and communication, but if the local warring factions do not want to stop fighting, it will be next to impossible to impose peace.
Clarity of Mandate

After taking into account attitudinal factors, it is also necessary to look at how the goals of the mission are formulated, and this falls into two categories. The first is the clarity of the mandate. Peacekeepers cannot accomplish their goals if they do not understand their role within the country. If a mandate is too vague to be interpreted unambiguously, or if it is full of contradictions, the peacekeepers will not be able to carry out the prescribed goals adequately. Indeed, they may not even be sure what the exact goals are. There is also the phenomenon known as “mission creep,” which, as previously mentioned, occurs when the goals of the mission are “constantly redefined and expanded” (Jett 1999, 16). In this case, there is never a clear direction to the mission because it is continuously changing. Therefore I believe a mandate can be considered clear if there are easily identified goals and if the mandate remains relatively unchanged, or in some cases, changes as appropriate to the changing situation.

Scope of Mandate

Also important in a mandate is its scope. There are times when the mandate can be perfectly clear, but the announced goals are not actually in line with the situation on the ground. For this reason, the mandate needs to have the right goals identified, and the goals need to be feasible. The mandate must also equip the peacekeepers with the necessary means to achieve the specified ends. For example, there could be a case where peacekeepers required the use of force in more instances than self-defense, and so to be appropriate to conditions on the ground, the mandate would need to be authorized under Chapter VII of the Charter, instead of Chapter VI. Overall, I believe the scope of the
mission can be considered appropriate if the goals are in line with the situation on the ground and if it is able to provide the peacekeepers with the means to achieve their goals. Although it is hard to determine the appropriateness of the scope before a mission is dispatched, it becomes clear relatively soon, once the troops have been deployed, if it is indeed appropriate or not. Therefore, when looking at the scope of the mandate, it is necessary to look to see if it was modified to be more appropriate to what the realities were on the ground, once these realities are known.

**Adequacy of Resources**

It is also important to see whether the peacekeepers are well equipped for their mission, and this can be represented with resources. This is an important factor to examine because regardless of if the combatants want peace, and the mandate is perfect, if a mission is not adequately equipped, it will have very little chance of bringing about temporary, much less lasting, peace. Resources can include troop numbers, but beyond that there is also the amount and quality of equipment that is given to a mission, including physical and intellectual resources. Troops need weaponry and armored cars, but the mission also needs staff and ways of gathering and disseminating intelligence reports to the headquarters and those in the field.

**Command and Control Capabilities**

Lastly, there is a need to look at factors on the ground, and this is represented by a mission’s command and control capabilities, both among the different divisions of the mission and between the mission leaders and UN headquarters. A mandate addresses
aspects of a mission, and although the mandate could be clear, if there is poor communication among everyone as to what their specific goals are, then that hampers the effectiveness of the mission.

Overall, as previously stated, I believe that it is not just the presence of one of these factors that can guarantee mission success, but rather, each plays an important role in determining the mission outcome.

**Hypothesis and Case Selection**

My hypothesis is that the more of my independent variables that are present in a mission, the more successful the mission will be.

My case selection is broken down into two parts. First I have selected nine cases (one mission is split into two cases) to examine with regard to the role of each of my independent variables. These are the UN missions in: Cambodia (UNTAC, 1992-1993), Former Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR, 1992-1995), Somalia (UNOSOM II, 1993-1995), Rwanda (UNAMIR, 1993-1996), Haiti (MINUSTAH, 2004-present), East Timor (UNTAET, 1999-2002), Kosovo (UNMIK, 1999-present), and Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL, 1999-2005). I have chosen these cases for several reasons. One is that they are all multidimensional post-Cold War missions, taking place between 1992 and 2005 (except for UNMIK and MINUSTAH, which are still current operations). As a result, their mandates contain very similar provisions, rendering them easily comparable to one

---

3 I have divided UNAMSIL into two parts, because it underwent a complete overhaul shortly into the mission that changed its course from failure to success. Therefore, there was a change in the values of my independent variables between the beginning of the mission and the end, but it technically remained the same mission.
another in terms of success. This is so because each of these mandates is multidimensional, allowing them to be considered close to each other in level of difficulty for implementation. For example, it would not be beneficial to compare a traditional observer mission to a multidimensional mission because the mandate for an observer mission is most likely much easier to accomplish than a mandate for a multidimensional mission. However, because the general tasks are the same for my selected cases, they can be considered close in difficulty. Yet because there are differences in specific provisions within each mandate, it is possible that one multidimensional mandate is clearer than another, or the mandate of one is more appropriate for the situation on the ground. This is especially true with scope because not all of my selected missions have been equipped the same way to handle the similar situations, and this provides a good test for the impact of the scope of the mandate.

The second reason is that the cases come from a variety of regions, meaning the conclusions I draw are valid beyond the confines of a single region. For example, if all my cases came from one region, I would be able to apply my conclusions confidently to missions carried out in that region. It could be, however, that there is something unique about that region that is influencing my results. However, if using missions from several regions supports my hypothesis, I would feel more confident that my independent variables universally influence mission success, and the relationship is not spurious. In other words, I would feel confident saying that there are not regional factors that are actually accounting for success, and the outcomes of the missions do depend on the independent variables.

4 Although UNMIK and MINUSTAH have not ended, UNMIK has been in effect since 1999 and MINUSTAH has been active since 2004. Although the outcome of these missions can change in the future, in both of these cases, I believe an adequate amount of time has passed to evaluate their success to date.
Lastly, because these nine cases I have selected marked a stark change in peacekeeping practices in the 1990s, they are the ones that have had the most in-depth studies done about them. Given my limited time and resources, I would be unable to delve deeply into each of these missions, but because there are numerous sources that look at each of these cases individually, I am able to use their findings. Essentially, these are the cases for which there is the most data available.

I believe the number of cases I have chosen is both a strength and a weakness of my study. This is a small $n$ study, with only nine cases, all occurring within a narrow time frame. This means it may be hard to generalize my results to all multidimensional UN peacekeeping missions everywhere at all times. With that said, however, I believe looking at a smaller number of cases can also be a strength, because it allows a more in-depth view into the missions. I can feel more confident in declaring a relationship between my independent variables and my dependent variable because I have thoroughly looked at the cases. With more cases I would have to take a more cursory look at each one, which could mean that I miss a key factor in explaining the success or failure of the mission. With a more comprehensive look at the cases, I have a better chance of making sure it is my independent variables that are affecting the outcome of the mission, and not some other factors.

Data

My data sources are the in-depth research done by other scholars on each of these cases. There are several articles and books that go into great detail about each of the aforementioned cases, and I am using their findings as my data. However, in order to
make sure my information is reliable, I am going to triangulate my sources. Because so much research has been done on each of the cases, I am using the findings of three different authors for each independent variable on each of my cases to check one author’s analysis against another’s.\(^5\) This adds to my confidence about the measurements of my independent variables because I have provided a check for potential biases.

I am measuring each of my independent variables with a yes, no, or mixed. Because each of my independent variables covers a fairly large domain, and there are several ways in which each could be evaluated, I will have different subheadings for them. For example, cooperation of combatants refers to how willing they are to work with the UN in achieving its mission mandate. Because there are innumerable ways in which combatants could or could not be cooperative, I am mainly evaluating the extent to which combatants did or did not undermine UN efforts to fulfill the mandate. Examples of being cooperative include allowing the UN to have access to all necessary places, and respecting UN authority and control over various organizations in the country.

Clarity of mandate is the second variable that I am measuring. Clarity of mandate can be compromised if either the goals, or the means to achieve them, are not explicit. For example, as previously mentioned, the clarity of the mandate is related to the stability of the mandate, and if there are constant revisions, there can be no clear mission direction. What’s more, if the wording of the mandate is vague, that can open it up to several different interpretations. In these cases, the overall goals of the mission are not manifest, and the mandate can be said to be unclear. It can also be unclear how the mandate is to be implemented, and what the actual rules of engagement are. Therefore,

\(^5\) The only case I could not find three sources for each variable was Haiti, because it has proven to be a continually changing mission. However, I did find at least one source for each variable, and at times two or three, to provide values.
for clarity of mandate, I am looking at the wording of the mandate, in particular how clearly the ends, and means to the ends (i.e rules of engagement), are specified.

Scope of mandate is going to be measured by how appropriate the provisions of the mandate are to the realities of the situation on the ground. The subheadings include how realistic the mandate is, i.e. are the goals overly ambitious, or are the goals in the interest of the host country or those writing the mandate, and does the mandate provide the necessary resources and provisions to ensure mission success, i.e. the appropriate use of force and the need (or lack thereof) for consent to act.

For my resources variable, I am including quantity, timing (how quickly were the troops given the necessary resources) and quality. These three headings can refer to either physical resources (troops, equipment) or intellectual resources (intelligence, staffing). Overall, I am looking to see whether the physical and/or intellectual resources for a mission are adequate to the mission’s needs.

Lastly, under command and control structures, I am covering vertical command integration (between the force commanders, the SRSG, and UN headquarters), and horizontal integration (between the different segments of the mission). I believe a failure on either one of these accounts will jeopardize the mission, and generally if there are problems with one, there are problems with the other.

The following table shows the results of my data. If the variable was considered adequate, I marked it with an X. If the variable was inadequate to fulfill all aspects of the mandate, I marked it with a O. An O/X signifies that the variable may have been adequate to achieve part of the mandate, but not all of it.
Table 1: Presence of Variables in UN Peacekeeping Missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missions</th>
<th>Cooperation of Combatants</th>
<th>Clarity of Mandate</th>
<th>Scope of Mandate</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Command and Control Capabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone UNAMSIL “B” 2000-2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Timor UNTAET 1999-2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O/X</td>
<td>O/X</td>
<td>O/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia UNTAC 1992-1993</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O/X</td>
<td>O/X</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti MINUSTAH 2004-Present</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo UNIMIK 1999-Present</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone UNAMSIL “A” 1999-2000</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia UNOSOM II 1993-1995</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda UNAMIR 1993-1996</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia UNPROFOR 1992-1995</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next step is to measure the success of the mission. I believe the success of the mission needs to be based on how well it fulfills its mandate, but also what the state

---

6 For a detailed account of how each of these variables were measured, please reference Appendix I.
of the country is after the mission leaves. There is the possibility that a mission could have fulfilled its mandate, but because the goals were inappropriate to the situation on the ground, the state of the country would not be much better off after the completion of the mission. Howard (2008) also adopted this approach to her evaluations of success and failure, and I am going to use her measures. She says, “success in mandate implementation is the most relevant and equitable standard to which the UN can be held” (7). For the second point, she mentions that it is necessary to include “a broader assessment of the state of the country after the completion of the UN intervention” which includes analyzing the state of the “institutions that the UN attempted to monitor, reform, or create” that were intended to persist, after the departure of the UN (Howard, 2008, 7). The following diagram represents the order in which I ranked these missions in terms of success.

Table 2: Ranking of Peacekeeping Missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure</th>
<th>Qualified Failure</th>
<th>Qualified Success</th>
<th>Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNMIK (Kosovo) UNAMSIL “A” (Sierra Leone) UNOSOM II (Somalia) UNAMIR (Rwanda) UNPROFOR (Bosnia)</td>
<td>MINUSTAH (Haiti)</td>
<td>UNTAET (East Timor)- more successful</td>
<td>UNAMSIL “B” (Sierra Leone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two important things to note in this table. The first is that the order within each cell is significant. For example, in the Failure cell, the order of missions means that Bosnia was the worst failure, and then Rwanda, etc. Also, the large gap in the

7 For an explanation of these rankings, please reference Appendix II.
qualified success cell shows that the mission in East Timor experienced a bigger amount of success than Cambodia, although both successes are still considered qualified. An explanation of these judgments can be found in Appendix III.

**Methods of Inference and Analysis**

Each of the independent variables is coded with a 1 if the variable was measured as adequate, a 0 if the variable was partly adequate, or a -1 if the variable was inadequate. The values of the independent variables for each mission are then totaled and those final numbers, ranked from highest to lowest, should be able to predict the successfulness of each of the missions. The missions have been ranked 1 to 9, based on my definition of success, with the most successful being a 1 and the least being a 9. The next step is to see how well the predicted results match the actual results. This closeness of this match should be an indicator of the strength of my independent variables in explaining the outcomes of the missions.
This chart reveals that there is a definite overall trend that the more of my five independent variables are adequate, the more successful the mission will be. The relationship is not perfect, but there does seem to be an overarching trend, in terms of how successful the cases would be ranked based on the independent variables. The first relationship to examine is that between the total values of the variables, and “success by cell.” One trend is that all the missions that scored a -5 overall, (Kosovo, Sierra Leone “A,” Somalia and Bosnia) were also all placed in the Failure cell. In other words, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Coded Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone “B” UNAMSIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Timor UNTAET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia UNTAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti MINUSAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo UNMIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone “A” UNAMSIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia UNOSOM II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda UNAMIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia UNPROFOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
missions that scored the lowest were unequivocally considered failures. The two missions that scored a -3 (Haiti and Kosovo), were split between the Failure cell and the Qualified Failure cell. This does not fit my pattern perfectly, but it still shows that the missions that had only one variable that was considered adequate did not experience much, if any, success. Next there is Cambodia that scored a -1 and was considered a Qualified Success, and East Timor, which had a 2, that was also a Qualified Success. However, as was present in Table 2, East Timor was considered more successful that Cambodia, and so the discrepancy between the total values and placement in the same cell actually fits the pattern. The last point is that Sierra Leone “B,” the only mission to have a perfect score of 5, was also the only mission to be considered an unequivocal success. Therefore, by looking at the total values of the variables for each of the missions, one could reasonably guess which of the four cells to place the mission. They may not all correlate perfectly, but there is does seem to be a strong connection between the mission’s total values and which cell it belongs to.

The other relationship to look at is the one between the total values of the variables and the 1 to 9 success ranking of each of the missions. The graph on the next page shows a strong relationship between the totals of my variable values and the degree of success the mission experienced.
Although I do not have enough cases to run any sort of statistical test to try and determine level of causality between my variables and the level of success the mission experiences, these nine cases do provide strong support for my hypothesis. There appears to be a clear relationship between the variable totals and how successful the mission was. Ideally I would have also liked to provide some sort of test to determine the relative importance of each my variables, but nine cases do not provide a substantial enough number with which to do that. However, this graph does display that there is a strong correlation between the total values of the variable measures and how successful each mission was.

Comparative Case Study- Sierra Leone and UNAMSIL “A” and “B”

The Sierra Leone mission provides a unique case study into the interactions of my variables because it underwent an intensive overhaul during its mission when it was clear
it was not going to be able to achieve its mandated objectives. Each of my independent
variables was addressed by the overhaul, providing a clear distinction between how the
variables were affecting the mission when they were inadequate versus when they were
corrected.

Background to Conflict

The state of Sierra Leone collapsed in a civil war in 1991, when a rebel group of
exiled Sierra Leoneans known as the RUF (Revolutionary United Front), backed by
Liberian president Charles Taylor, invaded the country and began an insurgency directed
toward the capital of Freetown. However, this insurgency started an already inevitable
war, because Sierra Leone was already rapidly descending into the status of a failed state.
Decades of oppressive and corrupt political rule, coupled with little or no economic
growth, were leading to massive civil unrest throughout the country. Before UN
intervention, the main external presence in Sierra Leone was the Economic Community
of West African States (ECOWAS), and their cease-fire monitoring group ECOMOG.
As the situation continued to worsen, the UN agreed to send in a small observer mission,
consisting of only 30 unarmed troops, to assist in efforts “to disarm fighters and
document human rights violations” (Olonisakim, 2008, 25). However, in January of
1999, the RUF launched “Operation No Living Thing” in Freetown, which left thousands
dead, including hundreds of ECOWAS’s troops, mainly Nigerian (Olonisakim [2008],
Berdal et al. [2007]). This is significant because Nigeria has long been considered the
dominant player in West African affairs, and after this incident, it began taking measures
to withdraw its troops from Sierra Leone, aiding in the creation of a security vacuum and
leaving people desperate for peace (Oloniskain [2008]). This led those involved in the conflict to finally agree to, and sign, the Lome Peace Accords, which in essence constituted an appeasement of the war lords, “giving them political power in exchange for military peace” (Berdal et al. 2007, 257). After this agreement, UNAMSIL was authorized in October 1999 to help oversee its implementation.

**Problems Encountered by Initial Mission**

Under its mandate, UNAMSIL was to: “assist with the disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) of combatants, ensure the security and freedom of movement of UN personnel, monitor the adherence to the cease-fire agreement, facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance, as well as to provide support, as requested, to the elections that [were] to be held” (Olonisakim, 2008, 41). However, there were problems from the start.

**Cooperation of Combatants**

The RUF was almost immediately guilty of breaching the cease-fire agreement, and because of its staunch anti-UNAMSIL perspective, launched direct attacks on UNAMSIL personnel. The RUF succeeded in obstructing the DDR process by storming and then shutting down the established DDR camps, and then detaining the UN personnel that had been operating them (Olonisakin [2008], Berdal et al. [2007]). They restricted UN personnel from the diamond-rich areas under their control, and they also often set up road barricades to block UN movement around the country. Looting of equipment and supplies was also a common problem the UN faced with regard to the rebels. All of this
came to a head in May 2000, where over the course of that month, the RUF seized a total of 500 peacekeepers and stripped them of their weapons (Olonisakin, 2008). Overall, through their complete disrespect of the organization, the RUF sought to intimidate and undermine UN authority. This made UNAMSIL’s job of overseeing a ceasefire agreement completely hopeless, and when the troops would attempt to facilitate DDR or deliver humanitarian aid, the RUF physically stopped them from being able to accomplish their goals.

Clarity of Mandate

Clarity of the mandate was also cited as a criticism against UNAMSIL, mainly with regard to the provisions for the use of force. Although there was a provision allowing for the use of force to keep UN personnel and civilians safe, many participating governments believed that they were confined to limited use of force, namely, only in self defense. This proved to be a problem because of the violent offensive attacks instigated by the RUF. The wording of the mandate was not robust enough to send the message that UNAMSIL would not tolerate the rebels challenging their resolve (Olonisakin [2008]). As a result, the RUF was able to make a mockery out of UNAMSIL and render them powerless to take any steps to establish a safe and secure environment, much less carry out the specific mandate tasks of DDR and the delivering of humanitarian aid.

Scope of Mandate

The scope of the mandate was also problematic. The SC was relying on the assumption that the RUF would be a cooperative party in the quest for peace, and...
therefore did not incorporate any safeguards into the mandate allowing the peacekeepers to impose peace by force if necessary. Although the language allowed force to be used in self defense and to save civilians, there were no provisions about what to do should the RUF not comply with the peace agreement, much less what should be done in the event of full on attacks on UN personnel by the RUF.

**Resources**

Lack of adequate resources also proved to be detrimental to the mission. While operating in Sierra Leone, the ECOMOG force had 13,000 troops on the ground. However, when UNAMSIL was authorized, only 6,000 were initially sent into Sierra Leone. In addition, these troops engaged in a slow deployment, allowing the security situation to worsen as ECOMOG was undergoing its withdrawal of forces. This delayed deployment was a result of the inability to secure commitments and support of UN member states, as Sierra Leone was a low priority for most members (Olonisakim [2008]). Troops numbers were finally increased to 11,100 by February of 2000 (the initial deployment having taken place in November of the previous year), but after the assessment of UNAMSIL a year later, it became clear that 11,100 troops were still not sufficient to accomplish the mandated tasks.

Troop numbers were not the only problem, however. It was argued that the deployed troops lacked sufficient equipment, discipline, and training to carry out the tasks at hand. Funding was the cause of most of these problems. As a result of inadequate funds, equipment was of poor quality, and there was very little in the way of intelligence resources. For example, many of the troops were not given adequate
information about the terrain they would be inhabiting, as all that was available were out of date maps of the area (Berdal et al. [2007]). Overall, the quality and quantity of resources, both physical and intellectual, proved to be an enormous problem for UNAMSIL.

Command and Control

The last factor to address is command and control. In the beginning, UNAMSIL’s problems mostly revolved around its vertical integration. Similar to other missions, there was the problem of UN troops following commands not from the UN force commander, but rather from their home governments. This resulted in the lack of a unified military unit, because the UN did not have central command powers over its troops. There were also problems, mainly in the military components, between the various heads of staff. Most notably was the disconnect between the Force and Deputy Force Commander. The Nigerians wanted a prominent role in the UNAMSIL makeup, because they felt the most invested in the situation. However, although the SRSG was Nigerian, the position of Force Commander went to Vijay Jetley, of India, while the Deputy Force Commander was another Nigerian. However, because of Nigeria’s unhappiness with the selection of an Indian force commander, problems began brewing from the beginning, creating a division between India and Nigeria. The military components could not be coordinated because those in charge harbored suspicions of each other. This division was noted in the assessment of UNAMSIL, which was accused of lacking “cohesion, understanding, communication and coordination” (Olonisakim, 2008, 92). This lack of cohesion was also painfully present among the different UN
agencies, because each had a different agenda and different understanding of their purpose in the country. It was very hard for UNAMSIL to achieve its objectives with such weak horizontal integration, because there was no common purpose among the branches.

Comprehensive Assessment and Improvements Made

In June 2010, one month after the kidnapping of 500 UNAMSIL personnel, the Secretariat called for a “comprehensive assessment” of the UNAMSIL mission, and it was with the findings of this report, and the desire of the Security Council to gain back respect in the international community, that serious changes were able to be made with regard to UNAMSIL.

Cooperation of Combatants

Although it was mainly external, rather than UN, changes that led to the eventual RUF cooperation, the UN was only able to start making tangible progress toward change once the RUF agreed to follow the Lome Peace Accords. This reveals how essential cooperation from the combatants is to a mission’s success. Regional players, such as Guinea and ECOWAS were responsible for putting pressure on the RUF, both militarily and politically, in order to reduce their power. For example, Guinea conducted attacks on the RUF forces around their strategic areas, such as those places considered rich in diamonds. ECOWAS also set up an organization, in conjunction with the UN, to internationally regulate Sierra Leone’s diamond trade, which was also a source of power for the RUF (Olonisakim [2008]). Another factor that led to RUF compliance with the
Peace Accords was the decision by the UK and ECOWAS to send roughly 4,000 troops to Freetown to help stabilize the city after the kidnapping of the 500 peacekeepers. This sudden enforcement “defeated the RUF rebels,” allowing the UN to assume their other peacekeeping responsibilities (Howard, 2008, 304). These combined factors led to a decrease in RUF power, a willingness to become more accepting of UNAMSIL’s presence, and eventually their transformation into a political entity, known as the Revolutionary United Front Party.

**Clarity of Mandate**

As mentioned earlier, the problem with the clarity of the mandate was, what was the actual authorized use of force? This issue was addressed when the mandate was revised, the Security Council made sure that there would be no ambiguity about when the peacekeepers were and were not allowed to use force. The fact that the troops could use force directly on the RUF was made explicit with the phrase “where necessary, [force can be used to] decisively counter the threat of RUF attack” (Olonisakin, 2008, 94).

Afterwards, when the RUF tried to undermine UN authority, UNAMSIL responded with force, which significantly hampered the success of the RUF.

**Scope of Mandate**

The scope of the mandate was also revised to address the issue of if the actual authorized use of force was appropriate (Olonisakin [2008]). Once it became clear that the RUF were not going to be cooperative in the peace process, the SC made sure that UNAMSIL was deployed under a full Chapter VII mission. This insulated it from the
RUF by not requiring its consent in any way to fulfill mission objectives, and as is mentioned under clarity of mandate, it turned UNAMSIL into a peace enforcement mission, expanding the circumstances under which force could be used.

Resources

Once it became clear that the 11,100 troop authorization was not sufficient, the SC made efforts to authorize a higher number of troops, eventually reaching 17,500 (Olonisakim, [2008]). There was also a significant increase in funding, especially by the United States, when US Ambassador Holbrooke convinced the Senate Appropriations Committee to authorize $50 million to be given to UNAMSIL. The result of better funding was two fold. It allowed third world troop contributing countries, such as Nigeria, Ghana, and Guinea to keep their troops in the mission. It also allowed for other countries to be able to donate troops, as was the case with Gambia. Increased funding also allowed the UN to be more discerning about the quality of the troops that were committed, meaning those new soldiers serving the UN were better trained and equipped. As previously mentioned, this surge in numbers and quality of troops allowed for the severe weakening of the RUF rebels.

Command and Control Capabilities

There were several command and control problems that needed to be addressed, and in turn, each one was. First, as previously mentioned, there was a schism between the Force Commander and Deputy Force Commander, which inhibited the formation of a unified military branch. After the assessment, and Jetly’s departure from UNAMSIL, a
new Force and Deputy Force Commander were chosen, creating a much more unified military. The SC also worked to close the gaps that existed between various UN agencies, and they also worked to increase communication throughout the mission. For example, efforts were made to increase contact between troop-contributing countries and the UN Secretariat (Olonisakin [2008]). Steps were also taken to make sure that UNAMSIL headquarters was not as isolated from field operations, by “[deploying] a full signals battalion” (Olonisakin, 2008, 98). These steps were taken to cut down on confusion and make sure everyone had a clear understanding of what was to be done, and that they were all working toward a unified purpose. Furthermore, in an effort to be prepared in the case of an attack, UNAMSIL established a Military Information Cell, allowing for “gathering and processing of reliable information” about potential threats (Olonisakin, 2008, 98). In terms of command and control, UNAMSIL underwent a makeover in both vertical and horizontal integration, and even went beyond to set up systems in the case of an attack. Overall, this restructuring allowed all of UNAMSIL’s contingents to be clear on what the mission goals were, and how they were to be accomplished; it provided unification within the mission.

Conclusions

Although I have already mentioned several reasons why it is important to know why peacekeeping missions succeed or fail, there is another reason my research is important. The majority of the studies of peacekeeping missions “draw on lessons learned” (Fortna, 2008, 79), but this was not my aim. I specifically looked for a causal effect of five independent variables in each of the missions, and in doing so, provided a
more uniform analysis of missions, instead of just analyzing each mission by itself. This can contribute to policy formulation or theory, because a comprehensive theory of why peacekeeping may fail or succeed has not been provided. If there was a more comprehensive theory, it may be easier for states and the UN to take the necessary steps to ensure that the mission is successful. Despite not being able to draw definitive conclusions from my data, given the limited case selection, there are several interesting points to address.

The first is that there does seem to be a strong relationship between the number of independent variables considered adequate and the degree of success the mission enjoyed in my sample of cases. In addressing the first part of my thesis, I am looking at two potential relationships. The first is whether or not the values of my independent variables predict the ranking of each of the missions, in order of least successful to most. However, because certain situational factors must be taken into account that influence the success rankings (as described in Appendix III), it is not completely reasonable to believe that the independent variables can rank missions from least to most successful. The more likely relationship is between the values of the independent variables and into which cell of the success continuum the missions fell. It also seems to be the case that no one variable can be responsible for causing the success of the mission; a combination is required. This was most easily seen through my in-depth look of the UN mission in Sierra Leone. After looking at the case of UNAMSIL, it becomes clear how each of my independent variables, depending on their value, can either lend to the success or failure of a mission. However, it also becomes apparent that some variables are probably more important than others, although none can cause a mission to be successful alone. In the
in the case of Sierra Leone, it was not until the RUF accepted the UN and was dedicated to fulfilling the provisions of the Lome peace accords that the UN was also able to succeed at implementing all of its mandate provisions. Furthermore, the change in RUF mentality was most directly caused by outside forces, and so it is also important to take into account the importance of external actors when predicting mission success.

Secondly, there was a startling finding in my data, which was the fact that the majority of my missions were unqualified failures. All of these missions were either missing all five variables or only had one (Rwanda), and it is staggering how ill prepared past UN peacekeeping missions have been. Given this data, one must ask if the UN is actually a practical instrument with which to bring about peace in the world, or if it is a more symbolic organization, promoting values and morals by bringing attention to the world’s problems, but remaining ill equipped to handle them. To this question I would argue that as UN peacekeeping is currently practiced, it is not a strategic policy tool to bring about peace, as current PKO’s seem only to attack the symptoms of the problem, rather than the cause. However, it is also not fair to ask the UN to do something that any organization anywhere would have trouble accomplishing. The fact remains that peace is hard to institute, and when the UN is required to enter a country and try to rebuild the nation, its chances for success are diminished from the start, especially if those involved parties are not interested in peace.

The next question then becomes, because the UN does not seem to be designed to effectively handle multidimensional peacekeeping missions, is it better for the UN to be involved in these conflicts, where maybe it does a little good but overall fails, or is it better to not become involved at all? The UN seems to believe that it is better to be
present and not doing much, rather than not be present at all, but this is a point worth exploring further. What seems to be most often the case, is that the UN does not wish to turn a blind eye to world conflicts, but the member states also do not want to spend the money supplying troops and equipment, and they do not want to be involved in long drawn out conflicts. As a result, as was the case with Rwanda, those member states contributing to the peacekeeping mission look for ways to cut costs, but as a result, the mission’s ability to succeed is significantly hampered. At this point, the reputation of the UN is damaged, money that could have been directed elsewhere has been wasted, and peacekeeping troops lives have been put in danger. It is my belief that in many of the cases, it is worse for the UN to show that they are aware of a situation by deploying a peacekeeping force there without investing the energy necessary to make sure the mission is a success, than to not have one at all.

As this study has shown, UN peacekeeping, as it stands now, does not face a very high rate of success. Therefore, my advice for future policy decisions surrounding UN peacekeeping is two-fold. One is that the UN’s strengths do not seem to lie in multidimensional peacekeeping. However, in most of the cases I analyzed, the humanitarian components of the missions were able to be fairly successful, or at least significantly more successful than the other components of the mission. Therefore, I would recommend that the UN be responsible for discharging humanitarian duties in the conflict in question, but that the other duties required in multidimensional peacekeeping be left up to other organizations.

The second point is to be more discerning about the number, and type, of conflicts that the UN is becoming involved in. As it stands now, the UN is trying to
spread itself too thin, and as is the case with missions like Kosovo and Haiti, is becoming involved with conflicts in which the solutions are beyond their abilities to produce. With fewer missions, more attention and resources are available to devote to the already existing missions. Furthermore, if the UN made a return to the form of traditional peacekeeping methods, where it was not asked to enter a country and manipulate incentives and force change, it would also have a better chance for success. These steps would help increase the overall success rates of UN missions, as well as help to restore the reputation of UN peacekeeping, as an organization that can help to successfully keep the peace in countries that are desperate for it.
Appendix I

Explanation of Measurements of Independent Variables
Sierra Leone- UNAMSIL “A” and “B”

(UNAMSIL underwent serious scrutiny roughly a year into its mission because it was failing to achieve the mission objectives. Upon inspection, several problems were revealed in the mission that were addressed and corrected. For each of the following variables, I will list their status at the beginning of the mission, and after the reform.)

** Cooperation of Combatants:** $O \rightarrow X$

**Originally formed mission:**
- The two main parties were the Sierra Leonean government and the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), the Sierra Leonean rebel group. The RUF restricted UN access to the diamond-rich provinces, held peacekeepers hostage, and looted weapons and equipment (Berdal et al. [2007], Howard [2008]).
- The RUF also instituted roadblocks to limit UN access around the country and frequently broke cease-fire agreements (Thakur et al. [2001]).

**After reevaluations:**
- The UN, along with the UK and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) sent thousands of peacekeepers back into Freetown, (the capital) to stabilize the city. This “rapid response defeated the RUF rebels” who were the main actors blocking UN action in Sierra Leone (Howard, 2008, 304).
- Once the RUF had been defeated, they became genuinely interested in achieving peace and became cooperative with the peace process, allowing the UN peaceful access to all parts of the country (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- As a result, the RUF was converted into a political party: the Revolutionary United Front Party (Berdal et al. [2007], Olonisakin [2008]).

**Resources:** $O \rightarrow X$

**Originally formed mission:**
- Troop numbers were too low and poorly trained (Berdal et al. [2007], Howard [2008], Olonisakin [2008]).
- Funding was inadequate (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- Equipment was scarce and of poor quality (Berdal et al. [2007], Olonisakin [2008]).
  1. There was a lack of intelligence information, i.e. troops were given out of date maps of the area (Berdal et al. [2007]).

**After reevaluations:**
- There was a dramatic rise in troops levels from the UN as well as regional organizations i.e. ECOWAS (Berdal et al. [2007], Olonisakin [2008]).
- The troops that were being contributed were also better trained and better equipped (Berdal et al. [2007], Wills [2009]).
- Intelligence capabilities improved with the UK agreeing to provide logistical support and the US increasing their funding of the mission (Olonisakin [2008]).
Clarity of Mandate:  \( O \rightarrow X \)

Originally formed mission:
- There were reports from generals and troop members that there was a lack of understanding of the mandate as well as of the rules of engagement. (Wills [2009], Berdal et al. [2007], Olonisakin [2009]).
- This was because the mandate was a combination of a Chapter VI and VII mission. Most of the mandate was authorized under Chapter VI of the UN charter, but paragraph 14 was “adopted under Chapter VII” and authorized UNAMSIL to “take the necessary action” to keep UN personnel and civilians safe (Wills, 2009, 54).

After reevaluation:
- The mandate was modified to become a “clearer enforcement mandate” (Berdal et al. 2007, 266).
- The mandate was changed to become a full Chapter VII mandate, which meant the rules of engagement were those of an enforcement mission, and they could now be applied to all aspects of the mandate (Wills [2009], Olonisakin [2009]).

Scope of Mandate:  \( O \rightarrow X \)

Originally formed mission:
- It was inadequate because it did not provide any means for the UN to counter the attacks of the RUF in the case of non-compliance
- The mandate was authorized under both Chapter VI and VII, but the mandate needed to be an enforcement mission, not a traditional mission (Berdal et al. [2007], Howard [2008]).

After reevaluation:
- Mandate was made more robust by being fully authorized under Chapter VII, which was needed to launch attacks on the RUF rebels (Berdal et al. 2007, Howard [2008], Wills [2009]).
  1. Mandate was more robust and authorized to “where necessary, decisively counter the threat of RUF attack” (Olonisakin, 94, 2009).

Command and Control:  \( O \rightarrow X \)

Originally formed mission:
- Some troop-contributing countries would not put their troops under UN control, such as Nigeria, Jordan, India and Britain (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- During an assessment of the mission, a report revealed “a serious lack of cohesion with the Mission” from a lack of communication and coordination within the mission (Olonisakin, 2009, 92).
- Tension existed between the military and civilian heads (Howard, [2008]).
- There was also the issue of a lack of cooperation between the Force and Deputy Force Commanders, resulting in a non-unified military force.
After reevaluation:

- Horizontal integration was greatly improved between UNAMSIL and the NGOs that were present in the area when the uncooperative troop-contributing countries (India and Jordan) were replaced with cooperative troops from Pakistan and Bangladesh (Howard [2008]).

- Fixed communication problems by increasing the amount of contact between troop contributing countries and the UN Secretariat (Olonisakin [2009]).

- A new force commander and deputy force commander were instituted, ending the “schism between these two posts” (Olonisakin, 2009, 97).

- The UN commanders gained control of their troops, so the peacekeeping mission could be considered fully under UN control (Berdal et al. [2007]).
East Timor- UNTAET

Cooperation of Combatants-X
- Local populations and the elite were “favorably predisposed” to the UN troops. (Howard, 268, 2008).
- Indonesia, with whom the East Timorese was declaring independence from, agreed to be helpful with the transition to independence and accept the UN peacekeeping force (Berdal et al. [2007], Smith et al. [2003]).
- The East Timorese were willing to work with the UN and to “adopt the international bureaucratic standards and procedures that the UN sought to impart” (Howard, 297, 2008).

Clarity of Mandate-X
- Clearly established parameters and structures of the mission goals (Smith et al. [2003]).
- Clear timetable with specific goals (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- Mission had a uniquely clear endpoint, of leaving the East Timorese in charge of a newly developed government (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- Was not too narrowly interpreted as UNAMIR was. UNTAET’s mandate was broadly construed enough to allow commanders to change implementation in accordance with conditions on the ground (Howard, [2008]).

Scope of Mandate-O/X
- UN had to act as an interim government, so the broad scope giving UN control over everything was appropriate (Smith, et al. [2003]).
- It was however initially inappropriate because it did not provide the East Timorese with a chance to be part of the implementation process. However, once the East Timorese voiced their criticism of UNTAET because of this, it was quickly changed to allow the East Timorese a greater role in the formation of their government (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- All provisions worked to the common goal of helping prepare East Timor for independence (Bellamy et al. [2004], and Smith et al [2003]).

Resources-O/X
- Lacked a clear strategic plan to execute the mandate (Smith et al. [2003]).
- Slow to deploy staff and troop members (Howard [2008], Utley [2006], Smith et al. [2003]).
  1. There is a caveat because in this case, the late deployment of troops did not permanently damage the chances for ultimate, success, but it created several unnecessary barriers, and hampered some success (Howard [2008]).
- However, once staff and troop members were deployed, most proved to be adequate to accomplish most of the designated tasks.
1. For example, the military division inherited “experienced troops,” who worked to gain the trust and support of the public, through such means as learning the language (Howard [2008]).

**Command and Control Capabilities: O/X**

- At the onset there were several command and control problems.
  1. There was a lack of a coordinated information program, and there was poor command and planning coming from New York (Smith et al. [2003]).
  2. There was also weak horizontal integration across some of the divisions, mainly the judicial and civilian police (Smith et al. [2003]).
  3. UN staff experienced difficulties working with the East Timorese because of language and cultural barriers, especially in the civilian police. (CIVPOL) component (Howard [2008]).

- However, the other branches had a much more effective command system.
  1. The humanitarian branch was “centrally coordinating some 100 humanitarian organizations,” which were extremely effective in delivering necessary humanitarian assistance (Howard [2008]).
  2. There was good coordination between INTERFET (International Force in East Timor) and UNTAET when UNTAET inherited INTERFET’s military equipment and personnel and “well-functioning command structure” (Howard, 2008, 285).
Cambodia- UNTAC

Cooperation of Combatants- O

- Khmer Rouge, one of the major political parties, refused to cooperate and implement the Peace Accords (Berdal et al. [2007], Howard [2008]).
  1. Refused UNTAC entry into areas under its control. UNTAC was denied entry to 15% of the country (Berdal et al. [2007], Howard [2008]).
  2. Did not provide information on the number of troops or materials in their areas of control, as was stipulated in the Paris Agreement (Berdal et al. [2007], Sitkowski [2006]).
- The State of Cambodia (SOC) denied UN “direct control” over its administration (despite the mandate guaranteeing UNTAC direct control) while the UN was trying to establish a “neutral political environment,” in which to conduct elections (Berdal et al. [2007]).

Clarity of Mandate- X

- Although the scope was too large, UNTAC was “equipped with detailed instructions on how to proceed” (Sitkowski, 2006, 94).
  1. The components knew what needed to be done, but the scope was inappropriate and so they had trouble doing it. Goals were clear, and especially when the mandate was changed to make elections the main goal, there was a very clear means and end (Berdal et al. [2007], Howard [2008]).
  2. Clarity of the mandate was not the problem, it was a lack of understanding of the environment and an inability to plan on the part of UNTAC (Howard [2008]).

Scope of Mandate-O/X

- The original mandate given to UNTAC is generally considered inadequate for the mission it had to accomplish.
  1. The mandate was restricted to only peacekeeping, which meant force could only be used in self-defense. However, given the lack of cooperation from the Khmer Rouge it would have been necessary for the peacekeepers to use force to impose peace; there was no way to enforce the provisions (Berdal et al. [2007], Sitkowski [2006], Howard [2008]).
  2. The mandate also treated all four involved parties as equals when that was not the case, and the SOC “was in administrative control over most of the country” (Howard, 2008, 176).
- However there is a caveat because when it became clear that peacekeepers could not fulfill their mandate, the main goal became holding free and fair elections. The use of force was not needed for this provision, and the peacekeepers were able to hold democratic elections (Berdal et al. [2007], Howard [2008]).
Resources-O/X

- UNTAC was ill equipped to initiate and sustain large scale multi-component missions (Berdal et al. [2007]).
  1. “with the notable exception of [UNTACs] electoral and repatriation components” (Berdal et. al., 2007, 43).
- Overall there were poor logistics about the realities of the situation on the ground
  1. The logistics force sent to survey the area was too small and there were no engineering capabilities. For example, no “engineering reconnaissance aimed at identifying tasks, and local resources” was sent before UNTAC’s deployment (Berdal et al., 2007, 53).
- There was a shortage of supplies, such as: vehicles, radios, office supplies, etc. to certain divisions. (Howard [2008]).
- There was also a late deployment of staff causing conditions to worsen on the ground (Sitowski [2006], Howard [2008], Thakur et al.[2001]).

Command and Control Capabilities-O

- There was an absence of a centralized logistic planning unit (Berdal, et al. [2007]).
- Weak horizontal integration between components was also a problem (Howard [2008]).
- UNTAC suffered from unclear and ambiguous chains of command (Berdal et al. [2007], Bellamy et al. [2004], Fleitz [2002]).
- There was also the problem of Battalions bypassing UN commanders and listening to orders from their respective national governments, resulting in a disunited UN force (Berdal et al. [2007]).
  1. For example France refused “to deploy its troops where UNTAC directed” (Fleitz, 2002, 130).
Haiti- MINUSTAH

Cooperation of Combatants: O

- Previously failed UN missions in Haiti caused Haitian support for the UN to wane (Mobekk [2006]).
- Because Haiti was not exiting a civil war, but rather was a failed state, there were no clearly identifiable parties; there was violence, but not organized (Mobekk [2006], Yamashita [2008], Howard [2008]).

Clarity of Mandate: X

- The mandate has been fairly consistent Chapter VII mission from the beginning (Yamashita [2008]).
  1. It has undergone a few expansions, mainly in the area security sector reform and to deal with natural disasters, such as the 2010 earthquake, but these expansions were deemed necessary by MINUSTAH, international donors and involved NGOs (Mobekk [2006]).

Scope of Mandate: O

- The situation in Haiti was one of a failed state, not one of exiting a civil war. However the mandate was constructed as if a civil war had just ended, therefore making it inadequate to the tasks actually needing to be done (Howard [2008]).
- It was an unrealistic mandate (Berdal et al. [2007], von Einsiedel [2006]).
- The mandates have not been designed with the long term in mind, rather they are short and quick renewals, leaving the mandate “at the mercy of Council politics” (von Einsiedel [2006]).
- The mandate also prioritized holding elections before address the situation of security of the country (Mobekk, [2006]).

Resources: O

- Troops were under delayed deployment, which led immediately to worsening conditions and violence, making an already difficult situation harder (Berdal et al. [2007], Fishel [2007]).
- The mission was not operating at mandated capacity until after more than a year of its authorization (von Einsiedel [2006], Mobekk [2006]).

Command and Control Capabilities: O

- There is a multiplicity of international organizations, it is hard to have unified horizontal command and control (Howard [2008]).
- There is also the problem of vertical integration, especially within the security sector. There is not a unified approach to “justice, police, and prison reform” and the DDR programs have been “characterized by its individual components,” instead of as a package (Mobekk, 2006, 146).
Kosovo- UNMIK

Cooperation of Combatants: O

- Domestic support for the UN is “reluctant and at time non-existent” (Berdal et al. 2007, 241).
- None of the three main parties feel as though UNMIK is doing enough or moving quickly enough toward an end (Berdal et al. [2007], Howard [2008], Higate et al. [2009]).
- There is a serious amount of animosity between the three main Kosovar Albanian parties, “which complicates the negotiation process” (Howard, 2008, 303).

Clarity of Mandate: O

- There were ambiguities and contradictions implicit in the mandate (Berdal et al. [2007]).
  1. There were ambiguities about central tasks because they were broadly construed, such as the requirement to provide “basic civilian administration functions” (Yannis, 2004, 68).
  2. Also, the troops were supposed to respect the “sovereignty and territorial integrity of Yugoslavia [including Kosovo] while also calling for a “ ‘meaningful self-administration in Kosovo” (Berdal et al., 2007, 239 and Yannis, [2004]).
- It was hard to interpret the various provisions without knowing the final status of Kosovo (Yannis [2004], Bellamy et al. [2004], Howard [2008]).

Scope of Mandate: O

- Too robust, UN assumed complete control of most aspects of the government.
  1. This was an unprecedented amount of authority, and called into the question the role of state sovereignty with respect to UN missions (Higate et al. [2009], Berdal et al. [2007]).
- Under this broad and expansive mandate, UNMIK was not accountable to those it was governing, which raises certain legal issues (Yannis, [2004], Hehir [2006]).
- Because there is no consensus on what the final status of Kosovo will be, the mandate does not offer an endpoint (Howard [2008]).

Resources: O

- Poorly funded and lacks a set budget (Hehir [2006]).
- Staff levels are also law because of the lack of a proper budget (Todd [2002]).
- Not enough skilled human resources (Scheye, [2008]).

Command and Control Structures: O

- No clear leadership, guidance or expertise coming from those in charge (Howard [2008]).
  1. For example the SRSG changed four times in a span of five years (Howard [2008]).
There were many divisions within the mission, and there was not unity of command (Howard [2008], de Wet [2009], Yannis [2004]).

1. For example the three main pillars of the mission involve the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), European Union (EU), and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Therefore “the different wings of UNMIK are often working at cross, or parallel, purposes” (Howard, 2008, 302).

The lack of vertical and horizontal integration undermines the credibility of UNMIK because when large-scale operations need to be carried out, they are not done so effectively. Furthermore, the lack of unified command does not exude an air of authority on the part of the UN to the local population (Yannis [200
Somalia- UNOSOM II

Cooperation of Combatants-O
• There was no actual consent because Somalia was a failed state with no government. There was therefore no general commitment to peace (Berdal et al. [2007], Sitkowski [2006]).
• Citizens were hostile because Somalis had the perception that the UN was going to invade their country (Howard [2008]).
• Instead of working with a government, the main actors were warlords who were constantly fighting and not committed to peace (Bellamy et al. [2004]).

Clarity of Mandate-O
• Troops argued that there was no plan for how to interpret or implement the mandate (Howard [2008]).
• Provisions were vague with frequent changes, leaving the mandate open to a “myriad of interpretations (Jett, 1999, 40).
• In terms of the use of force, there was no strategy to use it to discharge mandate (Sitkowski, 2006).

Scope of Mandate-O
• Too expansive, which meant there were “inflicting imperatives” (Howard, 2008, 27).
• The goals were overambitious, making the mandate unrealistic (Sitkowski [2006]).
• The Americans played a large part in planning and supplying the forces for the mission, which gave UNOSOM II “a strongly American orientation,” which focused on accomplishing more American policy objectives than those the SC deemed important (Berdal et al., 2007, 129).

Resources-O
• Information was not gathered, and the existing information was not disseminated to the field (Howard [2008]).
• Not enough quality troops, and they lacked proper equipment (Fleitz [2002]).
• There was not an appropriate link between the mandated mission and the needed resources, i.e. the mission was under resourced (Crocker [1995])
• Starved the operation of civilian staff (Berdal et al. [2007]).

Command and Control Capabilities-O
• Strong divisions existed between the US and the UN, which is significant because US personnel were leading the mission(Howard [2008], Bellamy et al. [2004]).
• There were also divisions between headquarters and the field (Howard [2008]).
• “National contingents took orders…from national capitals,” instead of from UN commanders. (Bellamy et al., 2004, 159).
  1. For example, the Italian contingent “paid Somali leaders not to attack it,” but then it would not offer resistance when other units came under
attack (Bellamy et al. 2004, 159). There was not a sense of unification within the military division.

- There were disjointed military components that could not coordinate with one another (Wills [2009]).
Rwanda- UNAMIR

Cooperation of Combatants-

- Although the two major parties agreed to UN intervention, they were in the minority against the Hutu extremists, who were responsible for most of the widespread violence (Howard [2008]).
  1. President Habyarimana, a Hutu, along with the RPF (a rebel group of exiled Tutsi’s) created a power-sharing deal under the Arusha Accords that UNAMIR was sent to implement, but;
  2. Extremists murdered Habyarimana and began pursuing their own radical agenda (Bellamy et al. [2004]).
- The UNAMIR troops were among the targets of these “genocidaires” (Berdal et al. [2007]).

Clarity of Mandate-

- The mandate was clear what the goals of the mission were and the means in which to achieve them was clear. However, the mandate terms were inappropriate for the realities on the ground, and when the troop commanders tried to get permission for a broader reading of the mandate they were denied; headquarters made them stick with the outlined provisions (Berdal et al. [2007], Howard [2008], Gordon et al. [2001], Wills [2009]).

Scope of the Mandate-

- Mandate did not incorporate the major point of the Arusha Accords, which was ensuring overall security in the country (Berdal et al. [2007], Wills [2009], Bellamy et al. [2004]).
- The mission was also deployed under Chapter VI of the Charter, but the troops needed a broader scope for the use of force to in order to fight the “genocidaires” (Berdal et al. [2007], Howard [2008], Wills [2009]).

Resources-

- The mission was financially and logistically very weak (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- Never had a sufficient intelligence capacity or defensive equipment (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- UNAMIR Did not enjoy adequate funding or troop sizes (Howard [2008], Wills [2009]).

Command and Control Capabilities-

- UNSG and the Secretariat failed to provide leadership and did not accurately report conditions on the ground that could have facilitated mandate revisions (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- Headquarters and high leaders were also ignoring reports that detailed the impending genocide (Howard [2008], Wills [2009]).
• The UN commanders did not have the trust of the troop-contributing countries, and as a result, Belgium, along with several other countries, withdrew their troops from UN command (Howard [2008]).
BOSNIA-UNPROFOR

Cooperation of Combatants-O
- Bosnian Serbs deliberately undermined UN authority and trust (Fleitz [2002], Howard [2008]).
  1. For example they attempted to control the flow of humanitarian aid throughout the country by imposing roadblocks and looting the aid supplies (Bellamy et al. [2004], Fleitz [2002]).
  2. They had also agreed to stop shelling Sarajevo, but instead, launched “1,000 shells in Sarajevo per day” for 3 years (Fleitz, 2002, 141).

Clarity of Mandate-O
- Constant expansion, there was no clear mission statement (Berdal et al. [2007], Wills [2009], Gordon et al. [2001]).
- There was unclear mandate also because the rules of engagement were unclear; it was configured as both a Chapter VI and Chapter VII mandate. For example, the troops could use force to carry out humanitarian missions, but they had to rely on the consent of the “warring parties to move about the country” (Fleitz, 2002, 140).
- Mandate for the safe areas was vague and it was not clear how UNPROFOR would implement it. There were also no defined boundaries for the safe areas (Howard [2008], Wills [2009], Gordon et al. [2001]).

Scope of Mandate-O
- Completely inappropriate to the situation on the ground (Howard [2008], Jett [1999]).
- Rhetorically it was robust, but it did not equip forces adequately. Although the mandate was authorized under Chapter VII, it only provide for traditionally armed peacekeepers (Fleitz [2002], Gordon et al. [2001]).
- The mandate was also consent based, despite the genocidal acts committed by the warring parties and their reluctance to cooperate with UN forces (Gordon et al. 2001).

Resources-O
- There were inadequate resources. Experts had projected that around 34,000 troops would be needed to keep the safe areas safe, but only 7,000 were deployed (Jett [1999], Gordon et al. [2001]).
- Troops were also not given enough equipment to keep the safe areas safe and deter attacks from the Bosnian Serbs (Gordon et al.,2001, Wills [2009]).

Command and Control Capabilities-O
- There were problems of coordination between the UN and NATO (Gordon et al. [2001]).
- Poor leadership and communication from headquarters also existed (Howard [2008], Wills [2009]).
1. For example, there was the repeated denial of airstrikes to protect safe areas despite being under attack by the Bosnian Serbs (Bellamy et al. [2004]).

- UN commanders had to deal with national interference, meaning there were no clear lines of command between force commanders and their troops (Gordon et al. [2001]).
- There was also poor horizontal coordination between the humanitarian and military divisions of the mission, as well as between UNPROFOR and the local government. The mission “antagonized both Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Serbs,” instead of trying to constructively engage them in the mission (Howard 2008, 50).
Appendix II

Explanations of Measurements for Success
Sierra Leone- UNAMSIL A

Overall: Failure

Mandate:
- UNAMSIL was unable to disarm the militant combatants, meaning “violence remained prevalent” in Sierra Leone (Bellamy et al. 2004, 143).
- They were also unable to maintain a lasting ceasefire, and the DDR sites were attacked and stopped from fulfilling their objectives.

UN Impact on Country:
- RUF still held great power in the country, and they continued to undermine UN authority, at one point raiding a DDR site and holding 500 peacekeepers hostage (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- No ceasefires were observed, fighting continued and because UNAMSIL was seen as “a hostile presence” (Bellamy et al. 2004, 143).

Sierra Leone- UNAMSIL B

Overall: Success

Mandate:
- Goals were to assist with the disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) of combatants, ensure the security and freedom of movement of UN personnel, monitor the adherence to the cease-fire agreement, facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance, as well as to provide support, as requested, to the elections that are to be held.
- UNAMSIL was in charge of a DDR program, in which roughly 33,000 were expected to be disarmed, but it succeeded in disarming around 75,000 combatants (Berdal et al. [2007], Olonisakin [2008]).
- Once most of the combatants were disarmed, the civil war was declared over.
- Helped to hold the first peaceful elections ever and converted the RUF into a legitimate political party.
  1. Worked to register 2.3 million eligible voters (Olonisakin [2008]).
  2. UNAMSIL also worked to provide security and logistics for the elections, such as ballot boxes.

UN Impact on Country
- Sierra Leone is no longer considered on the brink of becoming a failed state and has thus far avoided falling back into civil war.
- Free and fair elections have continued to be held and the government has been making efforts to cut down on corruption and address other domestic problems.
East Timor- UNTAET

**Overall: Qualified Success**

*Mandate:*

- Not all components were able to fulfill all aspects of their mandates, but the majority did, and UNTAET eventually reached its end goal of turning the government over to the East Timorese. Those components that complete their goals were:
  1. The civilian administration, which allowed for the transfer of administrative to the East Timorese,
  2. the military division, which successfully set up a new army known as the East Timorese Defense Force, and;
  3. the humanitarian assistance and emergency relief programs, which delivered necessary humanitarian relief and aided in the return of 200,000 refugees (Howard [2008]).
- The civilian police and judicial affairs components were less successful, although still accomplished part of their mandates.
  1. Not much progress was made in setting up the East Timorese legal system, and those committed crimes during the 1999 post-election violence have yet to be tried.

*UN Impact on Country:*

- The UN successfully set up an East Timorese run government that has continued to function to the present day.
- Successful elections have been held and are considered free and fair by the international community (Berdal et al. [2007]).
- However, there has been political instability since independence with some politically motivated attacks (Berdal et al. [2007]).

Cambodia- UNTAC

**Overall: Qualified Success**

*Mandate:*

- Many provisions of original mandate were not fulfilled (Berdal et al. [2007]).
  1. The civilian police, rehabilitation and civilian administration components “were not able to fulfill their primary tasks set forth in the accords,” such as demilitarizing the combatants, or retraining the Cambodian police force (Howard, 2008, 178).
  2. The military and human rights components also did not fulfill all tasks of their mandate, but they did succeed in “providing security for the elections, creating goodwill toward UNTAC and making human rights a popular cause in Cambodia” (Howard, 2008, 178).
The mission was able to experience some success once the main goal of the mandate became holding free and fair elections. Elections were held in 1993, and UNTAC had registered almost 5 million citizens, and there was a 90% “electoral turnout” (Bellamy, et al. [2004]).

The repatriation component was also considered successful, when it was able to return over 360,000 refugees to their homes (Bellamy et al. [2004]).

**UN impact on Country Situation:**

- After holding elections in 1993 for the first time since the 1970s, Cambodia has continued to hold elections in 1998, 2003, and again in 2008 (Howard [2008]).
- This has led to the country moving toward a “more pluralistic and less repressive political system” (Berdal et al. 2007, 64).
- UNTAC was able to exclude the genocidal Khmer Rouge regime from the new political processes, which eventually led to its demise (Howard [2008]).
- More attention is now paid to the protection of human rights, which UNTAC brought to the country’s attention (Howard [2008]).
- However, Cambodia still suffers from several problems. For example:
  1. Human rights abuses are still prevalent (Berdal et al. [2007]).
  2. UNTAC was unable to train a Cambodian police force, so the police is considered an extension of the army, which is not disciplined and lacks professionalism (Howard [2008]).
  3. Despite holding regular elections, Cambodia still suffers from a fair amount of political instability, and corruption (Bellamy et al. [2004]).

**Haiti-MINUSTAH**

**Overall: Qualified Failure**

**Mandate:**

- The main provisions were “ensuring a secure and stable environment, supporting the political process, and protecting human rights” (Yamashita [2008]).
- Thus far MINUSTAH has been unable to provide a solidly secure and stable environment, although “even staunch critics of MINUSTAH concede that the mission needs to be in Haiti or the situation would be untenable” (Mobekk [2006]).
  1. Much of the violence is not organized but rather gang related, and since 2006, MINUSTAH initiated a “crackdown” on the gangs in and around the Port-au-Prince area. This helped stabilized those areas, allowing schools and shops to reopen, and the return of many of its residents (Mobekk [2006]).
- However, MINUSTAH has been much less successful at fulfilling its requirements of delivering humanitarian aid and supporting the political process.
  1. Supplies have been limited to help victims of the earthquakes and cholera outbreak (Limontas [2011]).
2. MINUSTAH was able to hold elections, but they were racked with corruption and fraud, which resulted in the necessity of a run-off election. The results are still unknown (Limontas [2011]).

UN Impact on Country:
- Still in the country, which is in a state of limbo, and no lasting UN institutions have been constructed.
  1. Haiti was been devastated by an earthquake, tornado, hurricane, and cholera outbreak. The cholera is believed to have been caused by Nepalese peacekeepers (Limontas [2011]).
  2. After the inability of MINUSTAH to adequately respond to the aforementioned catastrophes, many Haitians are calling for its withdrawal (Limontas [2011])
  3. There has also not been progress made on the political front. Although elections have been held they are ridden with fraud and corruption, as was the case with the elections held in November of 2010. As of yet, Haiti has yet to be governed by a legitimate democratically elected government (Limontas [2011]).

Kosovo-UNMIK

Overall: Failure
Mandate: (It is hard to definitively say at this point in time how successful UNMIK was at accomplishing its mandate because of its broad role as civil administrator in Kosovo. However, the following points can be used to point to UNMIK’s failure to effectively govern Kosovo and lead to its transition of a final status).
- There are four main pillars: humanitarian assistance, civil administration, democratization and institution building, and reconstructions and economic development, with UNMIK being most responsible for the civil administration.
- Without making much progress on mandate objectives, UNMIK responsibilities have been mostly transferred to EULEX (the European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo) mission sent to Kosovo. EULEX’s main focus is on “the administration of justice” (de Wet, 2009, 84).
- Kosovo declared independence in 2008, but is not fully internationally recognized as independent, and this declaration of independence was not supported by the UNSC because of objections from Russia and China (Lowen [2011]).
- UNMIK has not been able to repatriate many of the North Kosovo Albanians living in the Serb dominated North Province of Mitrovice (Express [2010]).

UN Impact on Country: (Because UNMIK was essentially in charge of running the country, the current state of Kosovo is a somewhat better means to measure the UN’s impact and successfulness in mandate implementation)
- Kosovo has “become a haven for drug running, trafficking of women, money laundering, and other criminal activities (Howard, 2008, 303).
1. Amnesty International has actually accused the UNMIK troops of furthering the sex trade in Kosovo (Amnesty International [2004]).
   • Some fighting has been held under control, but this can mostly be contributed to “a weighty NATO-led military and security presence” (Berdal et al. 2007, 217). UNMIK’s main responsibilities involved civilly administrating Kosovo.
   • However, there have still been several outbreaks of violence in the Kosovo’s divided northern provinces.
   • There has been little economic development, with unemployment reaching over 40%, and almost half of the population living below the poverty line (Lowen [2011]).
   • Because UNMIK is viewed in distaste by both the Kosovo Albanians and Kosovo Serbs, it has been denied the opportunity to mediate talks between Kosovo and Serbia (Express, [2010]).

Somalia- UNOSOM II

Overall: Failure

Mandate:
   • After losing 18 soldiers, the US announced the withdraw of its soldiers, which was quickly followed by European governments, “thus effectively ending the military enforcement action in Somalia” (Bellamy et al. 2004, 159). This was done before a ceasefire had been implemented.
   • The mission was unable to create a secure environment to distribute humanitarian aid, ensure the rehabilitation of the political institutions and economy of Somalia, including disarming the warring factions.
     1. However, minor achievements were made: some populations received short-term humanitarian aid, children were vaccinated, and some school and government structures were rehabilitated (Howard, [2008]).

UN Impact on Country Situation:
   • Somalia is still considered a failed state, with no permanent form of government or no legal system (CIA world factbook).
   • The country is still dominated by fighting and clan warfare.
   • The Somali population is also still plagued by humanitarian crises, including food shortages and widespread human rights abuses.
Rwanda- UNAMIR

**Overall: Failure**

**Mandate:**
- Failed to effectively implement the Arusha Accords:
  1. President Habyarimana was assassinated and then, thus breaking the ceasefire, and ending the power-sharing agreement between Habyarimana and the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), and allowing for the Hutu extremists to begin their genocide (Bellamy, et al [2004]).

**UN Impact on the Country:**
- Because the mandate was inappropriate in scope, it did not call for the protection of civilians or for creating a stable and secure environment. This led to 800,000 Tutsi’s and moderate Hutu’s being killed within 100 days (Bellamy et al. [2004]).
- The Secretariat and the Security Council were reluctant to become too involved in Rwanda, which lead to them ignoring reports from the field that there was an impending genocide (Howard [2008]).
- As a result, no action was taken, even though peacekeepers were present in Rwanda prior to the genocide, and could have been given the ability to protect the civilians.

Bosnia- UNPROFOR

**Overall: Failure**

**Mandate:**
- Was able to distribute some humanitarian aid, but at the cost of bargaining with, and thereby strengthening and legitimizing, the warlords (Bellamy et al. [2004]).
  1. However the humanitarian aid did keep thousands of people from succumbing to starvation during the Bosnian winter (Bellamy et al. [2004]).
- Was unable to do anything about the fighting and the Bosnian Serbs acts of ethnic cleansing (Bellamy et al. [2004]).
- Failed to keep designated safe areas under UN control safe, which resulted in the massacre of “7,000 Bosnian Muslims, and the ethnic cleansing of over 40,000 people” (Howard, 2008, 43).
- Because it became clear that UNPROFOR was powerless to end the fighting, after the fall of the safe areas, they were essentially forced to withdraw and hand over operations to NATO.

**UN Impact on Country Situation:**
- The UN was not able to end the fighting or ethnic warfare, and Bosnia is still considered to be “in a state of negative peace, with international forces continuing to oversee its security and smooth functioning of the state (Howard, 2008, 49).
Appendix III

Explanation of Success Rankings within Each Cell
Qualified Success:

- **East Timor (UNTAET):** This was ranked as more successful than the Cambodia mission because more parts of the mandate were able to be fulfilled, and the overall state of the country at the time of the UN departure was much more politically stable.

Failure:

- **Bosnia (UNPROFOR):** I ranked Bosnia as the worst failure because of the fact that the UN set up declared safe areas and then proceeded to not be able to protect them, and as a result, thousands of people were killed. In other words, the troops were not able to stop the fighting in Bosnia, and when they tried to protect civilians, they actually succeeded in getting thousands killed.

- **Rwanda (UNAMIR):** This is ranked as the second worst failure, although it is closely ranked with Bosnia. Although the UN allowed a genocide to occur in the country, it was not originally mandated to take action against those committing the genocide. This is as compared to Bosnia, where innocent civilians were killed while supposedly under UN protection.

- **Somalia (UNOSOM II):** Somalia is the third worst failure. Somalia was a failed state when the UN entered and it was a failed state when they exited. However, minor achievements were made, such as the delivery of some humanitarian aid, which kept some civilians from starvation.

- **Sierra Leone “A” (UNAMSIL):** I ranked Sierra Leone as the second worst failure, before it was doing little to end the civil war that was plaguing Sierra Leone. However, the killings were not to the mass levels experienced in Bosnia and Rwanda, and Sierra Leone was not technically considered a failed state. In other words, the mission was doing little to stop the violence, but the violence was not on the scale as the three previous missions.

- **Kosovo (UNMIK):** This was ranked as less of a failure than the other failures because of the overall state of the country. Kosovo is not experiencing a bloody civil war as was the case in the other failed missions. Rather, the UN failure revolves around being unable to bring about any substantial change to the country. It is governing the country, but progress is stagnant.
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