



## PEACEBUILDING AND PEACEKEEPING IN THE POST COLD WAR ERA

H. K. Pandey<sup>1</sup>, Ph. D. & Col Shantonu Roy<sup>2</sup>



*Scholarly Research Journal's* is licensed Based on a work at [www.srjis.com](http://www.srjis.com)

### Introduction

Since the end of the Cold War, two fundamental changes have shaped the way the international community understands peace and security. First, the range of potential actors of conflict has expanded significantly to include a number of non-state entities. Indeed, security is no longer narrowly conceived in terms of military threats from aggressor nations. In today's world, state failure and civil war in developing countries represent some of the greatest risks to global peace. War-torn countries have become havens and recruiting grounds for international terrorist networks, organized crime, and drug traffickers, and tens of millions of refugees have spilled across borders, creating new tensions in host communities. Instability has also rippled outward as a consequence of cross-border incursions by rebel groups, causing disruptions in trade, tourism and international investment. Second, the potential causes of insecurity have also increased and diversified considerably. While political and military issues remain critical, conceptions of conflict and security have broadened: economic and social threats including poverty, infectious diseases and environmental degradation are now also seen as significant contributing factors. This new understanding of the contemporary challenges to peace is now being reflected in high-level policy debates and statements. The 2004 report of the UN Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change highlighted the fundamental relationship between the environment, security, and social and economic development in the pursuit of global peace in the 21st century, while a historic debate at the UN Security Council in June 2007 concluded that poor management of "high-value" resources constituted a threat to peace. More recently, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon confirmed that "the basic building blocks of peace and security for all people are economic and social security, anchored in sustainable development, allowing us to address all the great issues – poverty, climate, environment and political stability – as part of a whole game plan." The potential for conflicts to be ignited by the environmental impacts of climate change is also attracting international interest. A recent high-level brief by the European Union, for instance, called climate change a "threat multiplier which exacerbates existing trends, tensions and instability" posing both political

*Copyright © 2017, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*

and security risks. As a result, no serious discussion of current or emerging threats to security can take place without considering the role of natural resources and the environment. This changing security landscape requires a radical shift in the way the international community engages in conflict management. From conflict prevention and early warning to peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, the potential role of natural resources and the environment must be taken into consideration at the onset. Indeed, deferred action or poor choices made early on are easily “locked in,” establishing unsustainable trajectories of recovery that can undermine the fragile foundations of peace. In addition, ignoring the environment as a peacebuilding tool misses an important opportunity for dialogue and confidence-building between former conflicting parties: some of the world’s greatest potential tensions over water resources for example – including those over the Indus River system and Nile Basin – have been addressed through cooperation rather than violent conflict. Integrating environmental management and natural resources into peacebuilding, therefore, is no longer an option – it is a security imperative. The establishment of the UN Peacebuilding Commission provides an important chance to address environmental risks and capitalize on potential opportunities in a more consistent and coherent way. This was clearly recognized in 2007 by the former Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support, Carolyn McAskie, when she stated that “where resource exploitation has driven war, or served to impede peace, improving governance capacity to control natural resources is a critical element of peacebuilding.” With a view to offering independent expertise and advice to the Commission and the wider peacebuilding community, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) established an Expert Advisory Group on Environment, Conflict and Peacebuilding in February 2008. Consisting of leading academics, think tanks and non-governmental organizations with combined experience from over 30 conflict-affected countries, the Group provides policy inputs, develops tools, and identifies best practice in using natural resources and the environment in ways that contribute to peacebuilding and prevent relapse into conflict.

The paper is divided into five parts. Following this first section, part two focuses on peacebuilding. Part three offers an analysis of peacekeeping and its direct and indirect impacts on governance and diversion of financial resources. The fourth part examines the relationship between peacemaking and peacebuilding in terms of conflict and security at a global platform. It also discusses how environmental cooperation and assistance for sustainable development can help achieve wider peacebuilding goals, and how integrating

various factors earlier on may build trust, contribute to reconciliation and support the peacebuilding agenda. The fifth and final part will sum up all the issues for a wider peacebuilding community to integrate the world to be a better place to live in and curb conflict management.

### **Peacebuilding**

Peacebuilding is an intervention that is designed to prevent the start or resumption of violent conflict by creating a sustainable peace. Peacebuilding activities address the root causes or potential causes of violence, create a societal expectation for peaceful conflict resolution and stabilize society politically and socioeconomically. The exact definition varies depending on the actor, with some definitions specifying what activities fall within the scope of peacebuilding or restricting peacebuilding to post-conflict interventions.

Peacebuilding includes a wide range of efforts by diverse actors in government and civil society at the community, national and international levels to address the root causes of violence and ensure civilians have freedom from fear (negative peace), freedom from want (positive peace) and freedom from humiliation before, during, and after violent conflict.

The tasks included in peacebuilding vary depending on the situation and the agent of peacebuilding. Successful peacebuilding activities create an environment supportive of self-sustaining, durable peace; reconcile opponents; prevent conflict from restarting; integrate civil society; create rule of law mechanisms; and address underlying structural and societal issues. Researchers and practitioners also increasingly find that peacebuilding is most effective and durable when it relies upon local conceptions of peace and the underlying dynamics which foster or enable conflict.

### **Definition**

Although peacebuilding has remained a largely amorphous concept without clear guidelines or goals, common to all definitions is the agreement that improving human security is the central task of peacebuilding.

Although many of peacebuilding's aims overlap with those of peacemaking, peacekeeping and conflict resolution, it is a distinct idea. Peacemaking involves stopping an ongoing conflict, whereas peacebuilding happens before a conflict starts or once it ends. Peacekeeping prevents the resumption of fighting following a conflict; it does not address the underlying causes of violence or work to create societal change, as peacebuilding does. It also differs from peacebuilding in that it only occurs after conflict ends, not before it

begins. Conflict resolution does not include some components of peacebuilding, such as state building and socioeconomic development.

In 2007, the UN Secretary-General's Policy Committee defined peacebuilding as follows: "Peacebuilding involves a range of measures targeted to reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities at all levels for conflict management, and to lay the foundations for sustainable peace and sustainable development. Peacebuilding strategies must be coherent and tailored to specific needs of the country concerned, based on national ownership, and should comprise a carefully prioritized, sequenced, and therefore relatively narrow set of activities aimed at achieving the above objectives."

There are two broad approaches to peacebuilding :-

First, peacebuilding can refer to *direct work* that intentionally focuses on addressing the factors driving or mitigating conflict. When applying the term "peacebuilding" to this work, there is an explicit attempt by those designing and planning a peacebuilding effort to reduce structural or direct violence.

Second, the term peacebuilding can also refer to efforts to coordinate a multi-level, multisectoral strategy, including ensuring that there is funding and proper communication and coordination mechanisms between humanitarian assistance, development, governance, security, justice and other sectors that may not use the term "peacebuilding" to describe themselves. The concept is not one to impose on specific sectors. Rather some scholars use the term peacebuilding is an overarching concept useful for describing a range of interrelated efforts.

While some use the term to refer to only post-conflict or post-war contexts, most use the term more broadly to refer to any stage of conflict. Before conflict becomes violent, preventive peacebuilding efforts, such as diplomatic, economic development, social, educational, health, legal and security sector reform programs, address potential sources of instability and violence. This is also termed conflict prevention. Peacebuilding efforts aim to manage, mitigate, resolve and transform central aspects of the conflict through official diplomacy as well as through civil society peace processes and informal dialogue, negotiation, and mediation. Peacebuilding addresses economic, social and political root causes of violence and fosters reconciliation to prevent the return of structural and direct violence. Peacebuilding efforts aim to change beliefs, attitudes and behaviors to transform the short and long term dynamics between individuals and groups toward a more stable, peaceful

coexistence. Peacebuilding is an approach to an entire set of interrelated efforts that support peace.

### **Background**

In the 1970s, Norwegian sociologist Johan Galtung first created the term peacebuilding through his promotion of systems that would create sustainable peace. Such systems needed to address the root causes of conflict and support local capacity for peace management and conflict resolution. Galtung's work emphasized a bottom-up approach that decentralized social and economic structures, amounting to a call for a societal shift from structures of coercion and violence to a culture of peace. American sociologist John Paul Lederach proposed a different concept of peacebuilding as engaging grassroots, local, NGO, international and other actors to create a sustainable peace process. He does not advocate the same degree of structural change as Galtung.

Peacebuilding has since expanded to include many different dimensions, such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and rebuilding governmental, economic and civil society institutions. The concept was popularized in the international community through UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's 1992 report *An Agenda for Peace*. The report defined post-conflict peacebuilding as an "action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict" At the 2005 World Summit, the United Nations began creating a peacebuilding architecture based on Kofi Annan's proposals. The proposal called for three organizations: the UN Peacebuilding Commission, which was founded in 2005; the UN Peacebuilding Fund, founded in 2006; and the UN Peacebuilding Support Office, which was created in 2005. These three organizations enable the Secretary-General to coordinate the UN's peacebuilding efforts. National governments' interest in the topic has also increased due to fears that failed states serve as breeding grounds for conflict and extremism and thus threaten international security. Some states have begun to view peacebuilding as a way to demonstrate their relevance. However, peacebuilding activities continue to account for small percentages of states' budgets.

The Marshall Plan was a long-term postconflict peacebuilding intervention in Europe with which the United States aimed to rebuild the continent following the destruction of World War II. The Plan successfully promoted economic development in the areas it funded. More recently, peacebuilding has been implemented in postconflict situations in

countries including Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Northern Ireland, Cyprus and South Africa.

### **Components of Peacebuilding**

The tasks included in peacebuilding vary depending on the situation and the agent of peacebuilding. Successful peacebuilding activities create an environment supportive of self-sustaining, durable peace; reconcile opponents; prevent conflict from restarting; integrate civil society; create rule of law mechanisms; and address underlying structural and societal issues. To accomplish these goals, peacebuilding must address functional structures, emotional conditions and social psychology, social stability, rule of law and ethics and cultural sensitivities.

Preconflict peacebuilding interventions aim to prevent the start of violent conflict. These strategies involve a variety of actors and sectors in order to transform the conflict. Even though the definition of peacebuilding includes preconflict interventions, in practice most peacebuilding interventions are postconflict. However, many peacebuilding scholars advocate an increased focus on preconflict peacebuilding in the future.

There are many different approaches to categorization of forms of peacebuilding among the peacebuilding field's many scholars.

Barnett *et al.* divides postconflict peacebuilding into three dimensions: stabilizing the post-conflict zone, restoring state institutions and dealing with social and economic issues. Activities within the first dimension reinforce state stability post-conflict and discourage former combatants from returning to war (disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, or DDR). Second dimension activities build state capacity to provide basic public goods and increase state legitimacy. Programs in the third dimension build a post-conflict society's ability to manage conflicts peacefully and promote socioeconomic development.

A mixture of locally and internationally focused components is key to building a long-term sustainable peace. Mac Ginty says that while different "indigenous" communities utilize different conflict resolution techniques, most of them share the common characteristics described in the table. Since indigenous peacebuilding practices arise from local communities, they are tailored to local context and culture in a way that generalized international peacebuilding approaches are not.

### **Major organizations**

Intergovernmental organizations

The United Nations participates in many aspects of peacebuilding, both through the peacebuilding architecture established in 2005-06 and through other agencies. The Peacebuilding architecture are UN Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), UN Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO). The other agencies are Peacebuilding Portal, UN Department of Political Affairs, UN Development Programme.

The World Bank and International Monetary Fund focus on the economic and financial aspects of peacebuilding. The World Bank assists in post-conflict reconstruction and recovery by helping rebuild society's socioeconomic framework. The International Monetary Fund deals with post-conflict recovery and peacebuilding by acting to restore assets and production levels. The EU's European Commission describes its peacebuilding activities as conflict prevention and management, and rehabilitation and reconstruction.

#### Governmental organizations

All nations such as France, Germany, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States including India have governmental organizations to look after the peace processes and security in the world with overseeing economic upliftments.

#### Nongovernmental organizations

There are Nongovernmental organizations like Alliance for Peacebuilding, Bergh of Foundation, Catholic Relief Services, Conscience: Taxes for Peace not War, Conciliation Resources, Crisis Management Initiative, IIDA Women's Development Organisation, Initiatives of Change, International Alert, International Crisis Group, Interpeace, Jewish-Palestinian Living Room Dialogue Group, Peace Direct, Saferworld, Search for Common Ground, Seeds of Peace, United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders), Tuesday's Children, Karuna Center for Peacebuilding, Nonviolent Peaceforce.

#### Research and academic institutes

Research and academic institutes also oversee peace like these as mentioned :Center for Justice and Peacebuilding, Center for Peacebuilding and Development, Irish Peace Institute, Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, United States Institute of Peace, University for Peace.

#### **Peacekeeping**

Peacekeeping refers to activities that tend to create conditions that favor lasting peace. Within the United Nations group of nation-state governments and organizations, there is a general understanding that at the international level, peacekeepers monitor and observe peace

processes in post-conflict areas, and may assist ex-combatants in implementing peace agreement commitments that they have undertaken. Such assistance may come in many forms, including confidence-building measures, power-sharing arrangements, electoral support, strengthening the rule of law, and economic and social development. Accordingly, UN peacekeepers (often referred to as Blue Berets or Blue Helmets because of their light blue berets or helmets) can include soldiers, police officers, and civilian personnel.

The United Nations is not the only organization to implement peacekeeping missions. Non-UN peacekeeping forces include the NATO mission in Kosovo (with United Nations authorization) and the Multinational Force and Observers on the Sinai Peninsula or the ones organized by the EU like EUFOR RCA (with UN authorization). The Nonviolent Peaceforce is one NGO widely considered to have expertise in general peacemaking by non-governmental volunteers or activists.

### **History**

After Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal, Britain, France and Israel attempted to intervene without success. This led to the 1956 Suez Crisis. Both sides wanted to cease hostilities, but a consensus did not take place. During a UN meeting on November 4, 1956, Lester Pearson, a Canadian diplomat, proposed the idea of a peacekeeping force wearing blue helmets for identification. Their goal was to ensure peace in a conflict and monitor the events. Pearson came up with the idea that each country would assign soldiers to the UN peacekeeping force. This was the first UN peacekeeping mission and the concept of peacekeeping was born.

### **Cold War peacekeeping**

In 1988 the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the United Nations peacekeeping forces. The press release stated that the forces "represent the manifest will of the community of nations" and have "made a decisive contribution" to the resolution of conflict around the world.

### **Since 1991**

Experiences of peacekeeping during the Yugoslav Wars, especially failures such as the Srebrenica Massacre, led, in part, to the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission, which works to implement stable peace through some of the same civic functions that peacekeepers also work on, such as elections. The Commission currently works with six countries, all in Africa. In 2013 the U.N. Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 2122, which among other things calls for stronger measures regarding women's participation



in conflict and post-conflict processes such as peace talks, gender expertise in peacekeeping missions, improved information about the impact of armed conflict on women, and more direct briefing to the Council on progress in these areas. Also in 2013, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), a UN women's rights committee, said in a general recommendation that states that have ratified the UN Women's Rights Convention are obliged to uphold women's rights before, during, and after conflict when they are directly involved in fighting, and/or are providing peacekeeping troops or donor assistance for conflict prevention, humanitarian aid or post-conflict reconstruction. The Committee also stated that ratifying states should exercise due diligence in ensuring that non-state actors, such as armed groups and private security contractors, be held accountable for crimes against women.

### **Non-United Nations peacekeeping**

Not all international peacekeeping forces have been directly controlled by the United Nations. In 1981, an agreement between Israel and Egypt formed the Multinational Force and Observers which continues to monitor the Sinai Peninsula.

The African Union (AU) is working on building an African Peace and Security Architecture that fulfills the mandate to enforce peace and security on the continent. In cases of genocide or other serious human-rights violations, an AU-mission could be launched even against the wishes of the government of the country concerned, as long as it is approved by the AU General Assembly. The establishment of the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) which includes the African Standby Force (ASF) is planned earliest for 2015.

### **Participation**

The United Nations Charter stipulates that to assist in maintaining peace and security around the world, all member states of the UN should make available to the Security Council necessary armed forces and facilities. Since 1948, about 130 nations have contributed military and civilian police personnel to peace operations. While detailed records of all personnel who have served in peacekeeping missions since 1948 are not available, it is estimated that up to one million soldiers, police officers and civilians have served under the UN flag in the last 56 years. As of March 2008, 113 countries were contributing a total 88,862 military observers, police, and troops.

Despite the large number of contributors, the greatest burden continues to be borne by a core group of developing countries, who often profit financially from their participation in such missions. The ten largest troop-contributing countries to UN peacekeeping operations as

of December 2013 were Pakistan (8266), Bangladesh (7918), India (7849), Nigeria (4836), Nepal (4580), Jordan (3254), Ghana (3005), Rwanda (4751), Senegal (2998), and Egypt (2742). In addition to military and police personnel, 5,187 international civilian personnel, 2,031 UN Volunteers, and 12,036 local civilian personnel worked in UN peacekeeping missions. Also, 3,243 people from over 100 countries have been killed while serving on peacekeeping missions. Many of those came from India (157), Nigeria (142), Pakistan (136), Ghana (132), Canada (121), France (110) and the United Kingdom (103). Thirty percent of the fatalities in the first 55 years of UN peacekeeping occurred between 1993 and 1995.

Developing nations tend to participate in peacekeeping more than developed countries. This may be due in part because forces from smaller countries avoid evoking thoughts of imperialism. For example, in December 2005, Eritrea expelled all American, Russian, European, and Canadian personnel from the peacekeeping mission on their border with Ethiopia. Additionally, an economic motive appeals to the developing countries. The rate of reimbursement by the UN for troop contributing countries per peacekeeper per month include: \$1,028 for pay and allowances; \$303 supplementary pay for specialists; \$68 for personal clothing, gear and equipment; and \$5 for personal weaponry. This can be a significant source of revenue for a developing country. By providing important training and equipment for the soldiers as well as salaries, UN peacekeeping missions allow them to maintain larger armies than they otherwise could. About 4.5% of the troops and civilian police deployed in UN peacekeeping missions come from the European Union and less than one percent from the United States.

### **Military Normalization**

Some commentators have highlighted the potential to leverage peacekeeping operations as a mechanism for advancing military normalization. Michael Edward Walsh and Jeremy Taylor have argued that Japan's peacekeeping operations in South Sudan provide those promoting Japan's military normalization with "a unique opportunity to further erode the country's pacifist constitution." "Unable to accept the full weight of modern peacekeeping operations without fundamental political, legal, and social changes," they conclude that "Japan's peacekeepers remain ill prepared to tackle many serious contingencies requiring use of deadly force." For this reason, they suggest that Japan's continued participation in U.N. peacekeeping operations might force policy changes that ultimately push the country toward

"a tipping point from which the normalization of Japan's military (will be) the only outcome."

### **Political Impact on Sending Countries**

Diana Muir Appelbaum, has expressed concern that the creation of a military in Fiji for the purpose of serving in international peacekeeping missions, has produced a military powerful enough to stage 4 coups d'état (1987, 1999–2000, 2006, and 2009) and to rule Fiji as a military dictatorship for over two decades.

### **Impact on the peacekeepers**

Studies of peacekeeping soldiers show both positive and negative effects. A study of 951 US Army soldiers assigned to Bosnia revealed that 77% reported some positive consequences, 63% reported a negative consequence, and 47% reported both. The peacekeepers are exposed to danger caused by the warring parties and often in an unfamiliar climate. This gives rise to different mental health problems, suicide, and substance abuse as shown by the percentage of former peacekeepers with those problems. Having a parent in a mission abroad for an extended period is also stressful to the peacekeepers' families.

Another viewpoint raises the problem that the peacekeeping may soften the troops and erode their combat ability, as the mission profile of a peacekeeping contingent is totally different from the profile of a unit fighting an all-out war.

### **Peace and Security and the UN**

Peacekeeping is one among a range of activities undertaken by the United Nations to maintain international peace and security throughout the world. The other activities are by UN are:

#### ➤ **Conflict prevention**

Conflict prevention involves diplomatic measures to keep intra-state or inter-state tensions and disputes from escalating into violent conflict. It includes early warning, information gathering and a careful analysis of the factors driving the conflict. Conflict prevention activities may include the use of the Secretary-General's "good offices," preventive deployment of UN missions or conflict mediation led by the Department of Political Affairs.

#### ➤ **Peacemaking**

Peacemaking generally includes measures to address conflicts in progress and usually involves diplomatic action to bring hostile parties to a negotiated agreement. The UN Secretary-General may exercise his or her "good offices" to facilitate the resolution of the

conflict. Peacemakers may also be envoys, governments, groups of states, regional organizations or the United Nations. Peacemaking efforts may also be undertaken by unofficial and non-governmental groups, or by a prominent personality working independently.

➤ **Peace enforcement**

Peace enforcement involves the application of a range of coercive measures, including the use of military force. It requires the explicit authorization of the Security Council. It is used to restore international peace and security in situations where the Security Council has decided to act in the face of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression. The Council may utilize, where appropriate, regional organizations and agencies for enforcement action under its authority and in accordance with the UN Charter.

➤ **Peacebuilding**

Peacebuilding aims to reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities at all levels for conflict management, and to lay the foundation for sustainable peace and development. It is a complex, long-term process of creating the necessary conditions for sustainable peace. Peacebuilding measures address core issues that effect the functioning of society and the State, and seek to enhance the capacity of the State to effectively and legitimately carry out its core functions.

➤ **Peacekeeping**

The boundaries between conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and peace enforcement have become increasingly blurred. Peace operations are rarely limited to one type of activity. While UN peacekeeping operations are, in principle, deployed to support the implementation of a ceasefire or peace agreement, they are often required to play an active role in peacemaking efforts and may also be involved in early peacebuilding activities. Today's multidimensional peacekeeping operations facilitate the political process, protect civilians, assist in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants; support the organization of elections, protect and promote human rights and assist in restoring the rule of law. UN peacekeeping operations may use force to defend themselves, their mandate, and civilians, particularly in situations where the State is unable to provide security and maintain public order.

**Conflict, Security and Emerging threats**

Despite the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the emergence of a terrorist threat with global reach in the form of Al Qaeda, the first decade of the new millennium marked a low in the number and severity of armed conflicts worldwide. No phenomenon was more expressive of this trend than the decline in inter-state conflict: once the dominant pattern of war, only three such conflicts occurred in the decade. The traditional protocols of such warfare appear increasingly remote from modern battlefield realities. Yet the past two to three years have given serious reason to reconsider the apparent gains in peace and security that followed the initial, traumatic aftermath of the Cold War, when a wave of wars spread across the Balkans and sub-Saharan Africa. Brutal, intractable, high-casualty conflict has returned, most evidently in Syria, Iraq, Libya, the Central African Republic and South Sudan. Furthermore, it has done so in a way that often eludes the efforts of mediators and military and peace operations to end conflict, bypasses the mechanisms of the international community, and underwrites new forms of threat projection and displacement. In an otherwise optimistic account of the reduction in conflict and violence worldwide, the Human Security Report 2013 notes that ‘the escalating carnage in Syria meant a dramatic increase in the number of worldwide battle deaths in 2012. Indeed, the Syrian battle-death toll last year was the world’s highest since the World War I-style interstate war between Ethiopia and Eritrea in 1999.’ The novelties in the most recent conflicts, which help account for its particularly lethal virulence, should not obscure the continuities in organized violence. Modern wars do not break out for reasons that are in any way historically exceptional. Ethno-political tensions, rebel separatism and armed resistance to authoritarian regimes remain the major sources of intrastate conflict: of 136 civil wars fought since 1940, 74 aimed at gaining control of the state, and 62 at territorial separation. The one possible innovation in the field of combat is that provided by armed non-state criminal groups in Mexico and Central America, whose activities are guided. Although different research bodies use distinct methodologies to track the severity of war, the Global Peace Index offers one sobering overview: deaths due to internal conflict have increased nearly five times from 2008 to 2013, and the incidence of major conflicts has nearly tripled by a combination of territorial control and transnational trafficking and business logics, and whose extreme brutality owes much to high degrees of social atomization. Modern civil war’s causes, in short, are recognizable. The Syrian civil war emerged from state repression of a popular uprising with a heavily sectarian component, based in large part on the regime’s exclusion from power and wealth of the country’s Sunni majority. Likewise, Mali’s armed crisis of

2012 can be understood as the fourth Tuareg rebellion of the country's post-colonial era, as it was unmistakably connected to combatants belonging to this ethnic group who had once served in General Qadhafi's military forces in Libya, and who demanded the creation of a new country, Azawad, upon their return. Fighting in South Sudan, Iraq, the Central African Republic and Libya can also be understood in terms of armed competition for power and resources between different, largely ethnic or religious factions, and is generally presaged in each case on the acute sense of exclusion of one group rooted in perceived historical grievances. For the scholar Akbar Ahmed, it is the misunderstood and maltreated tribal peripheries of various states, such as Pakistan and Yemen, which are now engaged in escalating retaliation against central states, and with the Western military as a consequence. Inter-state war, for its part, has undergone a marked decline, driven by a rising body of global norms against such warfare, as well as increasing economic and financial ties between nations. Even so, the far higher death-tolls that traditionally result from conflicts between the military forces of rival nations continue to make the risk of such war a compelling feature of geopolitics. Both this danger, as well as a distinct unwillingness of big states to risk military escalation, were manifested in early 2014 by the tensions between Russia and the Ukraine, and by extension between Russia and the West, over the Crimean peninsula and eastern Ukraine. A sharp increase in antagonism between Japan and China, the continuous presence of North Korea as an erratic, nuclear-armed state with a brittle leadership structure, the internationalization of African conflicts such as that of the Central African Republic (CAR), or the possibility of direct war between states affected by the widening Syrian conflict also pose real threats to international security, even if the diplomatic means to contain them are in principle available. According to Wimmer, global data since 1945 shows that 'an increase in the size of the politically excluded population by 30 per cent increased the chances of civil war by 25 per cent. In short, it is the new dynamics of the process of fighting, and the effects of these on the evolution of the objectives that combatants and their leaders set themselves within the course of conflict, that have become outstanding features of recent wars. The main problems for the international community emerging from this most recent wave of conflicts – their intractability, the risk of an unpredictable spill-over of organized violence and the limited relevance of existing global security institutions – derive in large part from the evolutionary dynamic of modern organized violence, rather than the initial causes.

However, internationalization has many other forms aside from direct military implication by foreign parties in support of a conflict partner. Globalized Islamist extremism has prompted the emergence or consolidation of new fronts for armed violence, such as that of Boko Haram in Nigeria. Yet unlike the early days of Al Qaeda as a centrally controlled transnational terrorist network, the organization has been restructured into a franchise operation, handing out its blessing and insignia to preferred local groups. While this may have diminished the ability to project violence into the highly securitized developed world, including Europe, it has made the extremist cause much more responsive to local grievances and discontents, exactly as intended by the Al Qaeda's leaders according to internal correspondence. Franchised jihadist activity has thus grown ever closer to zones of existing conflict and tension, and particularly to populous lower to middle income countries, including India, Nigeria, Russia and Thailand. Its mobility and flexibility has made it highly responsive to weak spots for international security, in precisely the same ways that narco-trafficking has managed to adapt to successive waves of law enforcement by decamping to new and accessible routes. Moreover, the emergence of various sub-groups competing in the Islamist eco-system has also seemingly furthered state linkages to these groups, particularly where these groups are active in poorly governed cross-border territories. The case of Pakistani intelligence support for the Taliban, Yemeni regime links to Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, and foreign backing for insurgent and Islamist forces operating in the Sahel all suggest that internationalization of current terrorist activity may take on many different forms. Understanding new threats and risks as mentioned above, many conflicts continue to stem from deep rooted ethnic grievances or territorial tensions. Both the conflict in South Sudan, and the friction between Russia and Ukraine, are easily recognizable within these classical paradigms of war. But at the same time, there is evidence to suggest that a number of recent conflicts have assumed a more decentralized, fragmented structure, in which cross-national influences operating along various dimensions have been accentuated. The multiplicity of interests and actors do not seem so far to have been able to agree on any solid basis for negotiation, nor shown much wish to do so, beyond the minimal commitment not to use chemical weapons or to provide limited humanitarian access. As a result, a genuine risk exists in Syria, as well as in other internationalized civil wars, that unresolved internal conflict might eventually expand into even more lethal interstate war.

## Conclusion

The national and regional displacement of conflict, the use of potent symbolic attacks on urban and economic centres as a means to wage asymmetric warfare, and the proliferation of stakes and actors in key conflicts, such as that of Syria, together represent a complex array of security threats. Although these are not characteristic of all current and emerging conflicts, they stand out as threats for which conventional, institutionalized responses are largely absent. Peacekeeping operations in a changing world at the root of these new threats are trends that have become a distinctive feature of intrastate conflicts in the Sahel, the Middle East and North Africa, as well as the Horn of Africa and in the criminalized zones of extreme violence in Latin America. Fighting groups are growing more dispersed and fragmented, seeking local territorial control as a primary means of exerting influence on the course of conflict, and over their own prospects of political leverage and economic accumulation. At the same time, various dimensions of external influence, whether through illicit business, Islamist ideology, proxy influence from nearby states or cross-border sectarian alliances, are internationalizing a rising number of civil wars. In such contexts, without organized national counterparts to negotiate with, and in the face of risks of contagion of violence or instability along various transnational transmission routes, the international community appears to be facing the toughest tests for its mediation and peacekeeping architecture.

The original peacekeeping formula was fairly straightforward: when parties to a conflict agreed on a ceasefire, an international force could be deployed to observe and report on whether or not they lived up to their commitment. The deployment would take place only with the consent of all the parties and the mandate would be quite restricted. The peacekeepers would use force only for self-defence and would stay on the sidelines if combat resumed.

## References.

- Barnett, Michael : "Peacebuilding: What Is in a Name?"*.  
*Keating, Tom : Building Sustainable Peace*.  
*Mac Ginty , Roger : International Peacebuilding and Local Resistance*.  
*Porter , Elisabeth : Peacebuilding: Women in International Perspective*.  
*Richmond, Oliver : A Post-Liberal Peace*.  
*Sandole, Dennis : Peacebuilding*.  
*Schirch, Lisa : Little Book of Strategic Peacebuilding*. .  
*Schirch, Lisa : Conflict Assessment & Peacebuilding Planning*.  
*Tarnoff, Curt; Marian L. Lawson: Foreign Aid: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy (Technical report)*.



- Bureš, Oldřich : "Regional Peacekeeping Operations: Complementing or Undermining the United Nations Security Council?".*
- Eveleigh, Robin : Peace-Keeping in a Democratic Society: the Lessons of Northern Ireland.*
- Fortna, Virginia Page : "Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War".*
- Goulding, Marrack : "The Evolution of United Nations Peacekeeping.*
- Pushkina, Darya : "A Recipe for Success? Ingredients of a Successful Peacekeeping Mission".*
- Worboys, Katherine : "The Traumatic Journey from Dictatorship to Democracy: Peacekeeping Operations and Civil-Military Relations in Argentina.*
- Dandeker, Christopher; Gow, James : "The Future of Peace Support Operations: Strategic Peacekeeping and Success".*
- Bridges, Donna and Debbie Horsfall: "Increasing Operational Effectiveness in UN Peacekeeping: Toward a Gender-Balanced Force."*
- Howard, Lise Morjé : UN Peacekeeping in Civil Wars.*