ON THE THEORETICAL AND TERMINOLOGICAL PREMISES FOR RESEARCHING PEACE OPERATIONS

Colonel GS Dipl. Eng. Radoslav IVANČÍK, PhD.
General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Slovak Republic
Prof. Dipl. Eng. Vojtech JURČÁK, CSc.
Armed Forces Academy of General M. R. Štefánik

Abstract

The high dynamics of the changes in the security environment, deepening globalisation, and the growth of current and new, predominantly asymmetric, threats make permanent new demands on international society and require new more complex approaches towards the issue. One of the most significant tools the international community has for keeping peace and security on an international level, restraining centres of tension, consolidating or stabilising relations in crisis areas, and multilateral reconstruction and restoration of countries after armed conflicts, is represented by peace operations within international crisis management. Peace operations have changed a lot throughout the last fifty years, and today, unlike in the past, they represent highly complex, dynamic, demanding and multidimensional activities. Therefore, the main aim of the authors is to point out the significance of a theoretical and terminological basis for research in the field of peace operations.

Key words: *Security, peace operations, international crisis management.*

Introduction

The end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the bipolar world order were the two decisive factors that altered the view of the international security and security

environment, and significantly influenced the development of peace operations. Today, peace operations are framed completely differently than in the past. With their changed concept, they represent a highly demanding, dynamic and complex activity. Therefore, the increasing dynamics of developing security situations in crisis areas requires constant updating and the applying of new theoretical knowledge and practical procedures, both on the level of the political decision-making process and in the field of planning and conduct of military operations.

Geopolitical changes, empirical findings and emerging asymmetric security threats have gradually led to changes in traditional UN peacekeeping operations (e.g. operations aimed at sustaining peace), as well as, to a significantly broader extent and content, of the current peace operations. This is because the ongoing changes in global, continental and regional security environments significantly affect not only the traditional military mindset, objectives and activities, but also the way military forces are used and led in peace operations. Since the end of the Cold War, peace operations have gained a new framework, one which, besides the traditional roles, entails such measures as support for elections, promotion of human rights, security sector capacity building, public administration development, and the expansion of democracy.

Peace operations thus represent a wide range of not only military but also political, diplomatic and economic activities. Each peace operation is unique in its policy framework, mandate, and the conditions under which it is conducted, as well as in the nature of the tasks to be fulfilled. The framework of peace operations is determined in the political decision-making process by major actors. These may include nation states, international and regional organisations, military alliances, non-governmental organisations or other entities in the system of international relations and politics, with the mandate to implement them.

Today, peace operations take place in an environment marked by increased competition between state and non-state actors. Conceptualised as the principal means of obtaining wealth and an exclusive space for delivering national security, the territory is now losing more and more of its significance in the globalised world. While in the not-so-distant past the geographical distance and technological backwardness of the "rest of the world" ensured the relative security and inviolability of Western borders and values, they are no longer so

significant and do not play such a role in the face of globalisation and so-called "closing distances".

The ongoing rapid development of technology, communication and information systems, transport and mass movement of people, goods, services and information are causing erosion in the traditional pillars of security within nation states. Under such conditions, neither economic or military power, nor technological superiority, education and other attributes of values render developed democracies immune to the new asymmetric threats. Combined with large-scale humanitarian and industrial disasters and epidemics or pandemics, they indeed come to pose a direct security threat to mature democracies. The states that exist on the brink of social and economic collapse, devoid of the ability to operate, to perform state functions, and to deliver elementary security for their own populations, are creating favourable conditions for disseminating and promoting radical movements and ideologies, developing and supporting international terrorism, cross-border organised crime, illegal migration, smuggling, as well as for making certain weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, etc.

Just as, historically, wars were waged between nation states, so also the content of the UN Charter was geared towards the resolution or prevention of such conflicts. Then, however, the period following the Cold War was mainly marked by internal conflicts and crises, which were designated as conflicts of a new type, or post-modern conflicts, whose resolution required drafting new approaches and theories, both at national and international levels, within alliances and integration groups, or various non-governmental organisations.

Regardless of whether or not there were crises or conflicts between or within states, in the past, conflicts were generally perceived as local conflicts. And since local crises and conflicts are continuously present, their occurrence cannot be excluded even in the future. This is partly because the nature of the current crises and the prediction model for the security environment's future development point to a geographical expansion of the zone of instability, which will affect regions or wider regional areas and incorporate several state entities. In this context, peace operations could then be carried out as simultaneous or independent military and non-military missions.

Theoretical premises

International Crisis Management (ICM) operations did not belong to the topical issues debated throughout the "Cold War" era, which may well have resulted from the redistribution of the world between the two superpowers – the USA and the USSR. Even for this reason, during the last two decades, an increasing number of assorted publications, monographs, specialised magazines, articles, and reports or news dealing with peace operations appeared. It could seem that the theory of peace operation is well elaborated at present; however, it is not.

Although in the field of relevant security studies and sources, which are mostly of foreign provenance, there exists a relatively substantial body of specialised literature, most authors in their articles and publications do not address the issue of peace operations from a conceptual point of view, but instead highlight the results of particular operations and map out their evolution and successes (from their own points of view) while using ambiguous concepts, terms and definitions, and this is also confirmed by several other authors. Consider, for example, Bellamy and Williams[1], or Bureš[2], who claim that in the field of theory of international peace operations there exist numerous problems, mainly because most published studies focus on the practical problems of specific operations. According to them, the theory and analyses of peace operations have seen only a very small shift ahead over the past 20 years.

Individual authors usually treat peace operations only from a specific or narrow viewpoint. While some authors deal with peace operations from a military point of view, some depict the spectrum of political perspectives; other authors approach them in light of economic and social phenomena, and yet others describe their appearance, conduct and benefits. According to Bureš[3], such efforts often result only in a descriptive case study of an operation or operations, one that fails to

---

1 BELLAMY, A. J. – WILLIAMS, P. 2004. Thinking Anew about Peace Operation. In *International Peacekeeping*, 2004, Vol. 11, No. 1, p. 6.
2 BUREŠ, O. 2008. *Teorie a praxe postkonfliktní rekonstrukce.* Plzeň : Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk, 2008, p. 7.
3 BUREŠ, O. 2007. Wanted: A Mid-Range Theory of International Peacekeeping. In *International Studies Review*, 2007, Vol. 9, No. 3, p. 407.

contribute anything new to the formulation of a universal concept of peace operations and their theories.

In their works, several authors attempt to apply the international relations theory to international peace operations, while others employ the rational choice theory and public goods theories. These theories share common ground, insofar as they all are rooted in international political economy[4]. Most authors tackle peace operations in light of the conflict resolution theory, which came to the fore at the end of the last century. Under this theory, peace operations are conceived as an important tool that enables violence to be contained and disputes prevented from escalating into war, and helps in reducing the conflict's intensity, tension and duration, as well as in creating the conditions for the country's post-conflict reconstruction[5].

However, the problem with such works is that they put focus on conflict management, rather than on the development of the theory of peace operations, let alone the application of the conflict resolution theory to peace operations[6]. Interestingly, even though no comprehensive and universally accepted theory of peace operations had been formulated in the past, at the end of the 1990s there were voices criticising the initiative to conceptualise peace operations. This criticism was primarily aimed at the disputable suitability of some attempts to apply conflict resolution to peace operations, especially their usefulness and relevance to the study and practice of peace operations after the end of the Cold War[7].

To illustrate this point, Luttwak criticises UN peace operations, for they unnecessarily blocked the natural transformational effects in a war, and thereby only prolonged the conflict, which could have otherwise been terminated by mutual settlement. Beets believes that a limited use of force and the impartiality

4   BUREŠ, O. 2008. *Teorie a praxe postkonfliktní rekonstrukce.* Plzeň : Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk, 2008, p. 22.

5   HANSEN, W. – RAMSBOTHAM, O. – WOODHOUSE, T. 2004*. Hawks and Doves: Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution.* Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2004, p. 8.

6   RYAN, S. 2000: United Nations Peacekeeping: A Matter of Principles? In *International Peacekeeping*, 2000, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 34.

7   BUREŠ, O. 2008. *Teorie a praxe postkonfliktní rekonstrukce.* Plzeň : Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk, 2008, p. 15.

of military units rendered peace troops incapable of acting with any impact and, instead of eliminating conflict and alleviating suffering, they turned out to be a breeding ground for conflict. Shearer claims that peace operations were inefficient, prolonged conflict and the suffering of civilians, and tended to worsen the situation, arguing that in most conflicts agreement was reached immediately after the military victory of one of the parties to the conflict rather than by political negotiations and mediation[8].

Terminological premises

At the beginning of this section of the monograph it should be noted that in the field of international relations or national and international security, or in any other study branch within the group of social, economic and legal sciences, there exists no generally accepted and valid definition of peace operations. In the case of the ICM organisations, different concepts and different terms are used by the UN, NATO and the EU, respectively. One reason for this is the fact that, although peace operation is the most commonly used term of essentially generic reference, it covers not only UN peace operations, but also NATO peace support operations, and EU crisis management operations. Just as it is applied by other authors[9], the term is also used by the authors of this publication, since it is an easily understood umbrella term. Moreover, it is very concise and, compared with the names of NATO and EU operations, far simpler and much more comprehensible.

For the above reasons, it is not at all surprising that most definitions of peace operations are offered by the academic environment. Jurčák et al. defines peace operations as "*operations undertaken by the international community to prevent and resolve conflicts that threaten peace and security in the world*"[10]. Diehl

8 STEJSKALOVÁ, L. 2011. *Komparace základních principů mírových operací OSN, NATO operací na podporu míru a operací krizového manažmentu EU.* Brno : Fakulta sociálních studií, Masarykova univerzita v Brně, 2011, p. 19.
9 For example: Berdal (2000), Findlay (2002) Guéhenno (2002), Norberg (2003), Donald (2003), Durch (2007), Doyle (2007), Diehl (2008), Urbanovská (2010), Zůna (2010), Stejskalová (2011) and other authors.
10 JURČÁK, V. et al. 2009. *Organizácie medzinárodného krízového manažmentu.* Liptovský Mikuláš : Akadémia ozbrojených síl gen. M. R. Štefánika, 2009, p. 16.

defines a peace operation in simple terms as "*one of many strategies used to manage and resolve conflicts*"[11]. According to Zůna, "*peace operations represent a wide range of political, diplomatic, economic and military activities. Each peace operation is unique in its political framework, mandate, scope of assigned tasks, and conditions under which it is conducted*"[12].

Foreign sources provide various definitions of peace operations. In their publications, works, articles or papers, foreign authors approach this term quite differently. For example, Goulding defines peace operations as "*operations established by the United Nations, with the consent of the parties concerned, to help control and resolve conflicts between them, under United Nations command and control, at the expense collectively of the member states, and with military and other personnel and equipment provided voluntarily by them, acting impartially between the parties and using force to the minimum extent necessary*"[13]. However, many authors still tend to use the UN term "peacekeeping". This is most likely because the term has since long been established in most UN official documents, though peacekeeping itself represents only one of many tools for ensuring, maintaining, or restoring security and peace.

In this respect, Bellamy, Williams and Griffin note that in most literature the term peacekeeping is used as a synonym for UN peace operations[14]. Commenting on this, Tardy adds that "strictly speaking, peacekeeping refers to the UN's traditional peace operations, the deployment of neutral military forces between two armed factions to supervise a ceasefire in a non-coercive or consent-based way"[15].

Of the international crisis management organisations under study, indeed, the most complicated terminology is used by the United Nations. It is highly paradoxical that even after more than half a century the United Nations has still

---

11   DIEHL, P. F. 2008. *Peace Operations*. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2008, p. 22.
12   ZŮNA, J. 2010. *Vliv změn v bezpečnostním prostředí na budoucí použití jednotek AČR v mírových operacích.* Brno : Fakulta ekonomiky a managementu Univerzity obrany v Brně, 2010, p. 182.
13   GOULDING, M. 1993. The Evolution of United Nations Peacekeeping. In *International Affairs*, 1993, Vol. 60, No. 3, p. 455.
14   BELLAMY, J. A. – WILLIAMS, P. – GRIFFIN, S. 2004. *Understanding Peace-keeping.* Cambridge : Polity Press, 2004, p. 45.
15   TARDY, T. 2004. Introduction. In TARDY, T. (ed.) 2004. *Peace Operations after 11 September 2001.* New York : Frank Cass´, 2004, p. 2.

not come up with generally accepted universal terminology, nor has it produced any unified conceptual approach to peace operations. One possible reason for this may be the fact that a definition of UN peace operations cannot be found even in the UN's most fundamental document - the UN Charter, and the first major document where UN peace operations are at least broadly defined is the United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Capstone Doctrine of 2008, drafted by the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (UN DPKO)[16]. According to the above doctrine, peace operations constitute "a spectrum of operations to prevent, contain and/or resolve violent conflicts and/or reduce the risk of their recurrence"[17].

The biggest confusion in the terminology of UN peace operations began after 1990, when a number of authors attempted to resolve the definitional problems in their works. However, this resulted in even greater terminological inconsistencies and in the introduction of several new terms. Some authors tried to introduce a new classification for peace operations in terms of chronology and their distinct, operation-specific functions. While taking account of these considerations, the authors divided peace operations into two major categories:

- traditional peacekeeping – typical of the Cold War era,
- new peacekeeping – typical of the post-Cold War era[18].

A similar classification of peace operations is applied by other authors, for example, Hansen, Ramsbotham and Woodhouse, who, in their work *Hawks and Doves: Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution* (2004), divide UN peace operations into:

- peace operations prior to the year 1989, which are designated as traditional peace operations,
- peace operations after the year 1989, which are designated as multidimensional peace operations[19].

---

16   Available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/about/dpko/.
17   UN. 2008. *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. Principles and Guidelines.* New York: Department of Peacekeeping Operation, 2008, p. 98.
18   BUREŠ, O. 2007. Wanted: A Mid-Range Theory of International Peacekeeping. In *International Studies Review*, 2007, Vol. 9, No. 3, p. 409.
19   HANSEN, W. – RAMSBOTHAM, O. – WOODHOUSE, T. 2004. *Hawks and Doves: Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution.* Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2004, p. 21.

In this context, it is important to note that even the UN itself applies the same definition to the developmental stages of peace operations in its top doctrine for UN peace operations.

Unlike the previous classifications, Hillen, in his book *Blue Helmets* (1996), divides UN peace operations according to their characteristic features into three groups:

- observation missions,
- traditional peace operations,
- second-generation peace operations, which additionally incorporate peace enforcement, adding that the UN delegates peace enforcement operations to other militarily capable organisations[20].

A step forward was the division of peace operations according to the combination of the functions they perform and their timing in a conflict, as outlined in the Agenda for Peace (1992). The author of the classification was the then UN Secretary, General Boutrus Boutrus Ghali. According to him, peace operations are divided into:

- peacekeeping,
- peacemaking,
- peacebuilding,
- peace enforcement[21].

Responding to the dynamic developments in the field of international security and peace operations, the UN's Brahimi Report of August 2000 recommended establishing a new managerial and financial system for peacekeeping operations, and reclassifying individual types of operations into:

- conflict prevention,
- peacebuilding,
- provisional administration,
- peacekeeping[22].

20 STEJSKALOVÁ, L. 2011. *Komparace základních principů mírových operací OSN, NATO operací na podporu míru a operací krizového manažmentu EU*. Brno : Fakulta sociálních studií, Masarykova univerzita v Brně, 2011, p. 11.
21 UN. 1992. *An Agenda for Peace. Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping* New York, 1992. Available at: http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agpeace.html.
22 JURČÁK, V. et al. 2009. Organizácie medzinárodného krízového manažmentu. Liptovský Mikuláš : Akadémia ozbrojených síl gen. M. R. Štefánika, 2009, p. 31.

Despite the progress achieved, one great disadvantage of this classification was that it was applied differently in various situational contexts, even by the UN. As a result, it gradually became subject to criticism and was replaced by a new one. Bellamy, Williams and Griffin suggested introducing 5 groups of peace operations. Their classification is not founded on operation-specific functions but rather on the functions that operations perform within global politics. Accordingly, the authors divide peace operations as follows:

a) *traditional peacekeeping*, conceived as operations based on traditional principles, i.e. consensus-building among conflicting parties, impartiality, and minimum use of force[23],

b) *managing transition*, conceptualised as activities leading to the transition of war to stable peace, whereas their task is to fill the transition period necessary for the conflicting parties to reach agreement, with the UN or another organisation playing the role of an intermediary or mediator in a conflict[24],

c) *wider peacekeeping*, referring to operations occurring in the first half of the 1990s; wider peacekeeping is also referred to as second-generation peacekeeping[25],

d) *peace enforcement*, conceived as operations to develop managing transition and wider peacekeeping,

e) *peace support operations*, conceptualised as operations combining elements of peacekeeping, peace enforcement and peace building operations and humanitarian operations, as set out in NATO doctrines (AJP-3.4 – Peace Support Operations, or AJP-3.4.1 – Peace Support Operations Techniques and Procedures).

In classifying peace operations, Goulding takes account of numerous criteria (e.g. goals of operations, their phases, roles in global politics, extent of the use of force, timing, size, mandate, etc.), yet he considers the functions of peace operations to be the main criterion. According to the respective functions, Goulding divides peace operations into:

23 BELLAMY, J. A. – WILLIAMS, P. – GRIFFIN, S. 2004. *Understanding Peace-keeping.* Cambridge : Polity Press, 2004, p. 95.
24 BELLAMY, J. A. – WILLIAMS, P. – GRIFFIN, S. 2004. *Understanding Peace-keeping.* Cambridge : Polity Press, 2004, p. 111.
25 BELLAMY, J. A. – WILLIAMS, P. – GRIFFIN, S. 2004. *Understanding Peace-keeping.* Cambridge : Polity Press, 2004, p. 129.

a) *preventive deployment*, which occurs prior to the beginning of the conflict, when peace forces mainly perform the function of early warning,

b) *traditional peacekeeping,* the role of which is to help create the conditions for political negotiations, for example, by supervising the implementation and compliance by the parties of a cease-fire or by exercising control over the buffer zones, etc.,

c) *operations supporting the implementation of peace agreements*, including, notably, the supervision of the implementation of and compliance of the parties with cease-fire, disarmament and demobilisation of belligerent forces, verification of human rights compliance, provision of election assistance, exercise of control over the existing administrative structures, etc.,

d) *operations to secure the delivery of humanitarian assistance*, including, notably, performance of tasks to create a safe and secure environment for humanitarian missions and deliveries of aid,

e) *deployment of peace forces in an environment of collapsed state institutions*, where peace forces, besides carrying out the above missions, are also assigned tasks to restore political, economic and administrative structures,

f) *ceasefire enforcement*, a variant of a peace operation with the use of force[26].

Another attempt to classify peace operations, and which proves the inconsistency of the use of terminology in this area, is the one by Diehl, Druckman and Wall, who, in their classification of peace operations, go beyond the respective functions of peace operations by taking account of the tasks that peace operations fulfil in a conflict and (therein consists their novelty/contribution) by outlining negotiation strategies for various types of operations. While taking into account the three criteria, their classification of peace operations is as follows:

a) *traditional peacekeeping,*

b) *observation,*

c) *collective enforcement,*

d) *election supervision,*

e) *humanitarian assistance during conflict,*

f) *state/nation building,*

g) *pacification,*

26   GOULDING, M. 1993. The Evolution of United Nations Peacekeeping. In *International Affairs*, 1993, Vol. 60, No. 3, pp. 456–459.

h)   preventive deployment,

i)   arms control verification,

j)   protective services,

k)   intervention in support of democracy,

l)   sanctions enforcement[27].

Another classification of peace operations is presented by Holmes, who considers the levels of the use of force in an operation and the consent of the parties to the conflict to the implementation of an operation as the main categorising criteria. Accordingly, peace operations fall into three types:

a)   *UN peacekeeping* – an operation carried out by lightly armed peace forces from neutral countries, which are deployed with the consent of the parties to the conflict and use force only in self-defence,

b)   *UN peace enforcement* – an operation led after ceasefire violation, where peace forces lose the support of one or more parties to the conflict and become a target of attacks by the belligerent parties; consider, for example, the Democratic Republic of the Congo or Somalia,

c)   *war making* – a military operation with the use of force without the consent of the parties to the conflict to the deployment of peacemaking forces[28].

Commenting on Holmes's classification of peace operations, Urbanovská says that "*the level of the use of force and the consent of the conflicting parties to the implementation of the operation are certainly relevant criteria, but the listing of war making as a type of peace operations must be ruled out on logical grounds due to the contradictory nature of war and peace*"[29].

Yet another, more recent classification of peace operations is provided by the UN Peacekeeping Operations Capstone Doctrine – UN DPKO Capstone Doctrine, which delineates UN operations as follows:

---

27   DIEHL, P. F. – DRUCKMAN, D. – WALL, J. 1998. International Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution: A Taxanomic Analysis with Implications. In *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1998, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 39–40.
28   HOLMES, K. M. 1993. New World Disorder: A Critique of the United Nations. In *Journal of International Affairs*, 1993, Vol. 46, No. 2, p. 329.
29   URBANOVSKÁ, J. 2010b. *Typologie mírových operací.* Available at: http://ispo.fss. muni.cz/uploads/ 2download/urbanovska.pdf, p. 11.

a) conflict prevention,
b) peacemaking,
c) peacekeeping,
d) peace enforcement,
e) peace building[30].

a) *Conflict prevention* involves the application of structural or diplomatic measures to keep intra-state or inter-state tensions and disputes from escalating into violent conflict. Ideally, conflict prevention should be based on early warning, information gathering, and careful analysis of the key conflict drivers.

b) *Peacemaking* generally includes measures to address conflicts in progress, and usually entails diplomatic action to bring hostile parties to a negotiated agreement. Upon the request of the UN Security Council or the General Assembly, or at his own initiative, the UN Secretary-General may appoint special negotiators to facilitate the resolution of the conflict.

c) *Peacekeeping* is a technique designed to preserve the peace, however fragile, where fighting has been halted, and to assist in implementing agreements achieved by the peacemakers.

d) *Peace enforcement* involves the application, with the authorisation of the Security Council, of a range of coercive measures, including the use of military force. Such actions are authorised to restore international peace and security in situations where the Security Council has determined the existence of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression.

e) *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 foundation for sustainable peace and development. Peacebuilding is a complex, long-term process of creating the necessary conditions for sustainable peace. It works by addressing the deep-rooted, structural causes of violent conflict in a comprehensive manner.

Unlike the UN and the EU (see below), the North Atlantic Alliance uses the most standardised and comprehensive terminology. To refer to NATO's peace

---

30 JURČÁK, V. et al. 2009. Organizácie medzinárodného krízového manažmentu. Liptovský Mikuláš : Akadémia ozbrojených síl gen. M. R. Štefánika, 2009, p. 31.

operations in its documents, it consistently applies the term "*Peace Support Operations*" (PSOs). Their concept and principles are elaborated on in a number of NATO doctrines and standardisation documents. In AJP 3.4.1, the Allied Joint Doctrine for Peace Support Operation, the operations are defined as "multifunctional operations (which) are conducted impartially, normally in support of an internationally recognised organisation, such as the UN or the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). They involve military forces, diplomatic and humanitarian agencies and are designed to achieve a long-term political settlement or other specified condition. They involve a spectrum of activities, which may include peace enforcement and peacekeeping as well as conflict prevention, peacemaking, peace building and humanitarian relief. This doctrine, as well as other NATO doctrines, defines, besides the basic principles of PSOs, their nature, planning, decision-making, capabilities, etc.

As regards the European Union, just as in the case of the UN, it must be noted that the EU does not use a standardised terminology for its peace operations. Given the fact that the majority of EU member states are also members of NATO, the EU applies NATO terminology in some cases, while it uses common UN terminology in other cases. For its peace operations, the EU uses the term "*crisis management operations*", which covers humanitarian, rescue, peacekeeping, peacemaking and peace enforcement operations.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the research, in conclusion, it is necessary to point out that peace operations undertaken by the international crisis management organisations, which are today's major contributors to delivering international security and peace in the world – the United Nations, North-Atlantic Alliance and the European Union, in no way can be seen as activities unfolding independently from each other. The opposite is true. The current development of the global security environment requires that the combined, multiple (civilian, military, police) capabilities of global, regional and non-governmental organisations eliminate emerging security threats, particularly the asymmetric ones. Not all of the organisations, with their respective capacities, are capable of delivering

mission performance of the highest quality in operations; therefore, there has been increased debate on the application of complexity in operations. It is the very combination of military and civilian capabilities and capacities, of command and control systems, and of basic principles and standards, that set the specific operations of the organisations apart, constituting an effective tool for resolving complications and crises that threaten international security and peace.

By developing efficient and effective cooperation in implementing the mandate of peace operations, it is possible to live up to the common intention of the three selected actors – to deliver peace and security at a global level.

This is one of the reasons why the UN has increasingly used NATO's military capabilities and capacities to carry out its peace operations. The European Union, unlike the Alliance, is currently not capable of conducting peace enforcement operations, under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, exclusively under EU command and solely with its own military forces, capabilities and capacities. EU CMOs are a half-way point between the traditional peace operations and the peace enforcement operations, which are dependent on cooperation between the military and civilian components, which the EU combines with the forces, capabilities and capacities of the other two organisations.

On the other hand, despite the ever absent military capabilities and capacities, consider, for example, strategic airlift in which, thanks to the implementation of the CFSP, the CSDP, and the EU BG concept, there has been a positive shift forward, and the EU's troops are now much better prepared to conduct military operations than at the end of the 1990s or at the beginning of the 21st century.

Based on the research results of different types of peace operations, the following general conclusions may be drawn:

1) The current peace operations can be characterised as multidimensional operations that bring together personnel, including soldiers, police officers, administrative staff, political advisers, legal consultants, economists, government workers, election observers, human rights watchers, humanitarian workers, and professionals in the fields of civil-military cooperation, information and communication technologies, mass media communication, public relations, and other areas, who are tasked with performing a range of functions.

2) The current peace operations put much greater emphasis on the post-war reconstruction of the affected areas than before, especially in the case of UN peace operations. As a result, military commanders are now building much deeper contacts with local authorities, and military elements penetrate more deeply into the local political and social structures, aided by local NGOs and other partners. From a certain perspective, it may even be argued that differences are being blurred between actual operations, post-war reconstruction and military intervention. This is confirmed by the annual report of the UN Secretary General of 2009, in which Ban Ki-moon notes that "*UN peace operations now perform a range of functions – from supporting political dialogue between the parties to the conflict, providing assistance to national governments in order to consolidate and strengthen their national authority, strengthening human rights and the rule of law, through advisory services focusing on security sector reform, support for disarmament, demobilisation, to reintegration programmes and protection of civilians. Operations now have a robust mandate*"[31].

3) The traditional UN peace operations, which are carried out in accordance with Chapter VI of the UN Charter, are currently playing only a complementary role in complex operations. Although the UN guarantees the ability to conduct multidimensional peace operations, including peace enforcement operations, it increasingly uses NATO's or the EU's forces, capabilities and capacities to achieve its military objectives, for it does not have sufficient military capabilities and capacities to manage operations under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Thus, the UN has increasingly lower numbers of forces being allocated from its own resources; however, it has seen more civil components involved in its operations.

4) While the traditional peace operations were, in the past, restricted to mainly eliminating the threat of conflict in the superpowers' areas of interests, hence the missions of peace forces were of predominantly military character, the current peace operations, in which military forces have more advanced military capabilities, are balanced by civilian elements, which are deemed essential to delivering more comprehensive solutions to crises. Admittedly,

---

31 UN. 2009. *UN Peacekeeping. Annual Report of the Secretary-General.* Available at: http://www.un.org/en/ peacekeeping/documents/pko_2009.pdf.

the aim of the current peace operations is not only to maintain the status quo, but also to contribute to the reconstruction and development of conflict-affected countries and societies, including, notably, economic, political and social recovery.

5) Unlike the traditional peace operations, the current peace operations are complex operations in which selected international crisis management organisation develop a whole range of activities within peace operations. These activities are similar and, in some cases, may seem nearly identical, though they apply different terminology.

6) Among the complex operations are peacekeeping, peace enforcement, peacebuilding, peacemaking, conflict prevention and humanitarian operations. In complex operations, individual activities overlap each other, depending on their sequence or the various stages of the crisis or conflict.

7) The current trends in this area suggest that the number of peace operations carried out under the auspices of the UN is comparable to the number of peace operations conducted by NATO or the EU, or other organisations (such as the African Union). This trend is closely aligned with the evolving global security environment, as well as with the changes that bear upon the current options for crisis and conflict resolution. In this regard, one of the most important changes is a growing preference for regional peace operations. Nevertheless, the UN remains the highest authority in guaranteeing international peace and security, though it delegates some of its activities to regional organisations, in particular to NATO and the EU[32].

8) The fundamental changes that occurred in the global, continental and regional security environment after the end of the Cold War greatly influenced, inter alia, the nature of UN POs. Since the end of the 1990s, UN POs have been strikingly reminiscent of NATO PSOs. This trend has also been noticeable in the EU's extension of the EU CMO concept. The differences in peace operations that were still observable in the 1990s, especially if you consider the juxtaposition of traditional UN POs and newly formed NATO PSOs, are now being gradually blurred.

---

32 HELDT, B. – WALLESTEEN, P. 2006. *Peacekeeping Operations: Global Patterns of Intervention and Success 1948 – 2004.* Research Report No. 1. Folke Bernadotte Academy Publishers, 2006, pp. 23–24.

9) The hallmark of today's peace operations is that the organisations engaged in the conduct of peace operations pledge a long-term commitment to the area of crisis or conflict, even after its end. There has been a noticeable shift from the traditional UN POs and NATO PSOs of the 1990s, whose primary task was to resolve the military situation in the area of crisis or conflict, with specific dates of commencement and completion, and a timeline for troop withdrawal from the affected area.

10) Based on the current developments in international security, changes in the security environment, as well as the development of peace operations and available solutions for the current crises, it can be assumed that, bearing in mind its military capabilities and capacities, NATO will be more involved in peace enforcement and peacekeeping operations, as it is in alignment with the Alliance's ability to conduct robust operations.

11) In this context, the UN itself refers to the necessity for the increased involvement of regional institutions and organisations in this field, known as regional peacekeeping. This trend was also highlighted in a report of the UN Secretary General, recommending that close cooperation be developed between the UN and regional institutions and organisations in crisis and conflict prevention and peace-keeping operations[33].

12) For the above reasons, NATO PSOs are now seen as a powerful tool that creates the conditions for peacekeeping operations to be carried out by the UN, the EU and other regional organisations (such as the African Union), and for subsequent post-conflict reconstruction of crisis- or conflict-affected countries or regions.

13) Today's peace operations are not geographically restricted in any way[34].

To meet the aim of this article with regard to terminology, the authors, being aware of the absence of a uniform definition for the term "peace operations" and of the wide range and large numbers of definitions in various sources, based

---

33 UN. 2005. *In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all (A/59/2005).* Report of the UN Secretary-General. Available at: http://www2.ohchr.org/ english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/gaA.59.2005_ En.pdf.
34 STEJSKALOVÁ, L. 2011. *Komparace základních principů mírových operací OSN, NATO operací na podporu míru a operací krizového manažmentu EU.* Brno : Fakulta sociálních studií, Masarykova univerzita v Brně, 2011, p. 58.

on their research and study results, and the facts and information stated in this monograph, avail themselves of this opportunity to offer their own definition of "peace operations":

"*The term peace operations means the operations conducted by the UN, other international organisations, or an ad hoc coalition of countries, acting on the basis of UN authorisation in a crisis area or area of conflict, or in a hot spot, in accordance with Chapter VI or Chapter VII of the UN Charter, usually with the presence of military forces, for a period of six or more months, with or without the use of force, with the aim of delivering international or regional security, stability and peace, or as part of the fight against international terrorism*".

In view of the above-mentioned complications in the usage of terminology, particularly in addressing inconsistencies, in other words, the use of numerous types of categorisations of peace operations in different sources, it should be noted, in defence of individual authors, that the issue of peace operations is not simple, but highly complex, interdependent, and subject to the dynamics of the current developments in the security environment and in international relations. The complexity of developing a common universally accepted classification of peace operations lies in the fact that "*peace operations have evolved in response to a wide range of conflicts, and have assumed so many forms that they defy any simple categorisation*".

Despite this, the authors of this monograph fully agree with Zůna's categorisation of peace operations, stating that "*regardless of which actor conducts which peace operation, they can be divided into six basic types –peacekeeping, peace enforcement, peacebuilding, peacemaking, conflict prevention and humanitarian operations, where each peace operation is, as a rule, conducted in combination with others*".

In conclusion, it should be stated that the decisions on the nature of peace operations (regardless of the terminology), their political and military objectives, and the methods and instruments (political, diplomatic, military or economic) to achieve them are taken in the decision-making process by the main actors in international relations, including, notably, national states, international organisations, regional organisations, non-governmental organisations, and, of course, military-political

alliances or groups, or other entities (e.g. various governmental and non-governmental agencies) operating in the system of international relations and international politics.

References

BELLAMY, A. J. – WILLIAMS, P. 2004. Thinking Anew about Peace Operation. In *International Peacekeeping*, 2004, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 1-15.

BELLAMY, J. A. – WILLIAMS, P. – GRIFFIN, S. 2004. *Understanding Peace-keeping.* Cambridge : Polity Press. 325 p.

BERDAL, M. – ECONOMIDES, S. 2007. *United Nations Interventionism 1991 – 2004.* New York : Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 1-31.

BRHLÍKOVÁ, R. 2013. *Európska únia a konflikty v jej susedstve.* In *Bezpečnostné fórum – zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie*, Banská Bystrica, 2013. pp. 124-132.

BUREŠ, O. 2007. Wanted: A Mid-Range Theory of International Peacekeeping. In *International Studies Review*, 2007, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 407-436.

BUREŠ, O. 2008. *Teorie a praxe postkonfliktní rekonstrukce.* Plzeň : Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk. 112 p.

DIEHL, P. F. – DRUCKMAN, D. – WALL, J. 1998. International Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution: A Taxanomic Analysis with Implications. In *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1998, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 33-55.

DIEHL, P. F. 2008. *Peace Operations.* Cambridge : Polity Press. 211 p.

DONALD, D. 2002. Neutrality, Impartiality and UN Peacekeeping at the Beginning of the 21st Century. In *International Peacekeeping*, 2002, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 21-38.

GOULDING, M. 1993. The Evolution of United Nations Peacekeeping. In *International Affairs*, 1993, Vol. 60, No. 3, pp. 451-464.

GUÉHENNO, J.-M. 2002. On the Challenges and Achievements of Reforming UN Peace Operations. In *International Peacekeeping*, 2002, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 69-80.

HANLON, Joseph. 2010. *How the Cold War shaped Mozambique today.* Available at: http://www2.lse.ac.uk/IDEAS/programmes/africaProgram me/hanlon.pdf.

HANSEN, W. – RAMSBOTHAM, O. – WOODHOUSE, T. 2004. *Hawks and Doves: Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution.* Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2004, pp. 1-21.

HELDT, B. – WALLESTEEN, P. 2006. *Peacekeeping Operations: Global Patterns of Intervention and Success 1948 – 2004.* Research Report No. 1. Folke Bernadotte Academy Publishers. 176 p.

HOLMES, K. M. 1993. New World Disorder: A Critique of the United Nations. In *Journal of International Affairs*, 1993, Vol. 46, No. 2, pp. 323-340.

IVANČÍK, R. – JURČÁK, V. 2011. Participácia Ozbrojených síl Slovenskej republiky na operáciách medzinárodného krízového manažmentu – príspevok Slovenskej republiky k medzinárodnej bezpečnosti. In *Národná a medzinárodná bezpečnosť 2011 : zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie*. Liptovský Mikuláš : Vojenská akadémia ozbrojených síl generála M. R. Štefánika. 2011. pp. 95-104. Available at: http://www.aos.sk/struktura/katedry/kbo/dokum/Zbornik_NMB_2011.pdf

IVANČÍK, R. – JURČÁK, V. 2012. Sily rýchlej reakcie – príspevok Severoatlantickej aliancie k medzinárodnej bezpečnosti. In *Vojenské rozhledy,* Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 55-64. Available at: scripts/file.php?id=125148&down=yes

IVANČÍK, R. – KELEMEN, M. 2011. Európske bojové skupiny – príspevok Európskej únie k medzinárodnej bezpečnosti. In *Vojenské reflexie*, 2011, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 73-83. Available at: http://www.aos.sk/casopisy/reflexie/vojenske_reflexie_12.pdf

JURČÁK, V. et al. 2009. *Organizácie medzinárodného krízového manažmentu*. Liptovský Mikuláš : Akadémia ozbrojených síl gen. M. R. Štefánika. 2009. 235 p.

RYAN, S. 2000: United Nations Peacekeeping: A Matter of Principles? In *International Peacekeeping*, 2000, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 27-47.

STEJSKALOVÁ, L. 2011. *Komparace základních principů mírových operací OSN, NATO operací na podporu míru a operací krizového manažmentu EU*. Brno : Fakulta sociálních studií, Masarykova univerzita v Brně, 2011, 81 p.

TARDY, T. 2004. Introduction. In TARDY, T. (ed.) 2004. *Peace Operations after 11 September 2001.* New York : Frank Cass´, 2004.

UN. 1992. *An Agenda for Peace. Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping* New York, 1992. Available at: http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agpeace.html

UN. 2005. *In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all (A/59/2005).* Report of the UN Secretary-General. Available at: http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/gaA.59.2005_En.pdf

UN. 2008. *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. Principles and Guidelines*. New York: Department of Peacekeeping Operation, 2008, p. 98

UN. 2009. *UN Peacekeeping. Annual Report of the Secretary-General*. Available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/pko_2009.pdf

URBANOVSKÁ, J. 2010. *Typologie mírových operací.* Available at: http://ispo.fss.muni.cz/uploads/2download/urbanovska.pdf

ZŮNA, J. 2010. *Vliv změn v bezpečnostním prostředí na budoucí použití jednotek AČR v mírových operacích.* Brno : Fakulta ekonomiky a managementu Univerzity obrany v Brně, 2010, 182 p.