With UN-missions towards peace?

Andreas Heinemann-Grüder

Compared to peace missions under the aegis of regional organizations or single states, conflict transformation by UN-missions has indeed been attested to be quite successful. Their bundle of measures mostly consists of a combination of emergency assistance and reconstruction, the reinstitution of public and regional security, the support of the rule of law, clarification of property rights, promotion of democracy as well as transitional justice and reconciliation. If transformation fails, however, the risk of a relapse is high.

Conflict transformation must be judged by the degree to which it is able to fend off or reverse extremist mobilization. Strategies of conflict transformation therefore address either structural causes of conflict or resources or incentives for violent actors. Theoretically, dangers can be decreased by limiting the access to resources of violence—by separating groups, weapons control, the containment of the war economy, demobilization and security sector reform. A physical separation up to a division of a country, however, is only justifiable if the parties were already separated; otherwise ‘ethnic cleansing’ will become a precondition for peace. In political terms, the security dilemma can be contained by the ‘civilization’ of the actors or institution-building. By prosecuting war crimes, the victors in turn try to establish norms which deter from repeating such actions, feed trust in the law and build barriers for future behavior. To gain the cooperation of violent actors for political reforms, however, they need to be offered incentives. The price for their cooperation could be impunity, offers of political posts or posts in the security apparatuses or attractive compensations. Communicative conflict management finally aims at overcoming the hardening of borders between groups or their images of self and the other. A change in attitude is to be expected from the solution of the security dilemma and changed expectations of personal gain from further pursuing violence. It is true that group identities harden as a consequence of the solidarization effect when a group is afraid of becoming extinct. A change in attitude can therefore only be achieved when the safety of the inferior group is guaranteed.

Against the background of current practice of peacekeeping missions, one can give a few recommendations.1 Peace operations have to set realistic goals—divided up in identifiable stages and adjusted to local changes—which must be accompanied by a parallel peace process. They should foster a political order and the rule of law sensitive to the respective history and culture of a country. Rather than enforcing political self-determination or the necessary constitutional consensus, the United Nations can only assist in this. All the same, they can exert its correcting influence should they have to bear the costs of an unsustainable constitutional order.

Primary goal should be the stabilization of public security and the saving of lives. Interventions with the ‘mission’ to protect civilians against life-threatening dangers need a concept for the primacy of civil defense and the readiness to protect humanitarian zones against violent actors—if necessary by force. It is desirable that the Security Council in evaluating criminal acts such as genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes as well as a war of aggression be bound by the International Criminal Court.

There is a need for a high-ranking coordination between UN departments, donors and the states sending troops by a special envoy who bears the responsibility for the planning of the mission and its implementation and who has immediate

---

authority over all civilian, police, military and supporting components of a mission. Realistically, the synchronization and planning of operations depend upon one leading nation, in particular in those cases in which the United Nations only gives the mandate rather than leading the operation. In addition to this, necessary resources and capacities need to be made available for the long-term. The United Nations should therefore constantly have action forces on standby and expand its early warning capacities—particularly for humanitarian catastrophes.

Local ownership, subsidiarity and a preference in the distribution of funds to recipients in need should be top priority for the allocation of funds rather than a return flow of funds to the donors. All relevant neighboring countries should be included in the securing of the borders, the control of illegal transactions and transboundary armed formations, i.e., the political regulatory process. Finally, UN-missions should end on the basis of a continuing impact analysis. Criteria for an end of a mission would be: no more proof of war and violence as well as massive human rights violations in the past twelve months; a successful disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of the majority of illegal combatants, and guaranteed public security enforced by mostly local actors. The rule of law, a country-wide enforced state monopoly of violence, comprehensive return programs for fugitives as well as the functioning of democratic and effective institutions, however, are measures of success the attainment of which lie in the responsibility of (mostly) local actors.


Marie Müller joined BICC in June 2009 and has since been working as a Research Assistant in the research team on Natural Resources and Violent Conflicts. Her primary research interest lies with African state-society relations, how they condition the governance of natural resource exploitation and how they generate conflicts. She has worked on a study about the significance of natural resources in the conflict of Côte d’Ivoire, West Africa. In October/November 2009, she did field research in Nigeria to inquire to what extent transparency initiatives can contribute to a resolution of the conflict in the Niger Delta. However, in her work she also focuses on the global repercussions on resource governance in Africa. This lies nicely into her work with the European network of research institutes and NGOs “Fatal Transactions” that is concerned with the impact of European purchase of extractive commodities in Southern producing countries.

Marie studied International Relations (BA) at Dresden University and Global Political Economy (MA) at Sussex University, Brighton, United Kingdom—an inter-disciplinary course consisting of political and economic science, international law and history. She studied at the University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, in 2005. In her studies, she mainly researched on North-South-relations, the global trade regime, economic development in Africa and political and economic theory. In her MA thesis, she compared the development of the management of the cocoa sectors in Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire, analyzing how the liberalization of the marketing affected corruption. She also did several internships in the area of development cooperation (InWEnt, BMZ, GTZ Eschborn and Abidjan).

In her spare time as a student, Marie was member of a number of associations, such as the UN working group at Dresden University and refugee advocacy groups. She likes Kung Fu and is looking for a piano to use in Bonn.

For more information please contact Marie Müller at mueller@bicc.de
Conflict dynamics in Chad

Chad—before and after the building of the Chad Cameroon Oil Pipeline—is a poor, undemocratic and conflict-ridden country. The promise had been that oil exploitation in the Doba basin would bring about a bright future and would finally lift the entire nation out of poverty. Almost ten years after the official opening of the valve of the Doba crude oil, poverty continues to be rampant. Furthermore, President Déby has established himself as an authoritarian ruler amidst ongoing violent contestations of his rule by various rebel groups.

Based on desk studies and field research, BICC brief 41 entitled “We were promised development and all we got is misery”—The influence of petroleum on conflict dynamics in Chad” analyzes the impact of oil revenues on potential conflict at the production site, on conflicts around the governance of oil revenues and on conflict-finances.

The Chad Cameroon Oil Pipeline was a project supported by the World Bank, which had promised that the development of Chadian oil would lead to poverty alleviation. As this brief demonstrates, despite this announcement, revenues from oil exploitation were only insufficiently invested in development sectors, such as health and education. Instead, oil revenues are being used to fuel a patronage system which strengthens the power-grip of the current government and especially the Head of State. Oil revenues can be said to directly contribute to keep Déby in power—by fighting off rebellions and co-opting armed and unarmed political opponents.

At the same time, some rebel groups might see the oil wealth as an additional incentive to seize state power. Conflict potential in the oil producing region exists, due to the negative socio-economic and environmental consequences of oil exploitation and their unsatisfactory mitigation. Nevertheless, the outbreak of violent conflict is unlikely as the area is closely monitored by security personnel. Violent crackdowns of previous rebellions in the now oil producing region are still vivid in local memory and avert new violent conflict.

BICC brief 41 (upcoming January 2010) addresses the question of how the development of oil production in Chad has influenced conflict dynamics at the local and national level, bearing in mind the regional conflict system involving Chad, Sudan and the Central African Republic. The study was conducted within the framework of the international campaign Fatal Transactions and was co-authored by the German NGO AG Tschad.

Report on Germany arms exports

In December 2009, the Joint Conference Church and Development (GKKE) presented its annual arms exports report. The report collects and presents publicly available information on German arms exports of the previous year (2008) and their export permits and evaluates them in connection with German peace and development policy. The report is written by the GKKE expert group ‘arms exports’ of which Marc von Boemcken, Senior Researcher at BICC, is a member. According to the report, in 2008, the German government granted 16,054 individual arms exports permits amounting to 5.78 billion Euro. This corresponds to an increase of 36.5 percent compared to the previous year.

The largest arms exports went to South Korea (1.87 billion Euro), to the United States (507 million Euro), to Great Britain (398.7 million Euro), and to Singapore (339 million Euro). Further relevant purchasers of German arms in the group of ‘third states’ (states that do not belong to NATO or to the European Union or that are treated the same) were Saudi Arabia (granted transfers amounting to 170.4 million Euro), the United Arab Emirates (142 million Euro), Pakistan (93.2 million Euro), India (51.8 million Euro), Egypt (33.6 million Euro), Afghanistan (33 million Euro), Israel (25 million Euro), and Oman (22.4 million Euro).

Again, in the year 2008, German arms exports were permitted to countries which do not meet the criteria of the EU Code of Conduct on arms exports. According to research by BICC, this holds true for 51 states, which received 2,554 licenses amounting to 1.16 billion Euro. The value of individual arms exports permits to states which do not meet at least four of the BICC standards that are based on the EU Code of Conduct (such as human rights situation, regional and internal stability, relation between arms expenditure and development efforts) amounted to 106.3 million Euro in the year under review. Recipient countries that are to be considered problematic under these criteria are, amongst others, Pakistan, Angola and Afghanistan.

The GKKE asks the new German government to strengthen its arms exports control regime. The participation of the Bundestag in decisions on weapons policy should be expanded and the corruption in arms exports dealings contained.

For more information please contact
Marc von Boemcken at boemcken@bicc.de
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BICC Notes

A governmental delegation of seven representatives from the Republic of Korea, led by Suk-min KIM, Deputy Minister for Social Integration, The Prime Minister’s Office, visited BICC on 4 December 2009 to discuss issues related to ongoing and planned restructuring processes of military facilities in the southern part of the Korean peninsula. The delegation was very much interested in the experiences and knowledge, BICC has gained in the context of its consulting and research projects on civil re-use processes of former military sites. Michael Dedek, Deputy Director and Lars Wirkus, Senior Researcher and base conversion expert at BICC presented lessons learned from more than 15 years of base conversion history in Germany. Furthermore, they identified and discussed entry points for the application and adaptation of successfully implemented ‘German’ base conversion procedures and concepts to the challenges the Government of the Republic of South Korea is actually facing.

For further information please contact
Lars Wirkus at wirkus@bicc.de

On 22 October 2009, the German government invited the Heads of Delegation of the First Committee to a side event entitled “Global Militarization and Military Spending matter! Future challenges for more transparency and participation” at the German House, New York. During this event, Peter Croll gave a presentation of the BICC Global Militarization Index (GMI).

For further information please contact
Peter Croll at croll@bicc.de

BICC staff wishes you all a Happy New Year

In the framework of his visit to Bonn, Alyn Ware, bearer of this year’s Right Livelihood Award, visited BICC on 8 December 2009. Research staff from the peace and conflict research center took the opportunity of exchanging experiences with the worldwide renowned peace activist. More than 25 years ago—in the middle of the Cold War—Ware began to lobby for peace. Today, he works in close coordination with UN General Secretary Ban Ki-Moon, is Global Coordinator for the Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, and lobbies governments all over the world on behalf of disarmament. BICC is hoping to be able to continue this dialogue with the laureates of the Right Livelihood Award in September 2010, when they meet on the occasion of the 30th anniversary conference of the Award in Bonn.

For further information please contact
Susanne Heinke at pr@bicc.de