FOLKE BERNADOTTE ACADEMY

REPORT ON THE XII INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR IN THE SERIES:

Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism

Krusenberg, Sweden
23–25 May 2003

HOSTED BY THE FOLKE BERNADOTTE ACADEMY in association with
Swedish National Defence College, Swedish Armed Forces, Swedish National Police Board

Report on the XII International Seminar in the series:

Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century

Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism

Krusenberg, Sweden
May 23–25 2003

The present report is dedicated to the memory of
Ms Anna Lindh, late Foreign Minister of Sweden.

Printed by Elanders Gotab, in Stockholm, Sweden, 2003.

Suggested citation:
Michael Sahlin and Annika Hilding Norberg, editors, *Report on the XII International Challenges Seminar: Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism*, Elanders Gotab, Stockholm, 2003.

Also available on the World Wide Web at http://www.peacechallenges.net;

1. Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century
   Concluding Report 1997–2002

2. Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century
   Concluding Report 1997–2002
   Executive Summaries
   English, Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, Spanish

3. Challenges Project Seminar Reports (in order of hosting):
   Stockholm (Swedish National Defence College)
   Moscow (Russian Public Policy Centre)
   Amman (Jordan Institute of Diplomacy)
   Pretoria (Institute for Security Studies)
   Carlisle (United States Army Peacekeeping Institute)
   New Delhi (United Services Institution of India)
   Tokyo (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Japan in coop. with the UN DPKO)
   Cornwallis (Pearson Peacekeeping Centre)
   Buenos Aires (Argentine Armed Forces) -to be finalized
   New York (Challenges Project Partners in coop. with UN DPKO) -to be finalized
   Melbourne (Australian Defence Force/Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law)

For further information about the Challenges Project and the Report on 'Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism', please contact the Project Coordinators at:

Folke Bernadotte Academy
87264 Sandöverken
Sweden
Tel. + 46 (0) 612-82200
E-mail: info@folkebernadotteacademy.se

Contents

Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century

Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism

Perspectives on United Nations Peace Operations

Academic, Policy, Military and Police Perspectives

Acknowledgements

The Challenges Project is a multinational and joint undertaking by a group of leading organizations from around the world in the field of peace operations. It is our great privilege to enjoy close and focused cooperation and consultation on the challenges issues of the preparation, planning and conduct of peace operations.

We would like to acknowledge the valuable contributions made to the Challenges Project by our Swedish Associate Coordinators; the Armed Forces, the National Defence College, the National Police Board, as well as our Partner and Associate Partner Organizations in the Challenges endeavour; Russian Public Policy Centre, Jordan Institute of Diplomacy, Institute for Security Studies in Pretoria, United States Institute of Peace, United Services Institution of India, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Pearson Peacekeeping Centre of Canada, Argentine Armed Forces Joint Staff and CAECOPAZ in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Australian Defence Organization in cooperation with Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, Turkey Centre for Strategic Research of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in cooperation with the Armed Forces, National Police Forces, University of Bilkent and the Istanbul Policy Center of the University of Sabanci, and China Institute for International Strategic Studies.

Additional support and important contributions to the project have generously been received from the following training centres; Argentine Gendarmerie Peacekeeping Training Centre, Commonwealth of Independent States HQ for Military Cooperation & Coordination, PfP Training Centre of Turkey, Royal Police Academy of Jordan, South African Army War College, Swedish International Centre, United Service Institution of India Centre for UN Peacekeeping, UN Department for Peacekeeping Operations Training and Evaluation Service, United States Army Peacekeeping Institute, Vystrel Peacekeeping Academy of the Russian Federation, Jordan Zarqa Peacekeeping Centre.

The active participation of and fruitful cooperation enjoyed with the United Nations, United Nations Institute for Training and Research Programme of Correspondence, International Peace Academy, and Stockholm International Peace Research Institute has been crucial to our effort.

The Krusenberg Seminar was made possible thanks to generous contributions to the project effort by our Challenges Associate Partners in Sweden; the Armed Forces, the National Defence College, the National Police Board, and not least, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We wish to acknowledge the effective editorial support provided for the preparation of the present report by Ms Charlotte Svensson and Mr Derek Boothby.

Introductory Remarks

Michael Sahlin and Annika Hilding Norberg

1. The present report 'Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism' is the result of a one day seminar discussion held at Krusenberg Herrgård in Sweden in May 2003. The Krusenberg Seminar set out to enable an open and frank discussion on a contemporary and challenging aspect of international affairs having an impact on the discourse concerning the conduct of peace operations. Indeed, the agenda was ambitious and the topic challenging. The deliberations focused on one of the most problematic and contentious issues facing the international community today. The seminar discussion was launched in the context of an unprecedented focus over the last year and a half by small and great powers alike on the role and impact of terrorism and counter-terrorism on world affairs. Given the weight and wide ramifications of the subject, the Challenges Project Partners decided the potential consequences of 11 September 2001 on the nature and conduct of peace operations needed to be properly addressed.

2. The tragedy of 11 September 2001 occurred in the closing months of Phase One of the Challenges Project. In the time remaining before the finalization of the Concluding Report of the First Phase of the project and its presentation to the United Nations Secretary-General at the United Nations HQ in April 2002, there was no opportunity for the Partner Organizations to address the implications of this new dimension of security threat, but several colleagues expressed a wish that such an opportunity should be found. Consequently, the topic was introduced on our agenda as the opening item in Phase Two of the Challenges Project. Thus, the aim was to elaborate, in an open and frank manner, on how and to what extent, if any, the recent global terrorist dimensions of threats to security will have an impact on the way in which peace operations are being conducted in the years to come.

3. The horror of 11 September elevated the dimension of terrorist actions to a new height or depth in that the terrorists involved were prepared to sacrifice both their own lives and those of not tens or hundreds but thousands of innocent civilians. In turn, that event and other large scale terrorist acts committed in recent years have now provoked counter-terrorist actions by a number of governments that only three years ago would have been inconceivable, and which have raised questions on the role of the United Nations and the strength of international law.

4. Terrorism, whether carried out with national aims or international terrorism carried out by non-state actors, have created new forms of security threat, new forms of conflict and new forms of response. Democratic societies, proud of their

openness and individual liberties, have found themselves having to introduce controls and intrusive constraints on public freedoms. At the same time, avenues of cooperation and coordination between national intelligence, police and military services have been established that hitherto did not exist. Rather than wait for the next attack to occur at home, the counter-terrorist effort against the perpetrators has been prosecuted vigorously and pre-emptively abroad.

5. There are some who believe that peace operations must inevitably be affected by counter-terrorism in one way or another, and must therefore adapt to the new reality. But the title of the seminar topic implied no value judgement. There are others who take the view that, while there may be terrorist acts committed by Al Qaeda or other groups in various parts of the world, they are in fact directed against policies or a way of life practiced by a particular country or group of countries. As such, they are of little direct relevance to the circumstances in which most peace operations are currently being carried out.

6. Another aspect concerns definitions. What do we mean by "terrorism"? There are different types. There are those who define terrorism as "violence, or the threat of violence, calculated to create an atmosphere of fear and alarm in the pursuit of political aims"[1], which implies that the terrorists are a sub-national group seeking to change the policies of the state, such as in Colombia or the Philippines. A somewhat broader definition is that of the U.S. Department of Defense: "The calculated use of violence or the threat of violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious or ideological".[2] But even this definition does not fully embrace the actions of such groups as the Aum Shinrikyo that carried out the sarin attack in the Tokyo subway in 1995, nor – at the other end of the scale – the terror caused by Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, or the genocide committed by the Hutus in Rwanda.

7. Yet another question concerns what do we mean by "peace operation" in this context? Do we restrict the term to those UN operations as defined in the Brahimi Report, authorized by the UN Security Council and carried out by soldiers under UN command often under Chapter VI of the UN Charter? Or do we include those more robust operations carried out by non-UN forces (regional organizations or 'coalitions of the willing') in Kosovo, Macedonia, Afghanistan and elsewhere? Indeed, do we include as peace operations the combat actions carried out by military units in the mountains of eastern Afghanistan or Chechnya?

[1] RAND-St.Andrews Chronology of Terrorism. See also Bruce Hoffman, Vice-President of External Affairs and Director of the RAND Corporation Office, Washington, D.C., noted expert on terrorism, author of Inside Terrorism.

[2] U.S. Institute for Peace, *Teaching Guide on International Terrorism: Definitions, Causes and Responses.* See also www.terrorism.com/terrorism/def.shtml

8. Having raised the matter of definitions, we did bring a caution to the seminar participants. It would have been unfortunate if the seminar discussion were to run aground on the shoals of definitions. We may simply have to recognize that these terms mean rather different things to different people.

9. The seminar discussion was not intended necessarily to seek agreement on terminology, but rather to consider what effects and implications, if any, terrorism and counter-terrorism have on the nature, planning and implementation of peace operations. Are the actions of counter-terrorism limited to those of the military and security services? To the extent that terrorism is the problem, is strengthening the sinews of the state an answer? – or *the* answer? Or do they include civil actions to promote better governance, improve societal stability, build sustainable peace and thereby isolate militant factions to the minority fringe where they belong and where they are unable to recruit followers? In such efforts, do counter-terrorism activities compete with peace operations, or are they compatible and complementary with them? These are only some of the aspects and issues that were discussed at the Krusenberg Seminar.

10. Overall, the topic proved to be a trigger for a thought provoking seminar and engaged discussion. The presentations that follow in this report raised much food for thought on the subject, and generated a rich discussion of questions, observations, and propositions. Some of the issues that were discussed included comments on the topic of international law. One participant, recalling the tribunals set up for former Yugoslavia and Rwanda and the establishment of the International Criminal Court, wondered whether it might be possible to criminalize the terrorist actions and then deal with the perpatrators in some form of UN arena. Another participant enquired whether there was any possibility of the Security Council adopting follow-up resolutions that would address the rule of law and ad hoc tribunals with regard to crimes against humanity or war crimes.

11. An aspect that attracted attention was the existential questions – should the UN be an organisation for counter-terrorism? And was it practicable for the UN to be such an organisation in terms of its institutional mechanisms and structures? If the answer to this question was no, then it raised the important issue of how to envisage the role of the UN in international security in the 21st century. An extension of this concern was expressed by another participant who questioned whether the events of Spring 2003, namely the decision by certain countries to proceed with war in Iraq despite the absence of the Security Council legitimising the action, was a fact of life that demanded appropriate adaptation of international law.

12. Ralph Zacklin, in agreeing with the significance of the latter questions, commented that they raised the whole other issue of reform and adaptability of the UN as an organization; the pursuit of that topic would take the discussion off at a tangent and was perhaps something for a separate meeting. As for the last point,

he felt that we are far from being at the stage where we will know precisely what was the impact on the organisation and on the collective security system. In his view, it was far too early to tell. What was clear was there had been a very sharp shock to the system and perhaps it was a wake-up call for members of the UN and especially those who are members of the Security Council to start asking some very fundamental questions about the collective security system and the role for the Security Council.

13. Regarding tribunals, the experience to date had been quite successful although the Member States paying the bills felt that they were extremely expensive propositions. He stressed, however, that individuals *are* accountable for crimes, and that there is a whole range now of international crimes for which individuals are individually accountable. They can be prosecuted wherever they can be found.

14. One participant drew attention to the matter of self-defence, and the difference between pre-emption and prevention: in his view, pre-emption was justifiable in international law and had been practiced in the past. Ralph Zacklin recalled the Israeli act of bombing the Iraq reactor in the early 1980s and pointed out that while it was clearly an act of pre-emptive and anticipatory self-defence it had been condemned by the Security Council including the United States. Another participant considered that as far as a role for the UN in counter-terrorism was concerned, the approach of the Security Council in establishing the Counter-Terrorism Committee was the right approach in that it gave an opportunity for a coalition of all 191 members to take appropriate action.

15. There was also an exchange of views on the importance of intelligence and information-gathering in a peace operation for the purpose of effective force protection, although a counter view was that in many cases the threats to the security of UN missions were not terrorism but the activities of criminal gangs.

16. One participant, noting the fact that several speakers had referred to the difficulties in finding an acceptable definition of terrorism, felt that the linkages between peace operations and counter-terrorism should not be pushed too far, especially at the operational and tactical level.

17. Another comment was that in some of the situations in which peace operations had to be conducted, they were not post-conflict as conflict was still continuing and terrorism was a part of the violence; therefore there was a need to address what kind of capabilities were needed to achieve a successful outcome in such circumstances. Sometimes, it was the political negotiators and civilian administrators, rather than the military, who would be first involved and so there should also be appropriate training for them. This elicited a comment that often the civilians were not well coordinated and the different civilian elements were perhaps not

quite as professionally prepared to go into a complex mission as the military or certain police forces.

18. Responding to the discussion, Alyson Bailes suggested that too often military interventions called for an exit strategy, whereas it would be much better to think in terms of aiming at a satisfactory end-state achieved over time and through a number of phases. William Durch observed that in the trans-conflict situations of Bosnia and Kosovo perhaps fewer troops would have been sufficient to deal with violence if they had been given broader mandates. It was a question of focusing on individual unit capability and, if possible, a ratio of peacekeepers to insurgents rather than to populations.

19. The discussion continued with an exchange of views on whether the Challenges project should include counter-terrorism or steer clear of the topic. One view was that the aim of peace operations in whatever form was to maintain peace and stability in the globe and terrorism threatened that very concept, so why should it be excluded from the project? Satish Nambiar opined that by focusing on counter-terrorism the Challenges project would be diluting its work, as in addressing the issues of Al Qaeda there would be little time for anything else. Al Qaeda had to be dealt with on a war footing, and he believed that the Challenges project should not be considering Chapter VII enforcement operations, as opposed to robust actions under Chapter VI.

20. This exchange gave rise to comments by several participants who felt that the Challenges project could not avoid the implications of terrorism to peace operations. One participant felt that in the past few years there had been some confusion over the application of Chapters VI and VII, and the interpretation seemed to depend on whatever particular way the Security Council was thinking at the time the mandate was approved. However, in dealing with terrorism – notwithstanding the absence of a definition of terrorism – force would have to be used, and this would present difficulties. It would be essential to make sure that forces were well prepared, coherent, able to protect themselves and carry out their mandate. Another participant pointed out that terror was a deliberate tactic of the Taliban and Al Qaeda and in such circumstances would a Chapter VI operation be adequate?

21. Satish Nambiar, in amplifying his understanding of Chapters VI and VII, commented that in situations such as Afghanistan and the terror groups of the Taliban, he doubted that a UN force could handle them and that a multinational force was more appropriate. In Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq the situations required Chapter VII action, and once the circumstances were stabilised a UN force under Chapter VI could then be deployed to help the ceasefire, restore state structures and other similar actions.

22. On a different aspect, Lars Nylen was asked what was the experience in Sweden concerning the best way of sharing responsibilities between the police and military in planning against terrorism. He responded that the police and the military needed to cooperate and use the intelligence gathered for common assessments; the military and police must work hand in hand. In peacekeeping operations with executive mandates the military comes in first and the police accompany military patrols. At a later stage, the military support the police in their patrol work, with the country's new police force accompanied by UN police officers. As there was no way of knowing where terrorists might strike, it was important that mission areas should not become safe havens for terrorists. To that end it was necessary to have closer cooperation and information-sharing, and the police component must be put into the perspective of the growing network of police cooperation around the globe.

23. Returning to the matter of whether the Challenges project should address issues of counter-terrorism, it was pointed out that some of the UN's other existing activities related to conflict, for example the handling of refugees, were inevitably scrutinised to see whether they met the requirements of counter-terrorism or anti-terrorism policy. There had been past cases where terrorists had been able to use refugee camps or people had been able to use those camps to re-launch conflict, and it would be a foolish policy which did not honestly face those issues and try to deal with them.

24. The existence and general content of the Report of the Policy Working Group on the United Nations and Terrorism, chaired by Under-Secretary-General Kieran Prendergast, conveyed to the General Assembly and the Security Council by the Secretary-General in UN document A/57/273 S/2002/875 (text available at www.un.org/terrorism/a57273.doc) was brought to the attention of the participants. Among the extracts read out were the following:

> "….. The United Nations should beware of being perceived to be offering a blanket automatic endorsement of all actions taken in the name of counter-terrorism" (para.15)
>
> "…."It is in the realm of norms, human rights, justice and communications that the comparative advantages of the United Nations will be most apparent and that it will make the greatest difference" (para. 16)

25. Participants were urged by the speaker to take the Report and its 31 recommendations into their consideration when determining the extent to which the Challenges project work should address issues of counter-terrorism.

26. It may be pertinent to note that recommendation 23 of the Report reads as follows:

> "Measures should be taken to ensure that the mandates of peacekeeping operations are sensitive to terrorism-related issues, providing, for instance, that civilian police officers receive appropriate training on measures to identify and counter terrorist groups."

27. Having high-lighted some of the issues that were raised in the discussion and which could be useful to explore further and in greater detail, to put the report in context, a brief presentation of the overall project effort may be in place.

28. The Challenges Project was initiated in Sweden in 1997 and is a joint effort by a multiplicity of Partner Organizations around the world.[3] The project is now coordinated by the Folke Bernadotte Academy in cooperation with the Swedish Armed Forces, National Police Board and National Defence College. The Folke Bernadotte Academy is a newly established, autonomous, governmental agency devoted to enhancing capacity in the field of peace operations, civilian crisis management, conflict prevention and disaster relief. It serves as a coordinating function in Sweden and as a national point of contact for international organizations in this area. The academy is named after the renowned UN mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte.

29. The aim of the Challenges Project is, first, to bring to bear, in a collegial and informal setting, the collective knowledge and views of participants on the challenges of peace operations as the world enters the 21st century. Second, to foster and encourage a culture of cross-professional co-operation and partnership between organizations and individuals from a wide variety of nations and cultures.

30. The Project Partner Organizations have organized and hosted seminars on a range of key issues in peace operations. Discussions on the practice and theory of peace operations are combined with practical issues of education and training. Over the years, some 240 organizations and 55 countries have exchanged experiences and ideas on how to enhance the planning, preparation, conduct and effectiveness of multinational peace operations. In particular, organizations in the field of training and education have made important contributions to the project process.[4]

[3] The Partner Organizations are; Folke Bernadotte Academy of Sweden in cooperation with the Swedish Armed Forces, National Defence College, National Police Board, Russian Public Policy Centre, Jordan Institute of Diplomacy, Institute for Security Studies in Pretoria, United States Institute of Peace, United Services Institution of India, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Pearson Peacekeeping Centre of Canada, Argentine Armed Forces Joint Staff in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Australian Defence Organization in cooperation with Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, Turkey Centre for Strategic Research of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in cooperation with the Armed Forces, National Police Forces, University of Bilkent and Istanbul Policy Center of the University of Sabanci, and the China Institute for International Strategic Studies.

[4] CENCAMEX Gendarmerie Peacekeeping Training Centre, Argentina, Commonwealth of Independent States HQ for Military Cooperation & Coordination, PfP Training Centre of Turkey, Royal Police Academy of Jordan, South African Army War College, Swedish International Centre, United Service Institution of India Centre for UN Peacekeeping, UN Department for Peacekeeping Operations Training and Evaluation Service, UN Institute for Training and Research Programme of Correspondence, United States Army Peacekeeping Institute, Vystrel Peacekeeping Academy of the Russian Federation, Zarqa Peacekeeping Centre of Jordan.

31. Some of the key results and products of the project are:

a. Challenges Project Seminar Reports-published following each seminar.

b. Input to the United Nations (Secretary General Report, Security Council and General Assembly deliberations, UN Special Committee for PKO).

c. Contributions to academic journals.

d. Increased knowledge about peace operations in the official languages of the UN: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish.

e. Concrete exchanges and cooperation between organizations and countries: exchange between participating training and education centra, establishment of an Early Warning Centre for Africa, book project cooperation, etc.

32. A report on phase I of the project was presented at a one day seminar at the UN HQs in April 2002. The report made recommendations to troop contributing countries, informed Member States on current peace operations developments and contributed to the process of reform of UN peace operations.

33. Phase II of the project began with the addition of more principal partners. The Partners and the Project are developing the agenda for the next two years, and are committed to the following; intensify research, conduct four international seminars, make recommendations to enhance the international capacity to conduct multinational peace operations, and finally, to develop strategies for implementation of recommendations. The next Challenges Project cumulative report is planned for 2005.

The first concluding report of the project was presented in April 2002 on behalf of the Project Partners by Swedish Foreign Minister Anna Lindh to the Secretary General of the United Nations Kofi A. Annan. We wish to pay tribute to the work and memory of late Foreign Minister Anna Lindh, who also gave the opening statement during the Krusenberg Seminar, thus launching the second phase of the project. Ms Lindh, who was later tragically murdered in Stockholm, was in words as well as in her deeds, a guiding light and true inspiration with her unfailing commitment to promoting democracy and sustainable development in general, and to secure respect for human rights in particular. She was widely and warmly recognized for her efforts, and her contributions to the Challenges project were invaluable. Without the generous support of Foreign Minister Lindh and her ministry, the Challenges Project Coordination would not have been possible. She will be greatly missed and it is in and for her memory that we are determined to continue our efforts and adress the many challenges she pointed out in her opening statement at the Krusenberg seminar.

Opening Statement

Foreign Minister Anna Lindh

Ladies and gentlemen,

I am very pleased to be here, at this important occasion!

This morning we heard on the news that the United Nations Security Council yesterday adopted a new resolution on Iraq. It was quite briefly mentioned, but in reality an important step. It shows that once again the UN has survived a crisis and is back on the scene, despite all misgivings.

The war in Iraq was no doubt a setback for the UN, but let us hope that it was the exception that confirms the rule – that the role of the UN has been strengthened in the last decade.

During the Cold War the UN was praised by all of us in ceremonial speeches, but lacked the force and instruments to make a real difference. The world order was created by the super-powers. They moved the pawns and set the rules.

With the end of the Cold War countries became free to take their own, independent decisions, and the globalisation process made information, technology and knowledge available and accessible as never before.

And with the signs of a new and more positive world order, the potential of the UN was beginning to show.

During the nineties building democracy, human rights and good governance became the ambition for many countries. Human security, not simply the security of states, became our focus, and the close connection between peace and development was widely recognised. A clear commitment to fight poverty was made by the world community.

Then came September 11. The fight against terrorism took force and gained international support. Legal, financial and security measures that had been neglected for too long were finally taken. That was important and positive.

But the fight against terrorism has also led to situations where human rights are set aside in many countries. The USA interpreted the right to self-defence, correctly when dealing with Afghanistan, also as a right to attack Iraq without a UN mandate. We fear a renaissance of weapons of mass destruction. We fear the threats of

terrorism. Once again the world is painted black and white. New tensions, new divisions and new armaments – like chilly winds from the days of the Cold War. Still I am convinced that the UN will survive. There is simply no alternative.

The severe problems we face today require multilateral solutions and joint efforts.

- Unilateral action is not enough to come to terms with the growing tensions between ethnic and religious groups.
- Unilateral action is not enough to achieve peaceful and sustainable solutionsfor conflict-areas such as the Middle East.
- Unilateral action is not enough to face terrorism.
- Unilateral action cannot heal the rift between rich and poor countries.
- Unilateral action cannot safeguard the respect for universal human rights.
- Unilateral action is not enough to abolish weapons of mass destruction.

A key to a more secure future is successful peace operations, and you have a very important role in achieving that.

Since 1948, there have been 54 UN peacekeeping operations, mostly during the last 12 years. Today, there are 15 UN peacekeeping operations in the field.

Initially peacekeeping was developed to deal with conflict between states. But today most conflicts occur within states, which have made peacekeeping efforts more complex and varied. A concrete example is (the Democratic Republic of) Congo, which I visited two weeks ago. After years of civil war the country is devastated. The situation in the north-eastern part is disastrous but despite the presence of MONUC, the UN mission that is present to assist the peace-process, there is no possibility to protect civilians. The UN Security Council is trying to find a possibility to stop the immediate violence by sending troops, and I hope they will succeed. But a lasting peace will require far more than military peacekeepers. The country needs political and financial systems, institutions and structures that function. Security and the hope for development must replace anarchy and frustration.

Although military personnel remain the backbone of most peacekeeping operations, increasingly large numbers of civilians work alongside them. Civilian police are an increasingly important component of peacekeeping operations. That is evident in Bosnia, Kosovo and Macedonia. It is a matter of rebuilding normality, by making daily life safe. It is also a way of making business difficult for organised crime, which prospers in the chaos of conflict.

Today, operations are mandated to strengthen a political process, by building democratic institutions, working with governments, NGOs and citizens' groups.

That is the case in Afghanistan, where the international community provides emergency relief, demobilises and reintegrates former fighters into society, clears mines, organises elections and promotes sustainable development practices. It is a very difficult task, which has to succeed.

UN peacekeepers must be able to carry out their mandate successfully. They must be professional and prepared to confront and handle violence and threats both towards themselves and to civilians. Rules of engagement should be robust and mandates should specify the authority to use force.

The first months after a cease-fire or peace accord are often critical for establishing stable peace. Opportunities lost during that period are hard to regain. A sad example of this is Angola in the early nineties. More adequate efforts might have avoided another decade of terrible war.

The Brahimi Report recommended that the UN should be able to fully deploy traditional peacekeeping operations within 30 days of the adoption of a Security Council resolution, and within 90 days in the case of more complex peacekeeping operations.

The report also pointed to the need for Integrated Mission Task Forces, bringing together responsible for military operations, civilian police, human rights, humanitarian assistance, refugees and recruitment.

The challenge now is to implement the recommendations of the Brahimi Report. A lot has been done, but still more remains in commitment on the part of Member States, on institutional change and increased financial support.

We need to work on the process of disarming, demobilising and reintegrating excombatants, not the least on efforts to get the 300,000 child soldiers in armed conflicts today back to a normal life. Too often various factions continue armed fighting, despite peace agreements and the presence of peacekeeping missions. A major problem is the availability of large amounts of armaments, in particular small arms and light weapons.

We need to expand the role and contribution of women in peace operations, at all levels, among staff and in decision-making. Women and children constitute the majority of victims in armed conflict, as well as of the world's refugees and internally displaced persons. Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) focuses on these issues, and gender perspectives are now incorporated into the mandates and activities of all peacekeeping missions. Member States have been asked to identify women to serve in decision-making positions, and to increase the recruitment of women as military observers, peacekeeping troops and civilian police. Last but not least, codes of conduct establish standards of behaviour of UN staff to prevent ex-

ploitation of women, as it is evident that prostitution and trafficking increase in the context of international interventions

We need to work on security sector reforms. National armies, formed in the aftermath of war, have to be balanced in ethnic, religious or regional terms. They have to be reduced in size and made accountable to a democratic state. A UN operation with a central role in the political process may need to assist in facilitating the payment of newly recruited soldiers, as in Afghanistan, but also in the serious political considerations regarding who should be disarmed and demobilised, or recruited and retrained in the new army.

We need to work on the troop contributions to the UN. Today, eight of the top ten contributors come from developing countries, while industrialised countries gradually have withdrawn their forces from UN peacekeeping. These forces are used in other peacekeeping activities, such as the NATO-led operations in the Balkans or ISAF in Afghanistan.

Sweden participates in the Balkans as well as in Afghanistan, but also in 13 out of all 15 UN operations, and will shortly contribute 90 persons to MONUC in the Democratic Republic of Congo. We hope, however, that more countries in the industrialised world will consider participating in UN peacekeeping operations.

My last point is how to engage regional organisations, without regionalising peacekeeping. The UN Charter provides for regional involvement but does not define precisely how. The EU, OSCE and the African Union all take an increasing responsibility for peace operations in co-operation with the UN, but a lot remain to be done.

UN-EU co-operation is developing around four areas: conflict prevention, military and civilian crisis management and regional conflicts. The military crisis management capabilities that the EU is setting up should be used by the UN to improve the capacity to deploy operations more rapidly. There is a lot to be gained by combining the EU instruments with UN experience on military and civilian peace support. Right now we are discussing an EU contribution to the peacekeeping mission in Congo.

The Challenges Project is in itself a valuable contribution to develop ideas and practice on multilateral peace operations. Some 240 organisations and 55 countries have contributed, and benefited from a wide spectrum of national perspectives, cultural outlooks, professional civilian and military expertise and regional insights. I am pleased to note the continued, and growing, interest to join the Project as it moves into its second phase. I would like to welcome old and new Partner Organisations, and look forward to following the progress and findings over the next two years.

The newly established Folke Bernadotte Academy will co-ordinate the second phase of the Challenges Project in co-operation with the National Defence College, Armed Forces and Police Board. This team reflects the broadening nature of peace operations and mirrors the larger international team of the Project. Such teamwork is vital, if we are to succeed in future peace operations. I am pleased to welcome you all to this opening meeting of the second phase of the project: Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century.

Thank you

Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism Perspectives on United Nations Peace Operations

Chief Arthur C.I. Mbanefo

1. Let me first thank all those who felt that the subject of this 12th Challenges Seminar was crucial enough to warrant our collective attention at this time. I for one, agree that the theme is important and the time for addressing it is most appropriate. Of course, whether there is any direct link between Peace Operations as understood by the Challenges Project Partners and Counter-Terrorism should be the real task of our gathering here for the next couple of days. I must also simultaneously thank those who crafted the background paper for this seminar. It is a job well done.

2. Now to our subject: Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism; I must say that despite the attention attracted by terrorism, particularly after 11 September 2001, we in the United Nations Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations in all its Aspects (C.34) are yet to address directly the issue of Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism. This is not to say that some other organs of the United Nations have not been seized with the subject, like the Security Council which has done extensive work on terrorism including setting up the Counter-Terrorism Committee. The C.34 and the Sixth Committee have nevertheless tackled the issue of the Safety and Security of UN staff in Mission areas. The Special Committee has recommended in this regard that the Status-of-forces and the Status-of Mission Agreements must

> "include specific and practical measures to enhance personnel safety and security, based on the provisions of the Convention on the safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel."

3. As we all know the process of peacekeeping operations has changed drastically over the years. The process which was once mandated under Chapter VI of the Charter is often now under Chapter VII as the Council seeks more robust mandates to meet the new challenges of current conflicts and their resolution. By the same token our understanding of terrorism has changed as we find with the efforts in the background paper to define terrorism. As we would have noticed groups that were once proudly referred to as "freedom fighters" are all of sudden "terrorists" as the world grows less tolerant of the tactics adopted by them to be effective and attract attention to their predicament.

4. It is obvious that terrorism is a special form of conflict and therefore I wish to suggest that we see the methods and processes for countering it as a form of "peace operation" to the extent that countering terrorism is in fact ensuring peace and security for all those who are vulnerable. If this premise is accepted, then we need to consider most the basics of the process for countering terrorism. The only known global mandate currently guiding us is Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001) which obliged all Member States under Chapter VII of the Charter to take specific actions to combat terrorism. This resolution provided amongst its various provisions for the establishment of the Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC). This Committee comprises all 15 Member States of the Security Council.

5. What is significant about Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001) is that it goes beyond the existing 12 international treaties that bind only those that acceded to them to create a uniform obligation to all the 191 United Nations Member States. The operative paragraphs of the resolution require Member States to deny all forms of financial support for terrorist groups; to suppress the provision of safe havens, sustenance or support for terrorists; and to share with other governments' information about any groups practicing or planning terrorist acts. It bars active and passive assistance to terrorists. Indeed resolution 1373 asks every government to undertake a self-assessment of its existing legislation and executive machinery to combat terrorism, to assess how well these instruments match the requirements of resolution 1373 and to take specific action where there are inadequacies. The Governments finally are expected to report regularly to the Counter-Terrorism Committee.

6. Let me quickly add that the Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee is not a sanctions committee, nor is it expected to prosecute or condemn any State. It is expected to seek to establish a basis for serious dialogue between the Security Council and Member States on how best to build global capacity against terrorism. As Ambassador Curtis Ward of Jamaica said "the CTC encourages cooperation at the national, sub-regional and regional levels to ensure that no country or region may be used to launch terrorist attacks anywhere in the world".

7. The latest resolution of the Security Council on the subject was Resolution 1456 (2003) adopted on 20 January 2003. It is a declaration of Ministers for Foreign Affairs on the issue of combating terrorism. The background paper raised the issue of definition. Yes, the formulation of an acceptable general definition of terrorism has remained controversial. At this point in time it is still under discussion in the General Assembly. But for the purpose of Resolution 1373, States upgrading their domestic legislative capacity are required to define terrorism under their domestic legislation. This therefore does not necessitate international agreement on a definition of terrorism. Resolution 1456(2003) however reaffirmed the following regarding terrorism:

a. terrorism in all its forms and manifestations constitutes one of the most serious threats to peace and security;

b. any acts of terrorism are criminal and unjustifiable, regardless of their motivation, whenever and by whomever committed and are to be unequivocally condemned, especially when they indiscriminately target or injure civilians;

c. there is a serious and growing danger of terrorist access to and use of nuclear, chemical, biological and other potentially deadly materials, and therefore a need to strengthen controls on these materials;

d. it has become easier, in an increasingly globalized world, for terrorists to exploit sophisticated technology, communications and resources for their criminal objectives;

e. measures to detect and stem the flow of finance and funds for terrorist purposes must be urgently strengthened;

f. terrorists must be prevented from making use of other criminal activities such as transnational organized crime, illicit drugs and drug trafficking, money-laundering and illicit arms trafficking;

g. since terrorists and their supporters exploit instability and intolerance to justify their criminal acts the Security Council is determined to counter this by contributing to peaceful resolution of disputes and by working to create a climate of mutual tolerance and respect;

h. terrorism can only be defeated, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and international law, by a sustained comprehensive approach involving the active participation and collaboration of all States, international and regional organizations, and by redoubled efforts at the national level.

8. In conclusion, it is obvious that a lot of work has been done by the Security Council to counter-terrorism but a lot more needs to be done. This seminar must examine all known approaches to counter-terrorism and determine whether a viable globally accepted method is emerging. This is important as no one seems spared today from the invisible hands of terrorists, not even the United Nations Organizations and its Agencies.

Ralph Zacklin[5]

Introduction

1. History does repeat itself. Much as 9/11 impacted on the closing stages of Phase One of the Challenges Project, the war in Iraq which began on 19 March 2003 has impacted on this organizational meeting of Phase Two. If 9/11 was seen as presenting new challenges to peace operations, the Iraq war must be seen as presenting challenges not only to peace operations but to the very system of collective security embodied in the UN Charter and therefore raises existential questions over and above the familiar questions of evolving law and practice which have marked the discussion of peace operations in recent years.

2. In this new post-conflict Iraq reality I interpret the topic "Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism" first and foremost as a metaphor rather than a working title – a metaphor for profound change, a watershed in international relations and the international system.

3. This is not to say that the designated topic should not be discussed as a working proposition. After all, peace operations have become synonymous with the United Nations and terrorism (however defined) has been a seam running through the sub-strata of international relations for decades. As the background paper states there will be some who take the view that counter-terrorism must impact on peace operations and therefore require or bring about an adaptation to the new reality; others will find it difficult to see a direct connection between peace operations and counter-terrorism. Before we can even begin to address the possible connection between peace operations and counter-terrorism, however, it is necessary to place the topic in its current international context.

The Impact of the Iraq War on the International System

4. It is self-evident that the discussion of 21st century challenges to peace operations here is taking place in a radically different context than that which existed in Melbourne in November 2002.

5. For more than half a century, any discussion of peace operations has, by definition, taken place in relation to the United Nations and more particularly in relation to the powers and competencies of the Security Council and the interpretation in practice placed upon Chapters VI and VII of the Charter by the Council. Of course, it is possible to speak of peace operations through regional mechanisms

[5] Ralph Zacklin: The statements contained herein reflect the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations.

i.e. Chapter VIII, but realistically speaking, the only reliable and credible source of peace operations both in terms of political credibility and administrative and logistical capacity has been the United Nations Security Council and through the Council the Secretary-General.

6. Peace operations are, therefore, inextricably linked legally and politically to the Security Council and the Security Council is the principal organ at the heart of what used to be referred to as the collective security system. Until recently, it was a system which, however imperfect, embodied a generally accepted legal framework based on fundamental Charter principles governing the use of force in international relations. It is worth recalling just how significant a step the Charter represented in 1945 in relation to pre-Charter law in relation to use of force in international relations.

7. The prohibition on the use of force in international relations contained in Article 2(4) of the Charter was intended to be comprehensive in nature. It was this provision which marked the historic evolution of organized international relations in the 20th century, prior to which no general prohibition on the use of force existed.

8. The Iraq war has seemingly confirmed and brought to fruition a trend which first emerged in relation to Kosovo in 1999, namely that the Security Council no longer exercises a central legitimizing or de-legitimizing role regarding the use of force in international relations.

9. In Kosovo, the armed intervention by a coalition of like-minded States that was neither in self-defence nor an authorized collective enforcement measure was clothed by politicians, diplomats and academics in the garb of something called humanitarian intervention. And indeed there was some truth to this and a kind of ex post facto legitimization took place when the Security Council overwhelmingly rejected the text of a resolution that would have condemned the use of force in Kosovo.

10. The war in Iraq is a use of force of a very different order and the damage to the UN system far greater than Kosovo. Some commentators believe that it may in fact be terminally damaged, although it is probably too soon after the event to assess the full effect on the United Nations; at the very least the system has been administered a strong shock and it has been temporarily rendered dysfunctional. Why do we say this?

11. For more than half a century, the use of force in international relations was made subject to the Charter which permitted use of force in only two circumstances: in self-defence or on the basis of a collective enforcement decision taken by the Security Council under Chapter VII. In either case, the Council had an important

role, effectively one of legitimizing the use of force or de-legitimizing it. A use of force in self-defence had to be brought to the Security Council by the State or States invoking the inherent right and a collective enforcement action required a prior determination by the Security Council of a threat to the peace.

12. In the case of Iraq, a decision to use force by a "coalition" of like-minded States was carried out with neither Security Council authorization nor under the self-defence provisions of Article 51. To be sure there were a number of legal arguments advanced, including arguments based on an interpretation of Security Council resolutions on Iraq which were premised either on the dubious "material breach" argument or the automaticity of 1441. But the fact remains that for an overwhelming majority of the Security Council these arguments were unconvincing and, consequently, the action eventually taken was outside the framework of the Charter, of dubious legality and certainly lacked legitimacy.

13. It will probably be many years before we will fully understand the impact of these developments on the United Nations and the role of the Security Council in the domain of peace and security.

14. In the immediate short term the Security Council will be pre-occupied with the role of the United Nations in post-conflict Iraq: the lifting of sanctions, what to do about the oil-for-food programme, the future of UNMOVIC inspections, the UNCC and the remnants of the framework of Security Council Resolution 687 (1991) such as missing persons and return of Kuwaiti property. It will also be engaged in trying to determine what the role of the UN should be in the political and economic reconstruction of Iraq. All of these issues will continue to produce tensions between the "coalition" and the other members of the Security Council.

The Future of the Collective Security System

15. Overshadowing these short-term issues will be the longer-term questions concerning the future of the collective security system and a rule-based order of institutions and law.

16. Since its founding, the United Nations has shown a remarkable capacity to adapt and the Charter has proved to be a flexible constitutive instrument in practice. The development of United Nations peacekeeping is perhaps the most notable example of this adaptability and flexibility.

17. It remains to be seen at the present juncture whether the Organization can adapt to the new circumstances or whether it will give way to a new type of organization. Viewed from the perspective of its most influential member, the United States, the United Nations has "failed" to meet its needs in a new age of global ter-

ror. While this does not necessarily mean the demise of the Organization, the role and effectiveness of the Security Council as a forum for collective security has been diminished, at least in matters perceived to be in the strategic interest of the United States.

Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism

18. In relation to the topic of this meeting – Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism – the general panorama which confronts us today is particularly pertinent because the crisis which has been precipitated by the Iraq war is a crisis born of terrorism. During the late stages of Phase One of the Challenges project it was quite natural that the thinking of those concerned with the challenges to peacekeeping in the 21st century should turn to the subject of counter-terrorism but it is doubtful if any of us in November 2002 could have fully foreseen the dimension of the challenge that would confront us in May 2003.

19. As noted earlier, peace operations are inextricably linked to the Security Council and consequently the extent to which peace operations could or should adapt to new challenges such as terrorism depends to a large extent on how the Council might function post-Iraq.

20. Because of the key role of the Council in relation to peace operations, it is axiomatic that the core of the Council, its five permanent members, must be able to work together effectively. In the past when the P5 have been able to coalesce around a particular agenda, peace operations have been a significant, if not always successful, contribution to peace and security. However, if such cooperation is lacking or if the aims of such operations are not perceived by the broader membership as legitimate –as was the case in Iraq- the Council will be unable to function and peace operations will not be possible.

21. In earlier discussions of the Challenges project the remarkable evolution of peacekeeping from its Middle East beginnings to the complex, multi-faceted peace operations of today with the greater flexibility of mandates, the more robust use of force in self-defence, the gradual breaking down of the barriers between Chapters VI and VII, all have led to a view of peace operations as a major-tool of conflict prevention and nation-building. Could this capacity of peace operations to adapt extend to counter-terrorism as it had so successfully adapted to internal conflicts?

22. Perhaps the best way to answer this is to look at how the United Nations reacted to 9/11 and to ask whether after 9/11 but before the Iraq war there was any indication that peace operations were adapting to the new reality of terrorism and becoming an integral part of the counter-terrorism activities of the United Na-

tions. Historically, both the General Assembly and the Security Council have been active in what today we call counter-terrorism. The General Assembly's role has focused on a legislative approach through the adoption of various conventions although the goal of a comprehensive convention including a definition of terrorism has eluded it.

23. The Security Council, on the other hand, has focused on particular cases e.g. Libya, Sudan and the Taliban in Afghanistan and has acted through non-military enforcement measures instituting sanctions against all three governments.

24. As a direct result of 9/11 the Security Council has focused more generally on the global fight against terrorism emphasizing that any act of international terrorism constitutes a threat to international peace and security. Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001) adopted under Chapter VII prohibited support for entities or individuals involved in terrorism and created a Security Council Committee to monitor the implementation of 1373 (the Counter-Terrorism Committee) and this was followed by Security Council Resolution 1377 (2001) which adopted a Declaration on the global effort to fight terrorism. The work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee has been intensive but until now has focused essentially on improving the legislative and investigative means of combating terrorism within and among member states, including the financing of terrorism.

25. It is important to note that post 9/11 and prior to the Iraq war no explicit connection had been made between peace operations, counter-terrorism and the formulation of United Nations mandates. However, there have been indirect connections. Two examples come to mind: the first is the authorization in Security Council Resolution 1386, as envisaged in the Bonn Agreement, of the establishment of an International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) to assist in the maintenance of security in Kabul and its surrounding areas in order that the Afghan Interim Authority and United Nations personnel can operate in a secure environment; the second is the adoption by UNMIK, as the interim authority in Kosovo, of UNMIK Regulation 2001/12 of 14 June 2001 on the prohibition of terrorism and related offences.

26. The practice since 9/11 does not provide us with clear guidance: the contexts within which the Security Council acted either directly or through a subsidiary organ (i.e. Afghanistan and Kosovo) were quite specific. Whether the Security Council is likely to mandate peace operations to combat terrorism in general is far from clear given the difficulties in agreeing on exactly what constitutes terrorism (not wishing to become enmeshed in the definition game) and the divisions within the United Nations on determining when a particular situation becomes a threat to international peace and security.

27. If we extrapolate from the post 9/11 practice, however, the post-Iraq evolution of the United Nations seemingly points in the direction of a supportive involvement of the Security Council and its subsidiary organs i.e. peace operations.

28. As long as terrorism remains a global strategic concern of the United States, it is clear that the United States will follow a doctrine of pre-emptive, anticipatory "self-defence" regardless of the existing Charter prohibitions on the use of force and it will act unilaterally if necessary. The United Nations Security Council may or may not acquiesce in such actions but its role at best will be to legitimize a unilateral decision to use force through an authorization of a US-led coalition of the willing.

29. Such a supportive but subsidiary role for the United Nations and the Security Council would dovetail with a certain view of the United Nations which is gaining ground in some influential circles in Washington. This view tends to see a future United Nations not as a central collective security system but as a technical, largely humanitarian organization which can be entrusted with certain types of activities such as election monitoring, humanitarian assistance and certain types of peace operations which do not involve situations of strategic interest of the United States, including terrorism. This brings me full circle to the starting point of this organizational meeting of Phase Two of the Challenge Project. The working hypothesis is that peace operations as they have evolved over the years are at the core of the mechanisms for conflict prevention and peace and security which can be deployed by the Security Council. To the extent that terrorism has become a global threat to peace and security, it is logical to suppose that peace operations could and should play a role in countering such terrorism. In this hypothesis counter-terrorism is seen as a challenge of adaptation to new circumstances and a new reality.

30. Even before the Iraq war there was little evidence to point to anything more than a subsidiary role for peace operations in counter-terrorism (e.g. Afghanistan). Post-conflict it seems to me to be even less likely that peace operations will be mandated for counter-terrorism actions. There are many reasons for this: political, legal, organizational, logistical. But even if these obstacles could be overcome there are good reasons why this should not happen.

31. Terrorism is not the only threat to international peace and security. Indeed it may be argued that many of the internal conflicts, ethnic rivalries, unsettled borders and weak governments that provide the backdrop to current peace operations pose at least as dangerous a threat to peace and security as terrorism. One only has to recall the failed missions such as Somalia, Bosnia and Rwanda (and their aftermath) and the dangerous conflicts spreading in West Africa and in the Great Lakes region to understand the problem. If the United Nations agenda on peace operations is to be taken over by counter-terrorism this will almost certainly orphan many existing operations and reduce the resources available for new operations.

32. Counter-terrorism is a complex multi-faceted struggle which in my view does not lend itself to the kind of transparent operational guidelines of United Nations peace operations. It is not through the deployment of peace-keepers that terrorism can be effectively countered. Indeed, it should be obvious by now that not even the deployment of coalitions of the willing in their hundreds of thousands can effectively combat the terrorism that is responsible for 9/11, East Africa and Saudi Arabia. This can only effectively be done by intelligence and security organizations.

33. On the other hand, peace operations can make a real difference when properly deployed, resourced and mandated in situations of internal conflict, post-conflict border demarcation and separation of the parties.

34. In the final analysis, the question is whether in the new reality of post-Iraq world order or disorder, peace operations and counter-terrorism can co-exist. This is a difficult question. The United Nations is confronted with a dilemma. If it adapts to the new reality and embraces the new order it risks compromising the fundamental principles of the Charter which provide the United Nations with the legitimacy which is inherent to its recognition. If it does not, it risks being marginalized through the withdrawal of the support of its largest contributor. This is the challenge and how the United Nations deals with this challenge will determine the shape of the Organization in the 21st century.

Timothy Ford

Introduction

1. Since 11 September 2001, much attention has been focused on the impact of terrorism as an issue to be addressed by the United Nations. There has been wide ranging discussion in the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council on the subject, with subsequent landmark resolutions, such as UNSCR 1373 (2001) and 1456 (2003). There has been the formulation of the UN Counter-Terrorism Committee, and various working groups to examine a range of proposals, and there have been a number of important international seminars conducted on the subject. In general, these considerations have addressed the international response to terrorism, the responsibilities of Member States under international and humanitarian law, the development of assistance mechanisms between nations to prevent and fight terrorism, the exchange of information on terrorism, and important issues concerning the control of weapons, particularly those that terrorists can use to create mass casualties or destruction.

2. There has been less discussion on the topic of this Seminar – the impact of this terrorism on Peace Operations. I therefore congratulate the organizers of the Challenges Seminar on choosing this subject for attention, and in collecting us together today to consider some of the relationships between Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism. In particular, I have been asked to consider this subject specifically from a military perspective with respect to United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. I will make some general observations first and then present some thoughts about military implications from the strategic, operational and tactical levels -i.e. from the UNHQ level, the Mission HQ level and the contingent level. I hope that my presentation will initiate further discussion on the topic.

The Nature of UN Peacekeeping Missions

3. UN Missions today, whether UN controlled "Blue Beret" missions or UN Mandated peace operations, are normally complex multidimensional activities. They are authorized as an integrated international response aimed to assist the development of peace in a specific region including security for the population, development of good governance and the promotion of human rights. As such by their very nature the conduct of peacekeeping operations can do much to relieve some of the root causes of terrorism which are fed by instability, social injustice, lack of representation, poverty, and the abuse of human rights. They incorporate at their core coalition military and security operations, bringing together a wide cross-section of multinational, multilingual and multicultural groups with an aim to achieve a common purpose (the UN mandate).

4. There is a strong case to be made for the notion that such peacekeeping missions and associated peace-building projects are really the best long-term counter-terrorism programmes at present available to the international community. They may prove to be more effective than the military response being engaged in by the US and its allies. There are limitations to military solutions, and there has been support for more integrated and holistic responses that combine humanitarian, political, and long-term peace-building approaches that include the construction of lasting coalitions for sustainable peace.

5. Experience has shown us over recent years that modern day peacekeeping is an extremely difficult task. For the military, it is in many ways more difficult than war fighting, as has been demonstrated quite dramatically in the Balkans, in Afghanistan, and most recently in Iraq. Certainly peace operations include many friction points which can provide opportunities for the use of terrorism against parties to the conflict and the United Nations peacekeepers.

Counter-Terrorism

6. Over the history of UN peacekeeping, UN peacekeeping missions have often been exposed to terrorism, either directly or collaterally. Examples of such terrorism began as early as in 1948, with the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations mediator, in Jerusalem on 17 September of that year. They include incidents such as the shooting down of an UN unarmed helicopter by a surface-to-air missile in October 2000 in the approaches to the Kodori Valley in Georgia, and massacres such as the market place and breadline bombings in Sarajevo in 1992 and 1994. Such acts of terrorism, significantly affecting UN Missions, have occurred across the breadth of UN peacekeeping. Incidents which could be classified as terrorist actions have occurred in Europe, in the Middle East, in Kashmir and Afghanistan, in Africa and in South America. They have been initiated by various individuals, disenchanted groups and renegade governments.

7. UN Heads of Mission and Force Commanders have written in their reports and in their various autobiographies of these acts of terrorism, and of the lengths that some individuals and groups will go to in an attempt to undermine the effectiveness of UN mandated missions. They acknowledge that, within the environment of peace operations, consent is seldom universal, and that "spoilers" will always exist who may use terror and all other means available to achieve their own "political" goals.

8. The need to prepare for terrorism is therefore not a new challenge. It has, however, attracted much closer attention over the last 20 months, to which the UN must respond. Under this new focus, planning for UN peacekeeping operations must be seen to address the possibility of terrorism, and to closely analyse its pos-

sible impact on both the structure and conduct of the mission. Preparation for UN peacekeeping missions must include a comprehensive and effective counter-terrorism policy.

9. On the other hand, we should recognize that the United Nations is not required to respond alone to the new emphasis on terrorism post 11 September. Many nations are already reacting to the current emphasis on terrorism in the context of their own perceived national threats, and there is growing cooperation between nations in the fight against terrorism. Much of the counter-insurgency doctrine of the nineteen fifties and sixties is being re-examined, adapted, and relearned. Training programmes for military, police and security forces that focus on counter-terrorism are being reviewed and implemented, and intelligence and information on terrorism sources are being developed and exchanged. UN consideration should therefore build on this new body of study and cooperation, and incorporate the appropriate procedures into UN peacekeeping operations

Strategic Level Response

10. Beginning at the highest strategic level, issues of terrorism and how they might affect any proposed peacekeeping mission must be addressed at the earliest stages of mission planning in UN Headquarters. In its advice to the Security Council, the UN should consider the threats to the mission, including from terrorism. In the various options it presents, the Secretariat should indicate the impact of its analysis on the conduct, establishment, structure, and budget of the proposed mission. Such considerations might influence the agreed mandate and the robustness of the military structure approved.

11. To be able to present well balanced options and responses, the UN must ensure that it has the necessary information sources to correctly assess the threats to the peace process. Through the Integrated Mission Task Force (IMTF) process, it must gain information from all sources, including existing UN offices, agencies and NGOs in the region, so as to develop a clear understanding of the local issues that impact on the mission and might increase the risk of terrorism acts against the various players and the UN presence.

12. Such consideration may result in restrictions on which nations should contribute forces to a mission. All UN missions must give a perception of impartiality. The mission should therefore include a wide range of developed and developing Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs), and include regional and international contingents of different political approach, cultures, religions, and economic groupings. Nevertheless, based on the history of the particular conflict and the positions of the various actors in the settlement, it may not be wise to include certain

TCCs in the peacekeeping force, either because of their lack of preparedness to respond effectively, or their perceived role in the conflict.

13. There are also a number of longer term UN peacekeeping military policy issues that consideration of terrorism should address. There may, for example, be a need to make adjustments to existing UN peacekeeping doctrine, and to include additional training subjects in guidance to Member States, such as through the Standardised Generic Training Modules, now being produced. The possible use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists also highlights the need to complete the current development of UN policy concerning the training for and equipping of national contingents for defence against NBC contingencies.

14. A final thought at the strategic level is that the threat of terrorism again highlights the need to develop, at an early stage of every mission, an effective public information plan. This must address how the UN presence will be presented to the international arena, to the local communities, and to the various actors and dissident groups. Clearly a public information plan that positively addresses international and local concerns can assist in reducing causes for terrorist actions against the UN mission.

Operational Level Response

15. Success in peacekeeping operations depends on the development and maintenance of a secure environment to permit the various actors to work together to achieve the agreed mandate. This requires effective integration of all components of the Mission, particularly the security components, i.e. the military component, the civilian police contingents and the UN civilian security staff (UNSECOORD). The best defence against terrorism remains a capable and credible security force with appropriate rules of engagement (ROE).

16. A UN Mission therefore needs at its core a peacekeeping force that is well equipped, well trained, and coherent. This force must clearly demonstrate by its structure, posture and actions that it has the capacity to protect itself and act against groups trying to undermine the activities of the UN mission. Links must be established between the UN Mission and any national/host nation security apparatus, with an aim to develop an effective and coordinated response to all threats, including terrorism and criminal acts. Such a response should involve all aspects of internal security, including border control, and the justice and penal system.

17. Military peacekeeping contingents must be thoroughly trained prior to deployment in all the basic force protection measures, such as NBC protection, counter-mine, field and static defences, patrolling, information gathering and rapid response. This must be reinforced within the mission by the leadership and

through focused use of the Mission Training cell. There is a flow-on impact to the training requirements of commanders, staff, UN military observers (UNMOs), junior leadership, civil police, civilian security staff and the various national contingents etc. There is also a need for every UN Mission to rapidly achieve coherence and to project an image of effectiveness.

18. Let me now comment briefly on some other operational or mission level considerations. Obviously the best preparation against terrorism is once again effective planning, this time by the mission headquarters to analyze the local threats and the appropriate counter measures. Establishing the correct relationship with the host nation, the development of good relations with local communities (including other UN agencies and NGOs), and creating effective local information systems will be important to such planning. This reinforces the need for Missions to be always active in contingency planning, continually reviewing the situation as it evolves and analyzing its impact on the structure and procedures of mission components. This includes a continual review of the Mission public information plan and the appropriate security procedures.

19. The Mission leadership will also need to carefully consider the appropriate balance between security restrictions (including counter-terrorism measures) and the necessity to engage sympathetically and closely with the local community so as to pursue mission objectives. All of us can think of examples where strong force protection measures have created a negative relationship with the local community. Forces that spend most of their effort protecting themselves do not effectively promote mission objectives or efficiency in a mission. Nevertheless, commanders need to plan a coherent security infrastructure for the mission that discourages the creation of easy targets for terrorism or criminality. This will include sound basic security procedures (including the use of reserves and ready reaction capabilities), good communications and control systems, and effective information processes.

20. In particular, counter-terrorism planning may impact on the Mission Rules of Engagement (ROEs) and the structure of the security forces. I note, for example, the robust ROEs and inclusion of an electronic warfare and a Special Forces capability that eventually was developed in UNTAET, and the creation of information operations capabilities in UNAMSIL and MONUC. Such inclusions are recognition of the need for Force Commanders to have a good understanding of the environment in which they are operating, and to have the ability to influence it. The inclusion of such capability again links back to the strategic level planning and preparation for missions.

Tactical Level Response

21. Finally, at the tactical level, the counter-terrorism plan must be implemented by contingent and sectors effectively. The threat may affect the protection levels and procedures to be followed by contingents and units. At the individual soldier and policeman level this could include, in addition to the mandatory use of helmets and flak jackets, the use of a greater number of night vision devices, and the issue to all personnel of NBC protection kits. For units, it may mean the inclusion of a greater percentage of protected vehicles, the use by all of secure communications, and more robust physical protection measures used to secure barracks and check points etc.

22. Counter-terrorism considerations may affect how UNMOs and units can actually operate in their areas of operation. Prudence may direct that groups should move in minimum-size convoys, and that assertive patrolling be required. Again there will need to be a balance between the need for sound local force protection and effective counter-terrorism procedures and the maintenance of an appropriate low level peacekeeping profile and a positive engagement with local communities.

Conclusion

23. In conclusion, we should recognize that by their very nature the conduct of peacekeeping operations can do much to relieve some of the root causes of terrorism. It is also clear that there is a need for the United Nations to consider carefully the impact that the use of terrorism may have on the conduct of future peacekeeping missions. Terrorism has been used by groups throughout the history of peacekeeping, directed both at United Nations activities, and at the local community. Recent incidents of terrorism have highlighted that with modern weapons a few terrorists can have a huge impact on many, and significantly affect the aims of UN peacekeeping missions. Counter-terrorist measures therefore need to be considered in the preparation, planning and conduct of UN peacekeeping missions, and should to be addressed at the strategic, operational and tactical levels.

24. Many of the principles of effective management and preparation for UN peacekeeping missions are already being addressed by the UN with Member States, as part of the ongoing Brahimi reforms. If followed through comprehensively, they will also provide the appropriate platform for the development of effective counter-terrorist measures.

Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism Academic, Policy, Military and Police Perspectives

Alyson J.K. Bailes[6]

1. I will only make one point about definitions, namely, the distinction between "terror tactics" (or "methods") used during conflict, and 'terrorism' proper. Both typically involve using force in ways that flout laws and norms of humanity, and aim to cause shock, disruption and demoralization beyond the direct practical effect. But the former may be one among many methods used by parties who are openly in conflict, with a view to winning; can also be used by state authorities, and as often against troops as civilians: and are punishable under laws of war and through war crimes institutions. The latter is the distinctive mode of operation of terrorist organizations fighting against established authorities; it is used also in times of 'peace', more often against civilians, for a much wider range of reasons than 'winning' a conflict [the presence of such motive is also what distinguishes it from general crime]; and it is punishable under special, permanently applicable international and national legislation.

2. True, during peace operations acts by terrorists and acts of terror by others may seem to pose very similar problems and be treated with many of the same methods. In fact, around the world, 'terror within conflict' claims far more lives than the kind of 'super-terrorism' or terrorism directed against peaceful societies that has obsessed us since 9/11. But a crucial difference is that 'terror tactics' will be prevented if the conflict is prevented, and they stop when the conflict stops. Organized terrorism can and does continue to pose threats after one side in a conflict has achieved military mastery, and for various reasons (discussed below) may even grow and/or be more prominent in post-conflict conditions. It is therefore a very real challenge for post-conflict peace-building: and inasmuch as peace operations are aimed to achieve or consolidate conflict resolution and the transition to peace, they also need to be conducted in a way that recognizes and helps to cope with this challenge.

3. Next, two 'big picture' comments about linkage between terrorism, counter-terrorism and peace operations.

[6] Alyson Bailes: The prescriptions offered in this talk were in large part based on "Anti-terrorism and Peace-building During and After Conflict", a Policy Paper published by Dr Ekaterina Stepanova while a guest researcher at SIPRI in Spring 2002. For the text in pdf form, see www.sipri.org

4. First, a curiosity of the post-9/11 scene is that new conflicts necessitating peace operations have been triggered by *counter-terrorist* rather than *terrorist* action, because of the US decision to meet asymmetric threats and violence by using military means to eliminate the source. Afghanistan is the classic case, while Iraq shows that a similar chain of events can arise from non-terrorist asymmetric threats. (Conversely, pinpoint strikes against terrorists can take place in a country at 'peace' without necessarily triggering conflict – Yemen.) The peculiarity in these cases is that while the punitive and coercive part of the military action was triggered by terrorism, subsequent international peace operations and peace-building may not be *'about' terrorism*, to the extent that the latter was not originally a native security problem for the regime itself. (This could be true both of 'failed states' and of 'rogue' dictatorships.) One of the goals of peace-building will certainly be to leave a regime in place that rejects terrorism, but this is likely to be the easy bit. The real worry, which we have too short experience to test, is that interventions of this kind may create impetus for new or more virulent terrorist movements at popular and trans-State level elsewhere. (Cf. Al-Qaeda's own origins.)

5. Secondly, on the basis of observation in 2002, the new anti-terrorist drive may also affect the course of existing conflicts, and hence the need and conditions for peace operations, in several ways:

a. an accrual of political support to the side which is seen as anti-terrorist, which could impede or delay peace efforts if even-handedness is important, or make it harder for international forces to be deployed with an even-handed mandate (the Israel syndrome)

b. extra external military support for régimes actively battling terrorists: which could bring a quick win, but if not, may also spur insurgents to fresh and more violent efforts and/or push them seek outside help as well. (Philippines, Nepal?) This could make it harder to solve the conflict without direct external military intervention in the long run. Also there is a risk that aid recipients, if victorious, will be unreliable allies and pose terrorist threats themselves in future (the Taliban syndrome).

c. on the other hand, there are some signs that sub-state combatants who want to win state control and international recognition will try harder, in their political/presentational tactics and also their actions, to avoid earning 'terrorist' labels with all the ensuing handicaps. Such modified behaviour should make the task of international forces easier, or even avoid the need for them. But it is important for the international community to be sensitive to such signs—dominant authorities are likely to try to obscure them and insist on 'terrorist' labelling. (Cf. the Balkans, some African cases).

6. There are more detailed/practical issues for peace operations and peace building where terrorism is part of environment.

7. In the operational phase there may be negative and positive responses:

a. Bad responses (by the international community) would involve providing inadequate force and incomplete control, visible failure to protect civilians, an excessive focus on troops' own safety (bunker mentality), indiscriminate and disproportionate use of force in reaction, and/or measures to 'punish' whole communities rather than terrorists (Vietnam, Palestine).

b. Good responses would demand: special attention to the supply and quality of intelligence (not just military and tactical), cooperation with internal security authorities (whether national or international) and local communities, 'hearts and minds' work including conspicuous contributions to welfare and other dimensions of security, (tactical) pre-emption rather than response whenever possible, targeting individuals and breaking up networks, rapid response and emergency handling resources, and attention to the risks of terrorist 'break-out' (including cross-frontier activities)

8. There is a need to harmonize different nations' approaches and to create common military doctrines for these situations through NATO, EU, OSCE, and other regional groups – although this may be difficult if the organization in question has not clarified its general concept of and policy on terrorism.

9. In the phase of transition to peace the crucial issue arises of who to include in the peace and who to make the peace against: the latter may have to include incorrigible, externally driven or independently motivated terrorist movements or those with non-specific/purely negative/impractical targets. However, careful thought is needed on the possibility of framing the negotiating process and eventual settlement to include:

a. elements who are on the 'wrong' side, not at present behaving as terrorists, but who might be driven to do so if excluded

b. social/political elements who are associated with militant terrorists but who have other, more constructive goals and functions and hence might be weaned away from them. (Cf. precedents from the de-colonization period, Northern Ireland, etc)

10. Even if certain elements cannot be given formal, political recognition and involvement, one could consider framing demilitarisation/rehabilitation/reorganization measures in such a way as to embrace individuals capable of conversion, and/or amnesties for rank-and-file and/or those willing to forswear terrorism for the future. However, care is needed on handling linkage and leverage: the achievement of peace on attractive terms is a strong lever to make people give up terrorism, but we must beware of making peace progress contingent on absence of terrorism in way that puts the lever back in the terrorists' hands.

11. In peace-building: we should be wary of the temptation, created by current preoccupations, to stress the need for strong central authorities to clamp down on terrorism and/or as mirror-image of peace enforcers' own methods and ideals. There is a risk of skewing the whole settlement towards authoritarianism, perhaps falling into factional score-settling, and hence perpetuating or stimulating new terrorism from the underdogs while denying true freedom and rule of law to the rest of population. Also, a 'strong man' in the national capital may not be able to control the provinces; apparently strong authorities may rule the streets by day but not by night, etc.

12. Conversely there is a danger of turning a blind eye to or marginalizing terrorist aspects, and believing that the terrorist angle can be dealt with by "the specialists" doing their "dirty work" and/or by general political and economic progress. Elections can be boycotted and ignored by terrorist factions and those under their control; economic growth and open borders give them new opportunities. In the worst case, aid and reconstruction resources can be diverted into terrorist hands, terrorists may be sheltered in refugee camps, etc.

13. A middle way is an integrated and balanced policy with elements of (i) legal proscription and norm building, (ii) appropriate court arrangements, (iii) security sector reform to produce public order and intelligence authorities who are professional, objective and representative, (iv) organs of oversight to make anti-terrorist forces accountable, perhaps with Parliamentary approval needed for extension of curfews/emergency powers, (v) active measures to infiltrate, disrupt and decapitate terrorist networks, (vi) detachment and recruitment of non-violent/"moderate" elements previously linked with terrorists (ethnic, religious etc.), (vii) use of non-governmental civil society forces to same ends, (viii) general public awareness and education, encouragement and protection of 'whistle-blowers', (ix) integration of the re-built state as soon as possible into international institutions, régimes and networks sharing anti-terrorist purposes.

14. The main principles in this phase, for which preparation is needed during peace operations, are: combine functionality with legitimacy; demonstrate authority and control, but co-opt as many elements and individuals as possible to share and support it.

15. My general practical conclusions for the international community are not novel, but in fact reflect the same lessons as other up-to-date crisis management analysis:

a. there is a need for cross-functional integrated approach of international institutions/ branches/specialists, at all stages

b. there is a need to tailor solutions to local circumstances and enlist as many potentially constructive local forces as possible

c. there is a need to avoid dictation and the creation of mirror-image solutions by any one external actor, and to base new norms and practices on international legal standards.

1. In this brief presentation, I would like to address several issues: the definitional question; the issue of the sources of terrorist violence that may be directed at peace operations personnel; and the potential threat (and, at the very least, the complications) posed by weapons of mass destruction in post-conflict situations.

Definitional Issues

2. Although we have not been talking about definitions of terrorism up to now in this meeting, it strikes me that to attempt to talk about countering something, or the threat from something, without defining what that something might be, is a potentially fruitless exercise and even potentially quite dangerous, as it allows powerful actors to take action against groups or behaviours that may be arbitrarily labelled terrorists. But since I will be talking about reactive rather than pro-active measures -dealing with things that could happen to a peace operation rather than persons or groups that peace operations should seek out to engage- the issue is somewhat narrower. What then constitutes terrorism for purposes of such a discussion and how is it distinguished from any other sort of violent resistance to peace implementation? A seemingly appropriate definition is one used by Stein Tonnesson at the SIPRI/PRIO conference on terrorism and armed conflict held last December in Oslo.[7] To paraphrase: terrorism a deliberate act or behaviour involving the use or threat of violence that seeks to create fear for political ends. I would stress lethal violence, that is undertaken by forces not considered bound by the international laws of armed conflict, which, depending on how many lawyers there are in the room, could be viewed to encompass governments acting against their own peoples.

3. What about defining counter-terrorism? In addition to retributive violence against the perpetrators and their supporters, counter-terrorism could and should include measures to address the causes of terrorist violence and to truncate its sources of recruitment. There seems to arise a division of labour between what Christopher Coker calls the US ethic of responsibility, which relies on political and military tools in its counter-terror campaign, and the EU ethic of conviction, which tends to eschew violent military action in favor of economic tools.[8] In the latter case, one may ask how much new wealth, or how much economic redistribution or levelling, between regions or within states, would be needed to erase the resentment generated by access to global culture and advertising without the resources to acquire what it sells; or to ease the discrepancies between what ancient texts de-

[7] Stein Tonnesson, "Historical approaches," in Terrorism and Armed Conflict, a report on a seminar co-organized by PRIO and SIPRI, Voksenasen, Oslo, 8–9 December 2002.

[8] Christopher Coker, "The West, Peace Support Operations and the War Against Terrorism," paper for the Challenges Seminar, May 2003.

mand and modern culture permits in terms of human behaviour and relations. Can political and economic development assistance make sufficient difference in areas of interest without also fundamentally changing systems of governance? Can it create stability by introducing market-based politics and economics that, by definition, produce both winners and losers. That there will be losers tends to be guaranteed given the obsession in Washington, as reflected in the "Washington consensus" implemented by international financial institutions, not to create or sustain welfare cultures amongst recipients of assistance.

4. One could equally ask how much military force would be enough to achieve the political ends of the counter-terror campaign, and at what point it might even create as much terror potential as it erases?

5. We are however not so much focused here on long term preventive measures as immediate post-conflict measures that involve not only civilian peacebuilding personnel and funding but military and policing resources to maintain order while peacebuilders carry out their programmes. Still, the post-hoc nature of peace support operations means that they can only address very localized sources of terrorist violence and are not designed to do so pro-actively.

Terrorists and Other Spoilers

6. All complex peace support operations (PSOs) run the risk of encountering spoilers; should all spoilers be treated as terrorists? They may use violence to achieve political ends. Could we give PSO's new cachet as post-conflict counter-terrorist operations? Does it matter for that purpose whether spoilers direct their efforts at their local opponents or at PSO personnel?

7. The spoiler risk varies with the degree to which the peace to be implemented has been arrived at voluntarily, imposed from outside, or has not yet been created at all. US Marines and French forces in Beirut in 1983 were set down in the midst of a live civil war with no pretense of a negotiated end in sight; they were soon victims of terrorist violence -truck bombs. UN forces in Bosnia were securing relief convoys in the midst of a live war, they received and returned fire, but terror tactics were directed mostly at the civilian population of Bosnia by the local fighting factions and the thuggish gangs that supported or encouraged them. UN and US forces in Somalia were caught up in its clan-based insurgency and suffered the small scale terror of remote-controlled roadside mines, as had some UN forces in southern Lebanon. Two UN observers in the DR Congo were killed in the past week during a wave of civilian massacres in or near Bunia. Should we call that terrorism or just bloody murder?

8. It may be useful to draw upon some recent work by Christopher Clapham and John Mackinlay and others in categorizing such threats. (See table 1.) Clapham categorizes insurgencies by aspiration: Liberation insurgencies seek independence from colonial or comparable foreign rule (think Namibia). Separation insurgencies seek to create a new state from part of an existing one (think Serbs in Bosnia or Kosovar Albanians). Reform insurgencies seek to correct glaring deficiencies in the existing structure of government or economy (think El Salvador). Warlord insurgencies are in it for the booty. Extortionate insurgencies might be considered a warlord subset whose very existence comes to be defined by the resources they extract and traffic (think the FARC in Colombia)[9].

9. Mackinlay does not characterize insurgent forces in terms of their objectives alone, but in terms of organization, objectives, leadership, and general mode of operation. A "lumpen" insurgency (the term drawn from Karl Marx's old notion of the lumpen proletariat -the dregs of urban economies). In this formulation lumpen "refers to the nature of the fighters, to the cultural sources of their energy, and to the lack of sophistication of the movement." *Lumpen insurgencies* fight for booty, and threaten force to scare off rather than engage opponents. A *clan-based insurgent force* derives its power from the social structure in which it is embedded; its membership is "dictated by…genealogy"; and its major motivation is survival. A *popular insurgent force* "sets out to overthrow a larger and more powerful regime," and needs the growing support of the population at large. Popular insurgencies, in Mackinlay's definition, proceed through three phases: pre-revolutionary, insurgency, and if sufficiently successful, limited war. In its earlier phases, a popular insurgency will rely on a cellular organization, but its focus is exclusively national in nature. *Global insurgencies* may have a similar cellular structure, and need to cultivate popular support, but are not similarly constrained by territory or nationality; their recruiting base may be worldwide in scope.[10]

[9] Christopher Clapham, "Analysing African Insurgencies," in Clapham (ed.), *African Guerrillas*, Oxford: 1998; cited in John Mackinlay, "Globalisation and Insurgency," Adelphi Paper 352, London: IISS, 2002, p. 40.
[10] Mackinlay, "Globalisation and Insurgency," pp. 41-92.

Table 1 – Characterizing Insurgencies

	Lumpen	*Clan-based*	*Popular*	*Global*
Liberation			X	X
Separatist			X	
Reform			X	
Warlord	X	X		
Extortionate	X	X		

Christopher Clapham, "Analysing African Insurgencies," in Clapham (ed.), *African Guerrillas* (Oxford: 1998); David Keen, *The Economic Function of Violence in Civil Wars;* Paul Collier, World Bank; John Mackinlay, "Globalisation and Insurgency," Adelphi Paper 352 (London: IISS, 2002).

Table 2 reproduces Mackinlay's summary assessment of the four types of insurgency.

Table 2 – Summarizing the Characteristics of Insurgencies

	Lumpen	*Clan-based*	*Popular*	*Global*
Motivation	Individual gain			Collective gain
Opposition	Weak			Strong
Organizational Structure	Horizontal			Vertical (cellular)
Training	Casual			Organized
Recruiting	Near-compulsion			Voluntary
International structures	Undeveloped			Very developed
Leadership & Fighters	Warlords & warriors			Revolutionaries & true soldiers

Adapted from Mackinlay, "Globalisation and Insurgency," chart 1.

PSO Responses will Vary by Type of Group Faced

10. In many African PSO's, factions tend toward the left side and the lower end of table one. A strong force would be capable of dealing with residual lumpen warrior groups, but dealing with clan-based warriors requires greater political finesse because their resource base is deeper and stronger. (Sierra Leone is an example of a lumpen insurgency with extortion as a driving motive. Somalia is an example of clan-based insurgency, with a mix of pillage and national power goals.)

11. Reform insurgencies presumably will have achieved a sufficient proportion of their agendas on the field and at the negotiating table that a peace implementing force will face a relatively lower risk of reactive violence. There is a similar story for liberation insurgencies: by the time that international forces are called in, the liberation struggle has likely reached some sort of denouement that needs a fair witness to its implementation (as Namibia and Mozambique). Separatist insurgencies pose some of the greatest problems for PSOs, especially if peace has been imposed by third parties, as in Bosnia and Kosovo; the separatist faction's goals may not have been met (or met fully, as in Bosnia), or may even be frustrated by international action (Kosovo). Terrorist violence to overturn the third party action is not a given, but may well continue to be directed on an individual basis against opposing ethnic factions or proponents of reconciliation within the terrorists' own ethnic group. Consider Kosovar-on-Serb and Kosovar-on-Kosovar violence since the deployment of KFOR and UNMIK.

12. Global insurgency is the new unknown for PSOs, and perhaps an unstated source of reluctance on the part of developed states to contribute forces to peace operations outside of Europe or those theatres where US forces are also deployed, such as Afghanistan and Iraq. Placing relatively small military forces in unstable lands where intelligence is relatively poor and good force protection may be difficult is not most democratic governments' idea of a good thing to do. Still, there are many softer targets tied to the West for global insurgency to strike. Armed forces, even in a relatively isolated command, may not be targets of choice, but they do have symbolic value, if simultaneous damage might be done to more than a handful of troops. It has happened before. Which brings us to weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

Peace Operations and Weapons of Mass Destruction

13. Included in my rather broad definition of WMD are not only biological, chemical, nuclear and radiological substances, but high explosives in high quantity: car and truck bombs; explosives-laden small aircraft; booby-trapped buildings.

14. WMD encounters may include deliberate use of such substances by parties to the late conflict; residual contamination of areas or equipment due to use of WMD in that conflict; or, as noted, targeting of peacekeepers by global insurgents based from the conflict zone.

15. WMD use by local spoilers would seem unlikely except as a tool to drive internationals out of the country, and would probably not be attempted unless the source of that use could be concealed, and/or casualties among the local population avoided. A local faction claiming responsibility for use of WMD could lose political credibility, especially if local people were harmed, but also for having

harmed internationals, if people outside the WMD-using faction viewed the internationals favourably.

16. The prospect of WMD use against peacekeepers could drive away troop contributors even faster than the need to deal with residual contamination. It would require more than force protection, which would itself require programmes of equipment and training assistance for some TCCs willing to brave the operation. Beyond force protection there is the question of population protection and treatment.

17. Residual contamination would be a major impediment to an operation, as it would require substantial preparation by military and civilian personnel alike, would likely keep unprepared NGOs away from the area of operations, keep many states from volunteering peacekeepers, and potentially involve substantial public health measures in support of the local population in the affected areas.

Final Thoughts

18. It is more useful to think in terms of insurgencies that may employ terror tactics against a PSO as a political tool, rather than to think of terrorist groups per se as a threat to such operations. The exception may be global insurgent/terrorist organizations who may target members of a PSO as they target any other national asset or interest. WMD could also be a potential problem for certain PSOs. Consider post-conflict Iraq – it is not a UN operation, but one where WMD contamination was anticipated. It is primarily an American operation, but with growing international, and especially Western, participation. It offers something of an ideal, highly distributed target for Al Qaeda or radical elements in neighboring Iran, not all elements of which can be protected equally well. There is also potential for continuing sabotage of reconstruction – of power supplies, for example. So just as coalitions may offer more powerful peacekeepers, so may they also offer more attractive targets to global-level insurgent/ terrorist enterprises.

1. The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 took place at the concluding stages of the Challenges Project and hence this new dimension of security threat was not addressed. We are asked to consider how and to what extent this phenomenon of global terrorism will impact on the way in which peace operations are being conducted. It may be useful to remind ourselves as we set out that Chapter VI of the UN Charter on the pacific settlement of disputes "stands at the heart of the Organisation's system of collective security". In the last decade, resolutions adopted under Chapter VII have received more attention but the major part of the Security Council's work continues to be carried out under Chapter VI. From this it is clear that whereas those who framed the Charter clearly understood the requirement for enforcement mechanisms and provided for the use of force against threats to international peace and security, their hopes for a better world lay in the peaceful resolution of armed conflicts.

2. It is probably important to note that the threat posed by terrorism is not in itself new. Many countries including my own have been dealing with it for years. It was also something the world's superpower had experienced in one form or another in various parts of the globe. However on 11 September 2001 it hit the American homeland and in a rather dramatic fashion with large-scale loss of life and property. That immediately gave the phenomenon a global dimension.

3. The responses to that strike and the others that have followed have in many ways, shown to the leadership behind the movement that they have largely succeeded in their aim. Some of the measures that have been introduced in democratic societies otherwise proud of their openness and individual liberties may well be further fanning the flames that the leadership tried to light. Even so there can be little doubt that the menace needs to be dealt with globally and with the full involvement and cooperation of all sections of the international community. In fact it is a demonstration of this intent and resolve that may well have compelled some of the terrorist groups that were operating within some countries or regions to move towards reconciliation and adjustments with governments concerned.

4. It would be futile to attempt definition of the term 'terrorism', as that is largely irrelevant in context of the examination we are undertaking. Similarly I would suggest that while recognising that there are root causes and frustrations that provide the material for the terrorist leadership to instigate their cadres, no justification or validity be accorded to resort to such actions. It is agreed that there are many issues that provide fuel for breeding terrorists and these need to be addressed. Even so, acts of terrorism against innocent civilians cannot be condoned no matter how noble the cause. Terrorism as distinct from insurgency or rebel movements is condemnable and must be acted against.

5. The scope and extent to which the phenomenon of global terrorism and its dimension needs to be introduced into the Challenges Project must be deliberated upon with some care. Our project is focussed on "peace operations" within the terms of Chapter VI of the UN Charter and in my view should remain that way. While recognising the merits and requirements of Chapter VII and counter terrorist operations and the need to factor these into our deliberations I would strongly advise against extending the canvas of our project to include such operations. These are distinct war fighting operations better handled by professionals who are trained, equipped and mandated to do so.

6. If that is accepted, the umbrella beneath which we should cover the aspect of terrorism remains much as before:

a. Under a UN Security Council Resolution.

b. With the agreement of the parties to the conflict.

c. Assisting in the restoration of infrastructure and law and order framework post multi-national enforcement operations.

7. At this stage it may be useful to distinguish between stabilisation operations and peace operations. In my view, the former would really be a continuation of the enforcement operations undertaken by a multinational force against the remnants of the belligerent regime, party or group of parties that has been removed from authority. Peace operations can only be undertaken to assist by relieving the stabilisation forces from routine tasks of security of state infrastructure, restoration of rule of law mechanisms, reconstruction of society, and so on.

8. Hence it would be unwise to consider the application of peace operations in a scenario that envisages operations against Al Qaeda type of organisations. Such organisations are not looking for compromises. They seek to impose their medieval and archaic philosophy on the human race and wish to destroy the societies that do not conform to that philosophy. I would therefore suggest that the Challenges Project restrict its focus on the terrorism aspect to possibilities that could emerge from attempts to make terrorist organisations in places like Northern Ireland, Sri Lanka, may be Palestine, and so on, sit at a negotiating table, where it has been shown to be possible to get the terrorist groups to renounce recourse to the use of violence and look for political settlement. As mentioned earlier such groups may well have been drawn to the negotiating table because of the international clamp-down on support to terrorist activity in terms of funds, weapons and equipment, recruitment, etc. There will still be many problems but they are well worth addressing.

9. Even in trying to enlarge the scope of our project to see how to assist in such processes it needs to be recognised that no single approach can be evolved because

as for other peace operations, no two conflict or post-conflict situations are alike. Our examination should try and assess what makes each crisis unique and then suggest mechanisms that would help develop responses accordingly. In doing so we may be well advised to address some of the following points made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations when he made a statement about a month back:

a. Do the parties to a conflict seek or welcome international involvement and if so, for what purpose?

b. Is the international community able, and does it have the political will, to provide the necessary financial and human resources, and sustain that commitment long enough to ensure success?

c. What are the preconditions for ensuring a self sustaining and durable peace?

d. What are the needs to be addressed, and in what order of priority?

e. At what pace does the process need to run?

10. All of us here are no doubt aware that as a consequence of the Security Council Resolutions passed in the wake of the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 a Policy Working Group on the United Nations and Terrorism was established. The Group determined that its report should place the role of the UN in the struggle against terrorism in context, prioritise the Organisation's activities regarding the issue, and contain a set of specific recommendations on how the UN system might function more coherently and effectively in this complex field. The Group submitted its recommendations some time last year. Since the Challenges Project is looking to address the same issues and is intended to complement the work of the UN in the field of peace operations it may be appropriate to take into account some of the major recommendations of the Group.

11. The Group does not believe that the UN is well placed to play an active operational role in efforts to suppress terrorist groups, to pre-empt specific terrorist strikes, or to develop dedicated intelligence gathering capabilities. It has focussed on practical steps that the UN might take in the following areas of activity:

a. Dissuading disaffected groups from embracing terrorism.

b. Denying groups or individuals the means to carry out such acts.

c. Sustaining broad-based international cooperation in the struggle against terrorism on the basis of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

12. While we are on the subject it may be appropriate to briefly dwell on the developments in Iraq though this happened after the approach paper for this meet-

ing was circulated. I suggest this because one of the reasons set out by the USA for launching the operations against the Saddam regime was its alleged links with the Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups. And why we need to address this development is the long term implications of what has generally been seen as arrogant unilateralism and the marginalisation of the UN including the Security Council. Without trying to indulge in any value judgements on the issue I would like to make the point that notwithstanding present moves at excluding the UN from any role other than in the humanitarian field, I foresee that the American led coalition that is attempting to stabilise the situation in Iraq will soon find it necessary to fall back on the expertise available within the organisation and internationally for the purpose. In my view there are already constituencies within the USA and the UK that recognise the need to bring in the UN and are calling for this to be done. No matter what the circumstances that led to the unilateral conduct of the operation the undeniable fact is that the Iraqi people need the assistance of the international community in rebuilding their state structures, their economy, education and health institutions that have long been affected by the sanctions imposed, and so on. To this end, there is a compelling need to set up peace operations. And here it would indeed be sad if on the one hand the USA denies a role for UN institutions, and on the other hand members of the international community decline to permit involvement of the UN on the grounds that this would legitimise US unilateralism. The needs of the Iraqi people I feel must compel the international community to rise above such self imposed restrictions.

13. Having said that I am convinced that the recent developments are a reminder that all is not well with the UN as an organisation. Its procedures are seen as cumbersome; it seems to absorb large amounts of money that could be better spent; it is not perceived as result oriented. There can be little doubt there is need for the UN organisation and secretariat to pull itself up by the bootstraps and deliver. Infirmities that already stand recognised must be addressed and overcome before it is too late. I wonder whether it would be useful for the Challenges Project to apply itself to this facet in the knowledge that in the fight against terrorism and other threats to international peace and security the UN must not allow itself to be side-lined in the future.

Introduction

1. The terrorist attacks on the USA on 11 September 2001 (9/11) changed the global agenda. The fight and safeguard against terrorism in all its forms has been enhanced. The terrorist act of 9/11 has had a great influence on international law and started a discussion about the right of states to military self-defence against international terrorism.

2. Terrorism is not a new phenomenon. It has a long and cruel record stretching all the way back to ancient times. In the ancient Greek myths, terror was a way of seizing power. In the Roman Empire, deterrence was always a factor. Crusades and other types of officially sanctioned massacres of minority groups have their heritage of horror in handling deviants and nonconformists and sown bitterness in generations after generations.

3. To some extent and in some contexts terrorism has a military face. "Terrorism is an arm the revolutionary can never relinquish", declared Carlos Marighella in his *Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla*.[11]

4. Terrorism is also said to be the strategy of the weak and thus a kind of surrogate warfare. For a relatively small investment compared to the cost of the more sophisticated arsenals for conventional armies and the reliance on outside financial support, a country sponsoring surrogate warfare can inflict debilitating losses on an enemy, yet, at the same time, deny any connection with the terrorist group inflicting the damage.

5. Terror can be the blackmail of many by the few.[12] The saying that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter blurs our picture of terrorism as a serious crime and threat to world public order. History gives a lot of examples of how outlaws, spiritual leaders of revolts and guerrilla fighters through an excessive use of terror means have become heroes.

6. There are a number of conventions relating to terrorism. Still terrorism is hard to define. Many views are visible and it is not an easy task to draw a clear line between national and international terrorism. It is not easy to cover every set of circumstances by exactly defined terms, nor in the last resort is it necessary to do so. The United Nations has struggled over the years to give terrorism a definition. History and this process within the UN show how extremely difficult this is.

[11] Reprinted in *Urban Guerrilla Warfare*, Adelphi Paper Number 79, International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1971, p. 36.
[12] Andrew Sinclair, *An Anatomy of Terror*, Macmillan, London , 2003, p. 56.

7. Some states have addressed the effects of terrorism instead of attempting to define terrorism. Professor Adam Roberts of Oxford University proposes the following definition:

> "The use of violence, often against people not directly involved in a conflict, by groups operating clandestinely, which generally claim to have high political or religious purposes, and believe that creating a climate of terror will assist attainment of their objectives. Terrorism of this kind almost always appears to be non-governmental, but in particular cases movements engaging in terrorism may have a degree of clandestine support from governments".[13]

8. A crucial element of the definition to the UN is the political nature of the terror violence. Terrorism is not a crime of common nature or random violence that harms civilians; it is premeditated and has a political, ideological or religious purpose: regime change, ending an occupation, promoting a world view based on specific interpretation of theology, resisting influence from external political, social or religious sources. While terrorist groups may engage in drug trafficking, money laundering, smuggling, or other organised crime, they are fundamentally different from organisations whose *raison d'être* is to engage in these organised crime activities; it is important for the UN to maintain this distinction in its anti-terrorism initiatives.[14]

9. In a framework decision of June 2002 the European Council has decided what shall be deemed to be terrorist offences within the European Union:[15]

10. Offences under national law, which, given their nature or context, may seriously damage a country or an international organization where committed with the aim of:

– seriously intimidating a population, or

– unduly compelling a Government or international organization to perform or abstain from performing any act, or

– seriously destabilising or destroying the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or an international organization.

[13] Adam Roberts, "Defining Terrorism; Focusing on the Targets," International Institute for Strategic Studies, Strategic Comments, V,7, Issue 9, Nov. 2001.

[14] William G. O'Neill, "Beyond the Slogans: How can the UN Respond to Terrorism", Concept Paper, "Responding to Terrorism: What Role for the United Nations?", International Peace Academy, Chadbourne & Parke, New York City, 25-26 October 2002.

[15] European Council decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism 2002/475 JHA.

Terrorism and Peace Operations

11. Issues of terrorism can in several different ways affect peace operations. It can be the reason to be there or a dilemma when being there. Four separate problem spheres can easily be identified:

a. Terrorism can be the direct reason for the conflict in an area and for the international community's involvement.

b In a conflict environment, terrorism can be a way to continue the local fight also in the presence of international peacekeepers. Terror, subversion or insurgency may involve possible attacks against the international agencies and their representatives directly or indirectly intending to interfere with the peace operation in the area. International agencies can also accidentally be targets. It will call for increased force protection. It could even affect the willingness of force contributing states to participate in operations, and, needless to say, seriously damage the efforts to solve conflicts.

c. A conflict area, where an international mission is operating, can be a transit area, not only for transnational and transcontinental organised crime, but also for terrorism. The area may be a place where terrorists hide. Actions can be launched from refugee camps.

d. With the new type of terrorist acts that the world has experienced recently, targets in a mission area can of course be attacked by terrorists without there being any immediate correlation to the ongoing mission as such. Terrorism then becomes a matter of self-defence and force protection as well as a law enforcement matter for the peacekeepers depending on the mandate.

The three latter problem spheres are the basis of this memorandum.

9/11, International Law and a Proactive Response

12. The form of terrorist acts is continuously changing; the effect of "asymmetric threats", a trend that is characterised by a smaller number of attacks, but by a bigger number of victims coming from increasingly more spectacular incidents and from suicide attacks and bombings, is playing a new role in this context.

13. Let us first review the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence as it is expressed through the UN Charter, Article 51:

> "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of

this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

14. Through, among other things, resolutions passed by the United Nations[16] and other international organisations, the international community as a consequence of 9/11 now supports the view that a right of military, not only police and judicial, self-defence under Article 51 of the UN Charter also applies in the event of large-scale terrorist strikes, i.e. attacks of a terrorist nature or imminent threats of such attacks that do not emanate from a foreign state. We understand that this view (*opinio juris*) must now be deemed to reflect current international law.[17]

15. Thus we perceive a new blend of situations:

a. Self-defence, individual or collective, in the event of an armed attack from a foreign state

b. Self-defence, individual or collective, in the event of a large-scale international terrorist strike

c. Self-defence for force protection in peace operations.

16. The right of self-defence is a right to take action to avert immediate danger in emergency situations. It is important to perceive the structure of this right. With armed attack we normally mean a war or war-like situation. In these kinds of situations military means are necessary to meet the aggressor. No one questions that meeting armed attacks against a state is a military task regardless of whether or not the attack or threat emanates from a foreign state. Armed actions can, depending on the national security doctrine, be undertaken by law enforcement authorities or/and armed forces (military forces).

17. Armed actions after the immediate emergency situation is over, cannot be considered as self-defence but as a punishment or a revenge action unless the intervention is part of legal law enforcement response. A very critical question is: when do we consider a terrorist strike as a military act and when is it a crime? The answer to this question is decisive and very difficult to give without profound background knowledge of the specific situation. In the beginning of the turmoil of an occurrence it is almost impossible to answer this question due to lack of information and overview. The general picture gives us an indication.

[16] UN Security Council Resolution 1368, 12 September 2001 and 1373, 28 September 2001, reaffirms the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence as recognized by the Charter of the United Nations. The Security Council declared: "Determination to combat by all means threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts."

[17] *Vår beredskap efter den 11 september*, Swedish Official Report Series (SOU 2003:32), with a summary in English.

18. Terrorists are not conventional criminals and it may be uncertain who the attacker is, what are the intentions and what is really going on.

> "It came as if from nowhere.
>
> "All of us were taking a beat to catch our breaths, and our bearings, figure out what the hell was going on.
>
> "At this early point, the talk on the television was that a plane had crashed into the tower, but there was no indication of the size of the plane, no word on the circumstances of the crash…" as a New York fire-fighter put it after 9/11.[18]

19. Law enforcement response to special events and crises can be divided into the following situations:

Anticipated incidents in **peaceful** circumstances.
Unexpected incidents in **peaceful** circumstances.

Anticipated incidents in **unsafe** circumstances.
Unexpected incidents in **unsafe** circumstances.

Anticipated incidents in **troubled** circumstances.
Unexpected incidents in **troubled** circumstances.

20. Terrorist attacks that are not obvious military acts are basically a crime and thus a matter for law enforcement. However, situations can happen where law enforcement agencies do not have the capacity to intervene or just limited capacity to intervene against an overwhelming crime in progress, for example severe attacks from air or underwater. Depending on national legislation armed forces can be called for assistance in such a situation or the law enforcement services reinforced.

21. In peace operations the Rules of Engagement must take terrorist activities into consideration and should also prepare for mutual assistance to the police from the military component of the peace operation to the police. The requirement for an effective intelligence system and the necessity for close integration of intelligence and operations are obvious.

22. There are also other crucial questions. Are we to see a future where the response to terrorism suspected to emanate from unstable countries or terror-sponsoring regimes will be military, such as Afghanistan and Iraq, with an early and preventive proactive response in someone else's habitat instead of a domestic law enforcement response in your own domicile with all the constitutional restrictions

[18] Richard Picciotto, *Last man down: a firefighter's story of survival and escape from the World Trade Center,* Berkley, 2002.

involved? As we can see, a proactive security policy doctrine may lead to disastrous terrorist reactions.

23. Whether government inspired or sponsored and directed, whether individually motivated or group instigated, whether national or international, terrorism takes its toll of innocent people. Everyone is a potential victim. Modern terrorism took a dangerous upswing in the wake of powerful international media. It became a headline grabber. Acts are intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population, influence the policy of a government, or affect the conduct of a government.[19]

24. The purpose of organised crime is economic gain. Terror violence often has a purpose that transcends the act itself. That must be taken into consideration when discussing response strategies. The purpose of terrorism can be expected to have at least a minimal base of support or sympathy somewhere on the globe. At the same time we can expect strategic considerations to operate against senseless slaughter. Terrorists want a lot of people watching, but not a lot of people dead. That was what the teacher taught us at the police academy.

25. The world for a long period of time feared the appearance of a terrorist using new technologies causing uncontrolled, indiscriminate casualties and damage.[20] Heard of but never seen – so far. The Tokyo subway case in 1995 and 9/11 have taught us a new lesson. Terrorism can also mean mass murder.

26. We now clearly understand that just a couple of people can launch attacks of such a substantial kind that they in gravity can be compared with armed attacks against the Realm. These attacks can be for foreign policy purposes, terrorist purposes or ordinary severe criminality but also acts of insanity. They can have domestic or international background.

27. It is easy to foresee several doomsday scenarios, where terrorism in terms of destruction can be more severe than limited military armed attacks. Fact can surpass fiction and be the nightmare of any security manager. The trend in terrorism, if we at all can talk about trends in this context, is toward high profile, high-impact attacks. The world has seen the use of means of mass destruction (weapons of mass destruction – WMD – and chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear materials – CBRN) and hijacked aeroplanes being used as missiles for terror purposes. Interdependent cyber-supported infrastructures make many nations vulnerable to attacks whether the assaulting enemy is a nation, a group or an individual. Cyberterrorism is clearly an emerging threat.[21]

[19] "The Terrorist Threat confronting the United States", Congressional Statement of FBI, USA, February 6, 2002.
[20] R.W. Mengel, "Terrorism and New Technologies of Destruction: An Overview of Potential Risk", in *Disorders and Terrorism*, Washington, D.C., Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1976, p. 458.
[21] "The Terrorist Threat confronting the United States", Congressional Statement of FBI, USA, February 6, 2002.

28. The plagues that afflicted ancient Egypt and allowed the departure of the tribes of Israel related in Exodus suggested bioterror. Waters were turned into blood, the fish died, rivers stank with pollutants and swarms of flies corrupted the land.[22]

29. Weapons of mass destruction and the terrorist or criminal use of CBRN materials have given rise to much concern for many years. Who has got them? Who is likely to use them? WMD are not a result of any recent technology. Biological WMDs have been in use since the 1300s. The first artificially produced WMDs were used during World War I. The means and recipes for the illegal development of these kinds of devices are readily available on the Internet and in widely circulated printed materials. For terrorism and criminal purposes unsophisticated, even homemade, delivery systems are, as we have experienced, good enough. The stock of suicide attackers does not seem to run short.

30. UN Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001) addresses the dismantling of terrorism financing. This resolution requires all member states to prevent terrorist acts and prosecute terrorists, though not prescribing any concrete route. The UN Counter-Terrorism Committee seeks to make an elaborated series of sanctions work and focus on financial intelligence on terrorist networks.

31. In December 2002 the European Union declared its determination to fight terrorism in all forms: "The fight against terrorism is for the long-haul and the challenges stemming from terrorism are global in nature and the response will also have to be global. This requires a comprehensive approach, including political, economic, diplomatic, and other appropriate means. At the same time, the fight against terrorism must be conducted with respect for the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms."[23]

32. People expect governments and their authorities to do their utmost to prevent terrorism, not merely investigate terrorist acts after they have occurred.

33. However, it is much easier to respond to acts of terrorism after the event than to detect and respond to actions in clandestine planning. We know that a potential for international terrorism exists, but we do not know what exactly is going on in their minds. One thing can be said with certainty, terrorist actors are unpredictable and take steps according to their own rationality. The problem is that we seldom know about an attack in advance. As soon as we know we try to intervene, prevent and interrupt. Variety is the spice of fright, destruction and terror. Rumours and false information are used to blur the intelligence picture. At the same

[22] Sinclair, p. 47.

[23] Presidency's draft report on the European Union's activities in the fight against terrorism, 4 December 2002. An action Programme on combating terrorism was agreed upon by the Council of Justice and Home Affairs at its extraordinary meeting of 20 November 2001.

time we know that terrorist acts often are committed by a group in one part of the world against an ethnic group, a community, a country or countries in another part of the world.

34. In preventing terrorism we consequently employ a variety of tools and hope that they in their totality will be successful. At the same time we must not allow our security measures to lead to self-strangulation of our societies. Therefore, technical means and control efforts must be supported with good intelligence to allow us to act in an informed way. The challenge is better co-operation in the domestic arena as well as internationally.

35. Organised crime and terrorism are to a certain degree planned, but at the same time the committal of the criminal act, ordinary crime or terrorism, is subject to spontaneity, flexibility and adaptability. If military presence is too strong the perpetrators may redirect or postpone their criminal acts. The surprise factor is often important and reduces the risk of failure or being caught in the act of committing their crime. Thus, it is important to close every window of opportunity and do that in a reasonable way.

36. Against this background international police co-operation during recent years has been restructured to provide a better operational support in countering global terrorism. Since the fall 2001 Interpol has a new Sub-Directorate focusing on global terrorism The Public Safety and Terrorism Sub-Directorate. Through different projects Interpol examines how terrorism affects national and regional public safety. Special consideration is being given to new preventive and operational measures that foster national security and public order.

37. Interpol also has an ongoing programme on nuclear/chemical/biological weapons, weapons of mass destruction. It also is of critical importance that the possession of biological agents, which can be used for bioterrorism and biocriminality, is controlled. Maritime security, piracy and offences committed at sea, are an international concern and require a global response.[24] This has also been emphasised by Interpol's General Assembly.[25]

38. The 7th Conference of the European Union Police Chiefs Task Force meeting on Crete in May 2003 among other things discussed a more effective and better co-ordinated co-operation among the police forces, judicial and other authorities involved of the EU member states as well as of third countries.

[24] The International Convention on Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), 1974. Adopted on 12 December 2002. – Chapter V Safety of Navigation, Chapter XI-1 Special Measures to enhance maritime safety, Chapter XI-2 Special measures to enhance maritime security. International Ship and Port Facility Code (ISPS), part A and B.

[25] "Police and Global Security", Interpol report No 10, AG-2002-RAP-10, at Interpol General Assembly – 71st session, Yaoundé, October 2002.

39. The European Union law enforcement organisation EUROPOL handles criminal intelligence. Its aim is to improve the effectiveness and co-operation between the competent authorities of the member states in preventing and combating serious international organised crime. EUROPOL's mandate includes activities against terrorism and the focus on counter-terrorism activities has been enhanced following 9/11.

Intervention Principles

40. The legal dimensions of peace operations were addressed as a separate topic at the Challenges Project Moscow Seminar in March 1998.[26]

41. When discussing responsibility for counter-terrorism measures in peace operations the legal framework for the mission as such provides the mission with its mandates and jurisdiction. That is very important to keep in mind. Is it an executive mission or do the responsibilities for law and order stay with the host state?

42. Deprivation of a person's liberty and certain other limitations of a person's freedom of movement may only be effected in accordance with a procedure prescribed by law.[27] This is called the general principle of legality. This means that all police interventions must be made within the framework of law. The general authorisation for the police to take any measure justifiable in the exercise of their law enforcement duties is based on several basic principles:

a. The principle of necessity.

b. The principle of purpose.

c. The principle of proportionality.

d. The principle of consideration.

43. These principles are of special concern if a law enforcement intervention touches basic freedoms and rights: freedom of expression, freedom of information, freedom of assembly, freedom of demonstration, freedom of association and freedom of religion. In the interests of national security or public safety, for the maintenance of public order and for the prevention of crime some of these freedoms are subject to limitations.

[26] *Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century – Concluding Report 1997–2002*, Elanders Gotab, Stockholm, 2002, p. 61.

[27] See The UN Charter, the International Convenant on Civil and Political Rights (adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966; treaty in force since 23 March 1976) and the European Convention on Human Rights and Basic Freedoms, Article 5:1 and Article 2 of the Fourth Protocol.

44. The legitimacy, and thus the acceptability and credibility, of peace operations is correlated to the conduct of missions in accordance with appropriate and generally acceptable international and national rules and procedures. The Challenges Project stresses that developing and maintaining legitimacy in situations where peace operations are complex and multifaceted is a challenge that must be met when undertaking such operations. In these contexts military and police components are playing different roles even if they are in the same mission area.

Military – Police Relations and Co-operation for the Future

45. The police are of course indispensable in a well functioning legal system. The police in a democracy serve society and the people under the law.

46. In recent years, due to the growing complexity of conflicts and what has been labelled the new world disorder, peace operations have become increasingly multi-disciplinary and therefore multi-dimensional. There is a continuum, stretching from prevention to conflict resolution and peace building. In July 1997, the UN Security Council for the first time considered the specific item of "Civilian police in peacekeeping operations". The Council adopted a Presidential Statement that emphasised the role of civilian police in the new generation of peace keeping operations. The police component will play an increasingly important and crucial part in forthcoming peace operations.

47. In peacekeeping operations the actors within the security sector must co-operate more closely with due respect to the roles and function and this was emphasised by the events of 9/11. A more distinct focus must be on the Rule of Law (RoL) components of tomorrow's peace operations to ensure that this area is top priority. RoL must be taken into account when planning right from the start of the operation. The experiences of Bosnia-Herzegovina and then Kosovo, East Timor, Afghanistan and now Iraq clearly show that we still have lessons to learn and important steps to take. We are still victims of stove-piped planning processes, seeing the different actors and activities as separate. A fit and courageous soldier with a rifle cannot do all that is required. It is hard to understand the multifunctional dimension and what co-operation really means. Our conceptual skills must be improved.

48. Without security and freedom for the people suffering from war and conflicts any political process will be hampered and delayed. International Human Rights standards must be upheld. Local ownership in strengthening the security sector including Rule of Law is essential.

49. There are a lot of issues to be addressed, and in so doing we must keep the mandate in mind – executive or non-executive mission:

a. Military doctrine differs from nation to nation and the content of strategic and operational concept differs. Regionalization of peacekeeping must not mean diversification in international standard.

– *How can we develop a peacekeeping doctrine focused to address internal security issues more effectively?*
– *What arrangements are necessary in order to ensure the interoperability of participating units?*

b. A lot of conceptual work has been undertaken to develop police strategies for peacekeeping in recent years, including the design of law enforcement capacities in a broader perspective, policing under executive mandates, the access and use of more specialised police units, demand for formed and integrated police units.

The police components in UN and OSCE are currently engaged in reviewing the competencies needed at headquarters level to enhance their planning capabilities. Likewise a report recently launched at the EU Council Secretariat recommends a review of their police unit in order to recruit specialised personnel for organised crime and trans-border criminality.[28]

– *To what extent are military components used for RoL issues in different phases of a mission?*
– *Procedures in the area of RoL for transition from international to local governance.*
– *Can the design of military and police peacekeeping forces be further developed to enhance co-operation? What areas are most important to start with?*
– *Are the lessons identified from the executive police missions in Kosovo and East Timor taken care of in this process (design of police and military forces, co-location of operation centres, increased information sharing, intelligence co-operation, joint security operations, etc.)?*
– *How to address these issues on the operational and tactical level?*
– *To what level do we need to have harmonised mandates and rules of engagements for participation components?*

c. There must be an integrated approach to Rule of Law components. There is a need to build RoL capacities for field operations. Judges, prosecutors and correctional officers are for the future necessary members of peacekeeping operations (Kosovo and East Timor experience, ECPS- Task Force on RoL, EU development of RoL concepts).

d. There is a need for the international society to establish an interim criminal code, a criminal procedure code and a police act designed for peacekeeping

[28] Report from the EU SG/HR to EU foreign ministers on Planning and Mission Support Capability for Civilian Crisis Management, 22 July 2003.

operations with executive mandates (ongoing work, OHCHR, EU, institutions like USIP etc.) This will be an important base for the training of personnel.

e. To ensure the freedom, security, and well being of people and to defend democratic values the fight against terrorism in all forms and related extremism must be carried in peace operations through a co-ordinated and inter-disciplinary approach.

f. Police capacity in peacekeeping, particularly in executive missions, must have a closer and more direct access to international bodies for police co-operation and be a part of ordinary cross-border police co-operation, networking programmes and preparedness programmes.

– *How and to what extent can peacekeeping police units be a part of these kinds of growing networking and operational support?*
– *How can communication with international police organisations be established?*
– *How can the police component be involved in international intelligence exchange and with what liability?*
– *How can the police component take part in liaison officers' programmes in countries organising different major events?*

g. Co-ordination between long-term development and institution building (RoL, security sector reform) on one side and the peacekeeping operation as such must be better established and enhanced. The two elements must go hand in hand.

h. It is critical to have an answer to the question: When is a terrorist strike a military act and when is it a crime?

– *How do we act in a grey zone situation?*

i. In the fight against terrorism security units deployed in peace operations must also pay attention to the non-proliferation, prevention and limitation of chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear threats (WMD, CBRN and related precursors) in or emanating from the mission area.

j. Military and police capabilities have to engage, according to mission mandate, in the protection of civilian populations against the effects of terrorist attacks.

k. Military and police components must enhance their co-operation in the intelligence dimension preventing terrorism.

– *How can strategic and operational analysis on criminal groups, cells and individuals related to the mission area and security at major events be carried out and threat assessments be shared?*

l. There must be a closer co-operation between military, security and criminal intelligence bodies and with corresponding components in peace operations to prevent and to combat terrorism.

– *How can action plans be elaborated?*

m. To effectively counter terrorism in a mission area police and law enforcement work must include the fight against organised crime related to terrorism, judicial capacity building, judicial co-operation, fight against corruption, border management, immigration law and practice, customs law and practice and human rights instruments underpinning good governance/rule of law.

n. In missions with an executive mandate the military component and the police component deployed in the mission area must run co-ordinated exercises in order to prepare for special intervention.

o. Units deployed need protection against terrorist attacks (force protection).

50. Some questions that are tough to solve have been highlighted in this composition. Hopefully these will be discussed at future seminars. Challenges without questions are no real challenges.

Winning the War on Terror? The Contradictions of Counter-Terrorism and Implications for the Pursuit of Peace Operations

Claire Heristchi

1. A few months ago, my third year undergraduate students in Middle Eastern studies were given the task of answering an exam question on the topic 'Is the War on Terror one that the West can win?' as one of their options[29]. Needless to say, this type of 'trick' question is contentious by nature and it begs for a speculative answer, which is probably why it was chosen by a large number of candidates. The answers I read were varied but engaging, and some were also provocative and original in the way they approached what is one of the most pressing questions for international security at the beginning of the 21st Century. Most interestingly though, what these submissions shared is that none of them responded with a 'yes'[30].

2. Now that the war in Iraq has fulfilled the objective of regime change, and in the context of recent attacks by Islamist groups in Africa, I feel compelled to come back to some fundamental issues raised by this exam question. In particular, I wish to reflect of what it truly means to 'win' the War on Terror. If this war stands as the largest counter-terrorism campaign seen on the global stage, what is the measure of its success, and what is its potential end-point? Can its aims be realised with the means chosen so far? And if the institutions and principles used to wage it overlap with established mechanisms for peace-keeping and peace-enforcement, does the future success of peace operations stand or fall alongside that of the War on Terror?

3. The main issues I want to investigate here pertain to the relationship between international mechanisms designed to manage and resolve conflict in the international system and the strategies employed by American policy-makers to fight the War on Terror. What I maintain in this paper is that the policy choices made by the USA will necessarily have an impact on the conduct and perception of peace operations taking place currently or in the near future. Yet, areas of overlap and confusion between US foreign-policy directives and what is commonly termed the 'peace operations' paradigm would set a dangerous precedent undermining the ef-

[29] This was based on the title of Benjamin Netanyahu's 1986 edited volume, *Terrorism: How the West can win*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

[30] Some issues and two small extracts from this paper have been used for publication for the *Western Morning News* before the Third Gulf War began.

ficiency of such operations and the safety of their staff and those who they work to protect. Arguably, the policies making up the 'War on Terror' are counter-productive in terms of global security, US security and the fight against terrorism per se –an important point that has been made by various scholars working in the fields of Security and Middle Eastern studies[31]. This is only part of my argument though. The ramifications of these policies for institutions and operations which base their work on the principles of humanitarianism and peace-building have so far not been fully ascertained, or debated. In response to this new question, I discuss the negative effects that the War on Terror will have on peace operations in terms of the way in which it remoulds security frameworks and objectives. Despite this largely negative assessment, I point out that, the current 'crisis' in UN diplomatic circles may eventually turn to be a blessing in disguise for the survival of both this institution, and the security principles it pledges to uphold. This can occur despite the creation of new problems for peace operations in the current context of terrorist attacks in a global setting and the further development of an aggressive US foreign policy culture towards the Middle East. The current rift between the US and the United Nations over the question of Iraq does not denote the failure of the International Community to act responsibly because it lacks 'unity'. On the contrary, debate and deadlock over the US perspective on Iraq have hinted at the growing legitimacy of the UN as a sanctioning body for intervention. Lack of UN support for the Third Gulf War may in fact work as a safeguard to the credibility of the institution in the long term. UN-backed operations to keep, enforce or build peace in areas where they are needed and often welcome will benefit from refraining to claim a counter-terrorism aim in the current context.

The Self Defeating Logic of the War on Terror

4. In the aftermath of the September 112001 attacks on the United States, there was little doubt that a 'strong' American response would come into play, and that the theatre for this response would be beyond American borders, and most likely in the Middle East. That Afghanistan would be at the frontline of this response was also a rather predictable outcome given the links between the Taliban regime and various Islamist groups, including Al Qaeda. Yet few would have predicted that the US response to September 11 would include a war in Iraq as its main focus, leading the United Nations Security Council and alliances into disarray. After all, none of the hijackers-terrorists of September 11 were Iraqi, and no links between Al Qaeda, the organisation that stands accused of such crimes, and Saddam Hussein's regime were ever convincingly made. In other words, there is little obvious or inevitable about a war in Iraq in the context of a 'War on Terror'.

[31] Prominent voices of critique include Edward Said for instance. See "The Alternative United States" in *Le Monde Diplomatique* (English ed.) March 2003 as an example of a critique of domestic US politics as counterpoint to culturalist arguments about the Muslim World. See also a recent interview of Noam Chomsky for *Frontline* "Iraq as Trial Run". http:www.flonnet.com/fl2007/stories/. Accessed 8 April 2003.

One could be forgiven for doubting the motives for this choice of priorities in a context where the last chapter of the War on Terror (in Afghanistan) is only actually over insofar as the conflict, and its human consequences, have all but disappeared from the news headlines.

5. What is apparent here is that a logic of justice for the victims of September 11 was applied to Afghanistan and later Iraq in a way that obscures the complexity of each of the steps taken in the 'War on Terror'. To begin with, a shift from punishing the culprits for the attacks to punishing those who chose to abide them was applied successfully, and mostly convincingly[32]. The militants responsible were already dead, therefore the parent organisation, Al Qaeda, and its leader, Osama Bin Laden were to be held responsible. As they were sheltered by the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, the Taliban itself became associated with responsibility for the terrorist attacks (as it presented the opportunity for them to occur and refused to give Al Qaeda members up to American justice). So far, the logic of the War on Terror seems to hold, but some problems already become apparent upon closer scrutiny. First, the case against Al Qaeda was never made fully public –and the elements of the case that were released were used to bolster public opinion at crucial times. This denotes a lack of transparency in the US policy which only served to support the opinion of those in the Middle East who were only too prepared to see the war on the Taliban as a war on Islam. The rest of the International Community was expected to trust the American case (which it had little reason not to), with a dossier of evidence being disclosed to a few (mostly Western) diplomats and heads of state. No process of lengthy, public debate in the UN Security Council provided world opinion with an 'Adlai Stevenson moment'. At the time, the public mood seemed to support the right of the US to respond to a direct attack on its territory and most felt united with the general aim to rid the world of the 'scourge' of terrorism. A few analysts and journalists pointed to the idea that a strong military response to September 11 would fill the ranks of violent Islamist groups rather than empty them. These voices were ignored or vilified as unpatriotic and in favour of appeasement. It is at this point that the War on Terror escaped the control of the International Community. A clear message was sent to the United States that it had a right to retribution to which no one could or should object to *under any circumstances and for as long as was seen necessary*. The United States was allowed to set the parameters of the War on Terror in a way that empowered it to define the enemies of Civilisation (in a broad sweep including terrorists, those who abide them and the Axis of Evil), and to control what constituted an adequate response to these threats without a necessary recourse to an internationally-agreed consensus. In other words, the United States was allowed to polarise the debate between those who agreed unconditionally with its foreign policy, and those who, by default, necessarily supported terrorism. No area of discussion was left to ponder about. This,

[32] This being said there are inherent tensions involved in defining who we 'may bomb' in response to this type of attack. See Barry Buzan, "Who May We Bomb?" in Booth and Dunne (eds.) *Worlds in Collision,* 2002, Pp.85ff.

of course, is the prerogative of hegemonic powers, but in the context of subsequent events, this occurrence proved to be an ominous warning.

6. Secondly, the war in Afghanistan showed the limitations of our security frameworks in dealing with direct threats to security. The right of the USA to respond to a direct attack is not in question here, the problem resides with how to respond to an attack which did not come from a state. Waging a war against an underground network of terrorist cells with supporters scattered around the globe necessitates a security response that uses other means than nuclear deterrence and a conventional army. Al Qaeda is not a state and waging a war against the Taliban instead helped make the US response to September 11more tangible to the American public. However, Osama Bin Laden was not found or brought to justice, and violent Islamist groups are still in operation in Afghanistan. Taliban fighters imprisoned at Guantanamo Bay are not necessarily connected to Al Qaeda at all, making their incarceration and potential prosecution questionable. Overall, the war in Afghanistan was only successful insofar as it removed the Taliban regime from power, a secondary objective. The primary objective of the war – bringing Al Qaeda to justice – has not been met. The way in which the aims of the war in Afghanistan and Osama Bin Laden have shifted away from our consciousness is very problematic – it is there that the War on Terror had its purpose, and not in Iraq.

7. The next step in the War on Terror was bound to be controversial given this state of play. A slippery slope was engineered to encompass all perceived threats to US security under the title of 'War on Terror'. This amalgamation has created opportunities for the United States to pursue policies that denote a different type of security concern to that of terrorism strictly speaking – that of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs). Fighting the development or spread of such weapons to states which have been labelled 'rogue' is a defensible, if controversial, security priority and the connection between terrorism and WMDs is a truly appalling prospect. However, there is little evidence to suggest that WMDs are necessary for terrorists to operate, and less expensive and more available materials remain the norm for terrorist groups (with the notable exception of those operating in Hollywood movies). The enormous destruction that the Twin Towers attacks provoked did not even require a single gun for instance. More significantly, there is no evidence to suggest that Saddam Hussein was in the position, or willing, to use such weapons against the United States. The use of WMDs against Iraq's Kurdish population 15 years ago denotes the Iraqi regime's lack of moral restraint in this regard, but it does not in itself make a convincing case for a pre-emptive war. Proving the existence of such weapons in Iraq was the minimum pre-requisite to the case for war, but the evidence in this regard turned out to be inconclusive before the Third Gulf War began (despite being its justification). The inability of the 'Coalition of the Willing' to find traces of such weapons since taking over Iraq is becoming increasingly embarrassing given this focus on 'WMDs terror'. The un-

willingness of the USA to allow UN arms inspectors back into Iraq to work as independent adjudicators for the case against Saddam Hussein is also damning – Hans Blix's team did not fully support the US case before the war and thus cannot be trusted to be 'impartial'. Chaos and insecurity reign in Iraq, Saddam Hussein has so far not been found either, condemnation of war-for-oil tactics and neo-Imperialism persist and debates on the reconstruction plans for Iraq are plagued by accusations of greed and corruption on the part of the American political elite. The shi'ia majority has been told in no uncertain terms that it will not be allowed to choose an Islamic leadership in an example of managed democracy most authoritarian leaders in the Middle East would be impressed by. The refusal to engage with the cultural and political needs and wants of the Iraqi people has only worked to reinforce the power of conservative clerics in Iran – and demonstrated to all in the Middle East that their freedom continues to have its limits. Indeed, Iraqi people, much like the Afghanis, have been liberated from their despotic rulers, but what is left in the wake of the wars goes beyond material destruction and loss of life. The instability and insecurity unpatriotic analysts warned of have come to pass, the terrorist groups still exist and are more active than ever before as predicted.

8. The War on Terror failed to achieve what it set out to do, and what it set out to do changed over time to include issues that ultimately delegitimise its purpose. In this sense, the War on Terror has already been lost by everyone except terrorists, who are stronger than ever, and this regardless of what move the United States makes next.

Implications for Peace Operations

9. The questions of terrorism and how to counter it have come to the fore on the security agenda of the past two years, and they will arguably remain prominent in years to come. This is bound to have an impact on all institutions and processes involved in regional and global security, including agencies dealing with peace operations, notably the UN. In this sense, the question of terrorism is of importance for an organisation such as the 'Challenges' Partnership. However, a number of problematic issues arise from the knock-on effect of the counter-terrorism agenda for global security.

10. To begin with, there are definitional issues associated with the use of the term terrorism as a tool for articulating global security imperatives. Additionally, the question of peace operations, especially with the rise of humanitarianism as the basis for intervention, raises its own dilemmas.

11. Terrorism is famous for being difficult to define, even by academics who specialise in the field, and it is also widely contested for being an emotionally-laden

term prone to political manipulation[33]. This does not mean that terrorism does not exist, nor does it imply that it is not a phenomenon of note, but extra care is to be given to its use in any political context. One of the leaders in the field, Paul Wilkinson, deals with the term with care, pointing to various aspects to 'political terror'. He invokes such elements as "a psychic state of great fear", a "resort to extreme violence", its "indiscriminate nature" (in order to spread fear), its "unpredictability" and "ruthlessly destructive methods[34]." A vast array of literature has attempted to articulate an overall definition of the term, and of its variants, including religious terrorism. Overall, issues such as spreading fear among civilians, aiming for maximum publicity for a political cause, and eliciting an extreme violent response to acts of terrorism in order to polarise public opinion are all documented aspects. Even state-sponsored terrorism has found its place in the literature[35]. The question of what constitutes legitimate political violence as opposed to illegitimate terror remains contentious despite these efforts, and the term has found widespread use in the media to denote a variety of issues, only some of which bear resemblance to the phenomena Paul Wilkinson referred to in 1974. One analyst goes as far as stating in the introduction to his monograph on the subject that "by the 1990s, the concept of terrorism had become so elastic that there seemed to be virtually no limit to what could be described as terrorism.[36]" He asserts that definitions of terrorism implicate the idea that the use of violence is illegitimate, while recognising that defining what is legitimate is often subjective and "derived from the existence of a consensus in society on the issue[37]".

12. I would dismiss the idea that such a consensus can be reached easily in any society, let alone in all societies at the same time. A consensus as to what our human rights ought to be is not even properly achieved on an international level. Agreeing on a definition is thus difficult, and the implications of this tension, which runs through the heart of the Terrorism Studies, are clear. The aphorism of one man's terrorist being another's freedom fighter is now perhaps a cliché, but the issue at stake with the War on Terror is perhaps not one of two sides fighting over the question of the legitimacy of political violence. Instead, we observe that a hegemonic power has the monopoly over the discourse on what constitutes legitimate violence on a global scale. The case of The War on Terror is illustrative: while Al Qaeda fits easily into established definitions of terrorism, Saddam Hussein's regime does not. Either we see this regime as authoritarian and therefore *merely terrifying* (but not terrorist as such), or we apply the definition of state terrorism to it, in which case Western support for this regime at the height of its reign of terror

[33] For an overview of the propagandist approach to the construction of the concept of terrorism, see Noam Chomsky, "International Terrorism: Image and Reality" in Alexander George (ed.) *Western State Terrorism*. Oxford; Polity Press, 1991, pp. 12-38.

[34] Paul Wilkinson, Political Terrorism, London, Macmillan, 1974, pp. 9-15.

[35] Adam Roberts. "Terrorism and International Order" In Lawrence Freedman et al. (eds.) *Terrorism and International Order*. London: RIIA/Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986, pp.10-12.

[36] Adrian Guelke, *The Age of Terrorism and the International Political System*. London: I.B. Tauris, 1995, p.1.

[37] Ibid, p.8.

over its population makes the United States a direct sponsor of terrorism (along with Britain and France). This is not a prospect that policy-makers in the US would relish, but one that conceptual rigour demands, and this by simply following the internal logic the perspective Terrorism Studies so justly puts forward. Here, the case is that of one man's freedom fighter being sometimes their terrorist, according to what the security climate dictates.

13. Additionally, at least some terrorism specialists point to the difficulties involved in counter terrorism through the use of massive force or repression:

> "...state coercion may actually be counter-productive, even in a domestic context where such as strategy faces fewer obstacles than it does in an international context. In particular, from the perspective of those engaged in violence, harsh repression may be seen *as evidence of the effectiveness of their campaign and thus a reason to persist*"[38].

Instead, they point to the need for a measured, strategic approach that deals with the issues that underpin terrorist activities. "The literature on this area provides clear guidelines: on the importance of keeping the adversary isolated and denying him popular support; on the need to gain the support of the population by offering protection against adversary action and providing – if necessary through political, economic and social reforms – counter-attractions to adversary blandishment"[39]. The conventional wisdom of this summary seems to have been lost on those who prone the eradication of Islamist violence through the massive use of force.

14. On the other hand, peace operations share some of the ambiguities associated with defining terrorism from a perspective of hegemonic dominance. In the abstract, there is nothing morally reprehensible about the idea of peacekeeping, peace-building and even perhaps humanitarian intervention. However, in practice, the patterns of intervention in internal and inter-state conflicts, as well as relief operations in 'failed' states, are part of a wider pattern of inequalities which such operations do not fundamentally challenge. Indeed,

> "Much of the impetus for peacekeeping and humanitarian relief comes from the wealthier, more powerful states from parts of the world that benefit from the maintenance of global inequalities. By contrast, the primary actors in civil conflicts and disasters, those immediately affected, are overwhelmingly from the developing parts of the world. They are often inaccurately portrayed in the discourse of intervention as victims of authoritarian politics or inevitable ethnic tensions. But it is no coincidence that the recipients of interventions are people who have been marginalized in the world economy and who are now to be rescued or policed by those who organize the intervening"[40].

[38] Ibid, p.180. Emphasis added.
[39] Lawrence Freedman, "Terrorism and Strategy" in Lawrence Freedman et al. (eds.) *Terrorism and International Order*, 1986, p.68.
[40] Michael Pugh, "Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Intervention" in Brian White et al. (eds.) *Issues in World Politics* (second ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave. 2001, p.113.

15. This observation does not render peace operations futile, but it does raise the question of the wider context in which security crises actually take place. Questions of political economy in a globalised system are of importance to what constitute human security, and lack thereof. And the context in which peace operations occur helps frame what they can realistically achieve and what they cannot. At best, they constitute a safety net for the most impoverished and unsafe segment of the world's population. At worst, they are subjected to the whims of powerful nations, which determine the worthiness of international involvement according to their own security prerogatives. The problem of selectiveness, which plagued the impetus for interventionism in the 1990s remains an unresolved issue, especially as it applies to the Global South[41].

16. If counter-terrorism and humanitarian intervention were to be conflated as one central security concept, the tensions that underpin them both could only be exacerbated. For instance, if humanitarianism is to be defined as a "neutral, impartial and non-coercive method of alleviating human suffering according to need"[42], then the relationship with counter-terrorism becomes very tenuous. Even with the precedent set with Kosovo, the concept could not go further than "abandoning neutrality to take sides with groups who are being brutally suppressed in a dispute[43]." Starting a pre-emptive war against a state which may have Weapons of Mass Destruction and which may sell them to terrorists is difficult (but not impossible) to justify in the name of the general search for global peace; what it is not is a humanitarian goal. The humanitarian needs of the Iraqi population were not used as the main justification for the Third Gulf War with the UN Security Council – and looking for such a justification *ex post facto* only highlights the lack of identified terrorists and WMDs in Iraq. Such a conflation of aims would only serve to delegitimise humanitarianism as a concept, and peace operations as its expression.

17. Questions of definitions are thus problematic in themselves and in their implications for our case study. Still, the implications of the War on Terror on peace operations go much further. It is arguable that the predominance of terrorism as the core security concern in global politics was over-stated after September 11 2001. The issue was seen to be of global importance because, for the first time, the US was successfully attacked by foreign terrorists on its home soil, and in a lethal and high profile manner:

> "The events of 11 September were shocking in part because they appeared to break the pattern of war established by the West in the 1990s. In the previous decade, war had been conducted at a safe distance. But on 11 September the attacks were at the heart of the West, against the Capital of the United States and

[41] These perspectives are outlined in Part Four of Albrecht Schnabel and Ramesh Thakur (eds.), *Kosovo and the Challenge of Humanitarian Intervention: Selective Indignation, Collective Action and International Citizenship.* NY: United Nations University Press, 2000.
[42] Michael Pugh, "Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Intervention", 2001, p.114.
[43] Ibid.

against one of its most famous and most visited cities... A new sense of vulnerability emerged..".[44]

18. This of course would make the issue of Islamist terrorism a priority for US policy makers, and, with the US being such a powerful player in the international system, for everyone else. The consequences of the September 11 2001 attacks became global despite the fact that the scourge of terrorism has been a fact that many in the developing world and in Europe have had to learn to live with for a long time. No major shift in international relations ever came from Tamil Tiger suicide bombings, or IRA violence on mainland UK, or Algerian Islamist terrorist attacks on French soil[45]. Despite this, terrorism has become the catchphrase for a fundamental shift in world politics – how many analysts and journalists now refer to the 'post-September 11 World' as if it were on a par with the end of the Second World War, or the end of the Cold War? My argument in this regard is not that significant changes have not occurred, but that their causes do not relate to the terrorist attacks of September 11 strictly speaking. Much of what constitutes the slippery slope of the War on Terror that I outline above is the result of a policy shift that occurred with the accession of the Bush Jr. administration to political power in the US, not with terrorism. The return to a foreign policy culture grounded in the Reagan era reflects old priorities (Missile Defense for instance) and old antagonisms (with Iran in particular). Interestingly, the question of terrorism was labeled as one of the most important security threats the United States faced under the Reagan Administration – and the contradictions of this agenda have been well documented[46]. September 11 provided the domestic support and international sympathy (initially) to develop an ambitious interventionist agenda which is directly at odds with the idea of 'intervention' proclaimed (and to some small extent applied) under the Clinton administration. Conflating these very different agendas is facile but dangerous. Should the 'Axis of Evil' or the War on Terror include all regimes which are not democratic and oppressive of their own population, the list of states concerned would contain far more than three names – and many that the United States have considered allies, or at least acceptable 'business partners' at one time or another. Waging war on all of them is unrealistic, waging war on only some of them is morally problematic. If anything, this policy is likely to lead to the self-fulfillment of 'Clash of Civilizations' arguments[47] with regards to the Muslim World, as feared by John Esposito[48]. In turn, the involvement of peace operations personnel under this mandate and for this agenda is unlikely to find grateful recipients on the ground, and thus success.

[44] Colin McInnes, "A Different Kind of War? September 11th and the United States' Afghan War" *Review of International Studies*, 29 (2), 2003, p.171.
[45] James Der Derian. "In Terrorem: Before and After 9/11" in Booth and Dunne (eds.) *Worlds in Collision*, 2002, Pp.103-104.
[46] Richard Falk, "The Terrorist Foundations of Recent US Foreign Policy" in Alexander George (ed.) *Western State Terrorism*, 1991, Pp.102-120.
[47] Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, London: Simon and Schuster, 1998.
[48] John L. Esposito, *The Islamic Threat: Myth of Reality?* Oxford: OUP, 1992.

19. Most disturbingly, associating peace operations to counter-terrorism in the current climate does not resolve the ambivalence vis-a-vis intervention that the War on Terror implies. The war of words on Iraq is illustrative once again. Was intervention about the fight against terrorism? This type of justification has been shown to be problematic. Was it about WMDs? How do peace operations fit into the struggle to limits weapons proliferation of this type? Initiatives in disarmanent for peace operations have been targeted towards conventional weapons. Was it about the end of Hussein's dictatorship? If so, what will be the significance of the role of UN forces in ensuring that Iraqi people enjoy the freedom they have been promised? Peace operations principles, procedures and institutions have not been used in the War on Terror to fight wars, only to justify them if possible and potentially to help secure postwar stability. Peace operations personnel would find themselves in a doubly difficult situation if trying to help build peace in the aftermath of such wars. They would be at the front line of operations without much actual operational freedom in some cases, since the US has decided that with Iraq, it should direct reconstruction plans and political reform without having to reach an international consensus. On the other hand, peace operations personnel could find themselves dealing with a highly volatile situation in Afghanistan where the US government has pledged little more than troops to fight the remnants of the Taliban and Al Qaeda still inside the country[49]. Either way, peace operations cannot operate with the impartiality and resources that they need to secure compliance and trust.

Counter-Terrorism and the Pursuit of Peace

20. Overall, it is hard to see how counter-terrorism can be made to fit into the aims and operations of agencies concerned with peace-building. Alternatively, it is unlikely that peace operations personnel could work within the framework of the War on Terror safely and effectively without relinquishing the principles upon which such interventions have been traditionally based. The lack of international consensus on the Third Gulf War could lead to a radical reshaping of the aims of peace operations, but it is doubtful that peace-building would benefit from such a process. The credibility of the UN as a mechanism for Global Governance would be further undermined by this type of policy also.

21. Terrorist attacks in Bali, and more recently Africa should be viewed in a way that is neither simplistically emotive, nor constitutive of an excuse for what are very real atrocities. Terrorist attacks in the last two years justly offend our moral sense of human needs and freedom, but winning against terrorism is a more

[49] Whether Afghanistan represents a fundamental shift in how wars are conducted is a debatable issue, but one of importance – the ramifications for personnel either fighting – or dealing with postwar peace-building depend on the type of war being conducted, its purposes, participants and context. For an engaging discussion of Operation Enduring Freedom and its implications for war studies, see Colin McInnes. 2003. "A Different Kind of War?

complex, and more difficult, endeavour than the War on Terror has catered for. And the War itself has become distorted in a way that only makes the likelihood of future attacks more likely. There are simply too many contradictions in the War on Terror agenda for it to be effective, and to convince the international community (understood to include all Member States of the UN General Assembly) of its long term worth as a mechanism for regulating a peaceful, stable, egalitarian and free New World Order. Ultimately, the question of justice in an international order, which many peace operations hope to address despite the severe limitations of their mandates, is incompatible with the kind of War on Terror that the United States has chosen to wage.

22. International institutions remain the only legitimate foundation for the pursuit of peace against terrorism. Leading US policy-makers may have described Franco-German opposition to the War on Terror as "dangerous" and "naïve", but bypassing official UN and NATO channels in the War denotes a worrying attitude towards international mechanisms designed to manage international security. A diplomatic agenda that only plays by the rules of international institutions as long as those rules are convenient to current policy decisions is one that is hegemonic, not democratic. When President Bush Jr. bypassed the UN Security Council due to lack of support for US plans, he did more than wound French pride. He undermined the credibility of the UN as an institution designed to find peaceful, agreed-upon solutions to conflict among states (at least in the short term). The optimism vis-à-vis the role of international institutions in managing a just global order has been severely tested by the War on Terror, and we must confront, once again, a fundamental question in international relations: are powerful states always right? The United States can be the leader of a free and democratic world, or it can be a hegemonic power pursuing strategic and economic self-interest, but is it not dangerous and naïve to believe that it can easily be both, and at the same time? Here, the American refusal to lead on ecological issues by pulling out of Kyoto protocols, and its rejection of the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court over its own citizens should form the backdrop to our understanding of the War on Terror.

23. Even if indeed we have a moral responsibility to topple dictators such as Saddam Hussein at all costs, we also need to seriously contemplate what these costs will actually be, not only for the Iraqi people, but also for ourselves, and the peaceful world many of us still hope to build through international institutions, and with aid of peace operations when required. What the Franco-German (and to a certain extent Russian) position ultimately shows is that there is indeed a middle ground in the War on Terror which international institutions concerned with security should address. This is an unpopular move in a volatile setting, but it accurately denotes the unease of many in Europe and beyond at the prospect of a War for which an irrefutable case has, so far, not been made. And, in the end, sug-

gesting that there could be a more legitimate way to fight the War on Terror might just be the starting point we need to start winning it.

In Conclusion: A Crossroads for the Peace Operations Paradigm?

24. The challenge of terrorism to peace operations is real, but so are the dangers of a badly thought out and clumsily executed policy of counter-terrorism. Policies of eradication of terrorism simply do not work, as the case of the Algerian Civil War amply demonstrates[50]. Perhaps paradoxically, peace operations principles and procedures may benefit from their exclusion from the War on Terror, insofar as the cornerstones upon which their legitimacy is built can outlast the War itself. This does not mean that the peace operations paradigm should remain unchallenged however. What the question of terrorism ultimately illustrates is the need to question the way in which security is perceived by academics, policy-makers and practitioners in the field of peace research. Establishing closer links between the global dimension of economic development and security is paramount in this regard, as Mark Duffield discusses at length[51]. We do "live in a messy world[52]" where too many people suffer from poverty, insecurity and political repression. We ought to be critical of labels such as 'rogue' in an environment where economic globalisation along the free-trade model is not reducing inequalities and creating all kinds of exclusions, and thus discontents, through a process of global structural violence[53] and dislocation. The linkage between economic welfare in the North and in the South can be devised as a process of forced (and thus not real) inclusion where the winners and losers of the game of capitalism have already been chosen. Alternatively, a process of genuine engagement in a dialogue between stake-holders in security would be a more time-consuming, but ultimately more mutually rewarding approach to managing change and security in the 21st Century[54]. New developments in the peace operations paradigm illustrate this hope, with initiatives aiming to be more sensitive to cultural context and long-term needs for societal stability. This, in turn, suggests that instead of focusing on how peace operations fit into a counter-terrorism agenda, we may want to look at how counter-terrorism can learn from the successes and failures of peace operations[55].

[50] Luis Martinez, *The Algerian Civil War: 1990-1998*. London: Hurst and Co/CERI, 2000 (1998).
[51] Mark Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars*, London: Zed Books, 2001.
[52] James Rosenau, "Governance in a New Global Order" in David Held and Anthony McGrew. (eds.) *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001, p.70.
[53] This term was coined by Johan Galtung in 1969 in "Violence, Peace and Peace Research" *Journal of Peace Research*. Pp.167ff.
[54] Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, *World in Collision*, 1992.
[55] Bhikhu Parekh, "Terrorism and Intercultural Dialogue" in Booth and Dune (eds.) *Worlds in Collision*, 2002, Pp.270 ff.

Terrorism, Political Violence, and Peace Enforcement

Michael J. Dziedzic

1. Experience in Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and now Iraq has demonstrated that when an international intervention causes the overthrow of a despotic regime, lawless forces and parallel power structures inevitably seek to fill any power vacuum that is created. Various forms of political violence, including terrorism, and criminal sources of revenue are likely to be the dominant resources used to determine the outcome. Relying exclusively on local police and judiciary to deal effectively with these extremist elements is a fundamental mistake. Interlocking civil and military strategies must be implemented by the international community to dislodge violent obstructionists and to deal effectively with terrorism in its various manifestations (e.g. as a part of armed power struggles, inter-communal violence, intimidation of the judiciary).

Lessons to be Learned

2. What does the voice of recent experience have to say about defeating political violence and wresting the rule of law from lawless post-war forces?

3. In Bosnia the US insisted that local police were responsible for arresting war criminals. The result? – notorious former Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic entrenched his power base through revenue from criminal enterprises and a network of paramilitary thugs. When NATO's Stabilization Force finally went after Karadzic, he was too well protected by clandestine support structures, and they could not touch him.

4. In Kosovo after a 78-day bombing campaign broke the grip of Slobodan Milosevic's brutal rule there, the United Nations thought local judges and prosecutors could be relied upon to bring justice. The result? – ex-Kosovo Liberation Army fighters, many with underworld links, immediately filled the power vacuum, intimidating the judiciary and thereby becoming untouchable. Kosovar Serbs were simply left to rot in jail without trial.

5. After Milosevic's overthrow in October 2000, elites closely associated with his regime were removed, but the nexus between crime and politics persisted through concealed networks that extended into the intelligence apparatus, military establishment, and police services. The result? – the assassination of reformist Prime Minister Zoran Djindjic by members of the former Special Operations Unit.

6. In Afghanistan, the US has preferred to eschew "nation building." The result? – real power in the hands of warlords and a judicial system "…dominated by religious conservatives who have more in common with the Taliban than Karzai," according to a *Washington Post* report.

7. What we have seen so far in Iraq suggests that its fractious society is permeated by lawless elements mixed in with competing political and religious forces. The assassination of moderate Shi'ite cleric Abdul Majid al-Khoei in Najaf, outbreaks of inter-ethnic violence, and institutionalized criminality raise considerable concern. The specter of Iranian subversion via linkages with radical Shi'ite clerics looms large.

8. The rule of law only began to prevail over lawless and untouchable forces in Kosovo and Bosnia after the international community incorporated itself into the system. Military forces had to begin contributing to the defeat of militant extremists, while international judges and prosecutors with proper authority were required to confront impunity and address politically destabilizing crimes effectively. International military and civilian personnel, in sum, had to integrate their efforts to ensure that the entire continuum – from intelligence to incarceration – was functioning reliably.

Lessons to be Applied

9. Securing the peace requires the defeat of militant extremists. This calls for military commanders to come prepared to detain violent criminal offenders from the inception of the mission. Military forces can only detain suspects for limited periods, however. They can seek to disrupt terrorist activities temporarily and deter assaults by their presence. This merely addresses the symptoms, however, not the sources of insecurity and disruption of the peace process. Progress in securing the environment is dependent, therefore, on a system of justice capable of incarcerating the most ruthless and violent elements. This requires the integrated efforts of military and civilian personnel to complete the "intelligence-to-incarceration continuum."

10. *Intelligence*: Intelligence-led operations need to be mounted by military elements in concert with international civilian police to identify and then target militant extremist groups. Scarce international legal resources must be focused on the centre of gravity. Structures and procedures need to be established for intelligence to guide the collection of evidence and to avoid ritualistic classification of evidence gathered by military personnel who may be first to control a crime scene or contact witnesses.

11. *Criminal Investigation*: Intelligence is needed to focus investigative efforts strategically on violence-prone networks and on their transnational linkages. Criminal investigators, including specialists in counter-terrorism, organized crime, war crimes, financial crimes, and forensics, along with surveillance technicians, are needed to develop and preserve essential evidence against perpetrators of politically motivated and security-related crimes. Criminal investigators will require access to a forensics lab, surveillance equipment, and the ability to pay informants. Crime scene technicians are needed with appropriate equipment to document, collect and preserve evidence. Legal and technical means to protect witnesses and for anonymous testimony will also be needed. Evidence regarding security-related crimes that cannot be prosecuted immediately must be preserved.

12. *Legal Framework*: Existing criminal law and procedural codes will undoubtedly need to be revised to ensure the basic rights of the accused. This process, however, must not mindlessly deprive the international community of legal tools that are essential for the effective prosecution of terrorism and politically motivated violence. If the existing law forbids use of evidence derived from covert means, such as surveillance video cameras, body microphones, and wiretaps, or use of tools such as immunity and witness anonymity, changes must be made to permit this. New laws may be required to grant international actors authority within the local justice system. This would permit a sharing of responsibility similar to that which occurred in Kosovo, where special three-member judicial panels comprised of at least two international jurists, were established for "security-related" cases.

13. *High-Risk Arrest and Close Protection*: A team of highly trained police who specialize in special weapons and tactics and high-risk arrests should be available to apprehend those suspected of committing politically motivated and security-related crimes. A specially trained and outfitted Close Protection Unit (CPU) will be required to provide security for international and local judges, prosecutors, and witnesses involved in these critical cases.

14. *International Judges and Prosecutors*: Successful prosecution of cases involving politically motivated and security-related crimes will require international judges and prosecutors ("IJPs") who are not susceptible to being suborned or intimidated by lawless elements. The vast majority of proceedings can remain entirely in the hands of the local judiciary. Only cases critical to domestic stability will require IJPs, who must be well trained in the applicable law and preferably experienced in peacekeeping roles.

15. *Incarceration*: A maximum-security facility run by international military forces will be required from the earliest days of a mission for security detainees who constitute the gravest threats to security. It should be centrally located, preferably adjacent to the main courthouse where the internationally staffed court responsible for such politically motivated and security-related crimes is located.

16. *Safeguards to Ensure Accountability and Discipline:* To ensure that the local police, judiciary, and penal system actually serve the public interest, respect minority rights, dispense justice equally, and maintain their autonomy from corrupting political forces, effective international safeguards must be developed. In addition to vetting the initial cadre of personnel, the international presence will need a long-term ability to observe the performance of these institutions and to sanction misconduct through independent oversight bodies – for police, corrections officials, prosecutors and judges.

Action Items

17. The following summarizes the necessary actions:

a. Identify the *capabilities that should be developed* to respond effectively to this fundamental peace enforcement challenge, including reserve rosters or rapid mobilization procedures for individuals with the skills described above. To the extent possible, those with previous, credible international experience should be identified for leadership roles.

b. Promote the *allocation of resources* by key governments, non-governmental and international organization for programs to develop standing or surge capabilities to perform the above functions.

c. Facilitate the *international coordination* of these efforts so these capabilities can be brought together effectively in a peace operation or similar intervention when a requirement arises.

d. Develop *training and induction programs* for international civilian personnel who will be serving in these capacities based on the lessons of previous experience.

Challenges of the Middle East: Possibilities for a Way Ahead

Farouk Kasrawi

1. The title of my talk seems really intimidating. Why is the Middle East in the present situation? What are the problems or the challenges? Are they purely domestic or international? Is there a way out and what are the possibilities? When I started to review in my mind the number of conflicts in the region during the last six decades, and look at its situation now, I asked myself whether I am sane enough to talk on this subject. In tackling this title, I would like to make one major assumption: that the root causes of the Middle East problems are not only indigenous ones (as currently we see efforts to explain them in these terms), but exogenous factors share a considerable part of the blame.

2. Let us review briefly some of the conflicts and wars in the region: the Palestine war of 47-48, the Suez war of 56, the Arab-Israeli wars of 67 and 73, the Lebanese civil war between 75 and 89, the invasion of Lebanon by Israel in 82, the Iraq-Iran war between 79 and 88), the Gulf wars of 1990 and 2003. And we could add to this sad saga, the Palestine Intifada between 87 and 91) and the current violence in the West Bank and Gaza raging since 2000. On the average, this situation means a war or a conflict situation every five or six year.

3. On top of all this, the horrendous evil attack of September 11 casts its shadow over the region with its people stand under the suspicion of international terrorism. As if the people of the region do not have enough problems of their own, to add such serious and devastating charge to their long list of concerns. The only lasting peaceful landmarks during this period were the peace treaties between Egypt and Israel in 79, Jordan and Israel in 94.

4. I would like to turn briefly to the domestic situation of the Arab Countries in the Middle East. The best evenhanded assessment of this situation can be found in the Arab Human Development Report of 2002. The report is very critical of the Arab countries' achievements in the economic, social and educational fields. For example we find that the GDP of all the Arab states combined is less than that of Spain. The report is more critical of the situation of Arab women, the lack of democracy, the lack of academic and intellectual achievements. Let me give some points from the report:

a. Aspirations for freedom and democracy remain unfullfilled. The wave of democracy that has transformed many parts of the world has barely reached the Arab States.

b. The utilization of women in the political and economic life remains the lowest in the world. Women suffer unequal citizenship and legal entitlement. Women remain severely marginalized and broadly discriminated against in laws and customs.

c. With an undersupply of knowledge, Arab society faces a significant knowledge gap, low investment in scientific research, low access to communication technology & internet.

d. With incomplete markets, critical macro-economic variables are still under performing, poor quality of public institutions, low growth rates, high unemployment, heavy regulations.

e. The report is mostly concerned about the quality of the work forces and the quality of their intellectual capital.

5. The results of the wars are unflattering to the Arab people. There is not enough to show in terms of economic and social progress. It was only for a brief time (like a flash or a glimmer) that the Arab world seemed on the rise after the oil crisis of 1973 when Saudi Arabia was given an executive director at the IMF board, and the world was talking about re-cycling of Petro dollars. We have slid a long way down since that time. The Arab world has to squarely face the challenges to its economic and social development, which I will later touch upon. But I guess our first main concern here is the challenge of peace, of peace making and peacekeeping. It has been argued by some Israelis in particular- that left to themselves every Arab state, the Palestinians and the Israelis will achieve peace. Evidence before us points to the contrary. For around ten years, the Palestinians and the Israelis struggled with this question and were unable alone to reach agreement. Even with the personal intervention of the president of the USA in 2000, they were unable to do so. Without an international role or third party intervention, to assist the parties, provide advice, mediation, and conciliation… etc, the road to peace remain blocked. The road map is the product of such third party role. The truth of the matter is that the international community has been involved in the conflict since its inception, and should not be banished from it when it is most urgently needed. The first peacemaking between the Arabs and the Israelis was done by UN mediator Dr. Ralf Bunche in 1948. The first peace keeping forces were UN truce supervision force (UNTSO) which supervised the truce established by Dr. Bunche, aforce which exists until now. The only peace agreement with Israel without UN or multilateral forces is the Jordan-Israel Peace Treaty.

6. The present situation in the peace process is seriously hampered by terrorism and violence. Suicide bombing has damaged the Palestinian cause. Combating terrorism is a challenge facing our region and the whole world. One also must be candid and fair when looking to identify the obstacles facing peace: Israeli settlements and settlement policy is the thorniest and hardest obstacles I believe the test

facing the Israeli public is the recognition that settlements preceded violence in blocking the search for peace. To show the relevance of this saying let us look at the period 1967-1989 i.e the beginning of the occupation to the end of the first intifada. This intifada was a peaceful revolt and an act of civil disobedience against the occupation. The Palestinians inside the occupied territories were docile, and there was no violence from within the territories during this period. There was an opportunity to establish peace then. The drive for settlements blocked this possibility. And after 1991, the PLO was brought inside the territories by the OSLO Accord. But, settlements expanded at an alarming rate without due regard to the requirements for peace. Those who are familiar with the overall picture in relation to settlements and their frenzied expansion can realize the enormous damage that this policy has caused to the peace prospects. I would candidly say there is a challenge to the West, and especially to the friends of Israel, in rising to convince Israel to abandon its settlement policy. I believe such a course would be a good investment in the prospects for peace.

7. Peace making in the Middle East has been done outside the UN, but its basis remain resolutions 242 and 338. The road map has an international face of four parties: UN, US, EU and Russia. Some form of international peace keeping would be needed in one form or another. Can the international community keep its engagement in the search for peace, even in the face of mounting pressure on it to step aside?

8. The emphasis on peace needs no explanation. Suffice it to mention the relationship between lack of peace and security. September 11 has put the fight against international terrorism at the forefront and is of the highest priority. And no-one in his right mind can disagree with this. I would like to add that absolutely nothing can justify the killing and murder of civilians. Furthermore no-one wants to wake up in the middle of bombs exploding around him. Our modern way of life requires trust and confidence from each other and to each other. Otherwise we all suffer, and no one will be spared. I am not an expert on terrorism, and I do not want to pontificate here, but I believe that we must use all available tools to fight and isolate terrorists. And we must not forget the value of peace and justice.

9. Allow me to frankly speak about a rising undercurrent that aims to link Islam as a religion with terrorism. These efforts predated September 11 by some time and are championed by well-known individuals. The thesis of this group is that the next enemy is Islam, and when they want to sound intellectual they say political Islam. Some do not shy from it, like Franklin Graham who has described Islam as an “evil religion”. In my opinion international terrorism has no religion, but terrorists use it a cover for their murderous pursuit. Islam categorically prohibits the killing of civilians. I also believe that there is a challenge to us Moslems to doctrinally and intellectually fight any notion that seeks to justify terror by using Islam.

10. The lack of just peace and recurring conflicts have interrupted or caused development to fail and left their imprints on the Arab society. One finds the emotions of people ranging from anger to frustration, and even bewilderment at the turn of events over which they feel they have no control. The most important challenges that face the Arab Society are democratization and the twin challenges of peace and development. The Arab Human Development Report identifies these as challenges to the pursuit of freedom from fear, and challenges to the achievement of the freedom from want. To illustrate the issue of economic development, I want to take the case of Iraq as an example. Iraq has the second highest oil reserves in the world, a good supply of water, and used to have good human capital. But, how does it look today? It breaks one's heart to see the one Arab country once considered a candidate for successful development is now labouring under enormous debt (more than $ 300 BN in debt and compensation claims), and its people mired in poverty.

11. In the present world economic environment, the Middle East in general and Arab countries in particular need to co-operate more to be able to successfully integrate and compete in the international market. In the case of the Arab states this cooperation becomes not only a must but is urgently needed. With small economies, we cannot individually compete or face the international market. Arab economic co-operation is a must. It is not a new or novel idea. The economic unity agreement was reached in 1957, and the Arab common market in 1965. The trend towards globalization and regional economic groups makes it imperative that the Arab world seriously move ahead towards a successful model of economic co-operation or integration.

12. At present, the Arab Free Trade Area is a step in the right direction. But it is not enough. We need to move towards a custom union and eventually a common market. I personally believe that the Arab world should, as first step, consider creating a suitable environment in which capital can move freely within the Arab world. Without a reasonable form of economic integration, Arab development efforts will suffer from fragmentation and miss the benefit of competition. When we turn to the twin challenges of peace then we really run into difficulty. If we take the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations as a model, then what do we find? Israel in occupation and control of the West Bank and Gaza. These areas are dotted with hundred of Israeli settlements. Palestinians live under curfews and closures with no functioning economy and with disrupted lives. Does this situation represent two equal parties for negotiations? – of course not. Then how can negotiations succeed without third party intervention? This is the challenge that faces the peace process: how to implement the road map? Could we, in the international community rise

to this challenge? I leave it in the form of a question. But, let me say this: can we imagine the contribution of the existence of a free and democratic Iraq, and of a free and democratic Palestine to the cause of security and peaceful relations in the region and the world, and the setback this would represent to the extremists and fanatics?

Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century

Johan Hederstedt

The "Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century" seminars started six years ago here in Sweden. The agenda was quite open, but there was a clear vision of the new challenges for international peacekeeping as we moved from traditional peacekeeping tasks of the Cold-War period into new, increasingly multifunctional, needs in the conflict environment in the 1990s.

At that time we could look back on half a century of United Nations' peacekeeping operations all over the world. But we could also already clearly see that peace operations were gradually taking on new shapes as regional organisations, most notably NATO, were taking an increasingly active role in multinational peace operations in the Balkans. The years that have passed since the project was launched have indeed confirmed these trends.

I have followed the project from different positions, and I have had the privilege to participate in several of the seminars and meetings of the evolving project. The series of seminars can rightly be described as a truly global process and a very successful one.

The project is now moving into a second phase. Building on the experience and conclusions of the first phase the agenda now should be focused on how to implement key findings and recommendations. I strongly encourage the effort to define concrete steps for those countries and organisations to start to implement already today.

Even if the academic environment – as here tonight at Krusenberg – is comfortable, we must not lose sight of the real challenges in a world, where the security of individuals, groups and countries are constantly being threatened. Although the specific topic of this first seminar in the second phase of the project, is "Peacekeeping and Counter-Terrorism", I would like to take a somewhat broader perspective of the tasks ahead of us.

Let me briefly point at two dimensions that I see as urgent:

- the need for close and open-spirited co-operation between military, police and other civilian functions and
- the need for close co-operation between global and regional organisations and arrangements.

These two dimensions are closely linked. There exists a strong common denominator in the need for establishing a spirit of openness, trust and confidence between all parties, individuals as well as organisations, working together in today's peace operations.

It is a truism that we are living in a time of dramatic changes in the global security landscape. When we look around us today it is quite clear that the threats and risks that are facing us today and tomorrow are very, very different from those of the past.

Ethnic and religious conflicts, large-scale transnational terrorism and organised crime in different shapes today are threatening the stability and security of regions, nations and individuals in all parts of the world.

At the same time a large number of countries in Europe – for the first time in sixty years – find themselves in a co-operative security environment, where they can ask themselves fundamental questions about the tasks of their armed forces and what capabilities they really need. The military threat emanating from Hitler's Germany and later from the Soviet Union did not leave any room for questioning the objectives.

The background of the Challenges Project, as we all are aware, is the dramatically changing scope and characteristics of peace operations, that we have been experiencing since the end of the Cold War and after September 11 2001.

We have moved from fairly straightforward peacekeeping missions with clear and distinct military roles to complex multifunctional missions. Military tasks are intertwined with broad tasks of maintaining and building fundamental civilian societal functions and with immediate humanitarian tasks. Not only do the modern missions include a broad scope of different tasks, but these different tasks often have to be carried out side-by-side. In Iraq for example we have observed how the front parts of units have been involved in fierce fighting, while other parts further back have been engaged in humanitarian assistance and peacekeeping tasks.

These new broader military roles put new requirements on the units we deploy. To contribute to humanitarian assistance, to support peace building, to assist in the return of refugees as well as in the process of disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration are essential new tasks in today's peace operations.

The long held view that any unit that has been trained for war fighting can automatically take on complementary roles as peacekeepers and peace-builders obviously has to be challenged. In this context we should remember that the old war-fighting role is also subject to rapid change.

The requirements on the soldiers in the field of tomorrow are vastly different from the old ones and here we may in fact see some hopeful convergence. The soldiers of tomorrow will increasingly have to be persons educated and trained to handle a broad spectrum of complex situations without resort to orders from above.

One overarching lesson from recent operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq is that the rapid establishment of a secure environment is vitally important. The military role goes hand in hand with the establishment of law and order.

If one single issue in the area of civil-military co-operation should be singled out, the one that seems to me to be the most critical is this: We urgently need to develop new forms for efficient co-operation between military and police with the common aim to foster efficient security. Without a secure environment there will be no humanitarian assistance and as Carl Bildt noted in a recent article, "there simply will not be any room for democratic politics or entrepreneurship as long as the gun remains the quickest way to power and property".

My second point is closely linked to what I have just said and concerns the relationship between global and regional organisations. We all know that the interplay between different organisations much too often is characterised more by wasteful competition and duplication than by complementary co-operation. To foster an efficient interplay between the different contributing organisations built on mutual trust and understanding remains a critical challenge in today's peace operations.

Mandated by the United Nations, regional organisations are well suited to take on some of the challenges of dealing with regional conflicts. In a time when overall demand on the international community is growing, all efforts that can contribute to a balanced and efficient distribution of burdens should be welcomed.

Of course there are many situations where there is no alternative to a heavy involvement by global organisations. For example, Sweden is right now preparing to contribute quite substantially to the MONUC-mission in Congo-Kinshasa.

"The challenge", as Ambassador Brahimi has observed, "rests in how to engage and involve regional organisations, without regionalising peacekeeping".

With regard to all relations, whether civil/police /military or global/regional, we must build on the many shared concerns and values that already exist between the communities. The fundamental challenges to better relations – the practical obstacles, misunderstandings and distrust – have to be addressed. And strategically, this builds heavily on improving the procedures for Training and Education.

Joint Training and Education is an essential tool and should be the norm. A determined effort is required aiming at better understanding at both strategic and operational levels – across disciplines and organisations. The international community should use the many international institutions that conduct joint courses, or create such institutions. It should take advantage of national and international crisis management exercises to put theory into practice. Modern information technology could play an important role in facilitating joint training efforts connecting institutions in different parts of the world.

Concluding Words

I promised to keep these remarks short. The challenges ahead of us in international peacekeeping are formidable and provide a broad "smörgåsbord" of problems and opportunities. I think it is important not to be overwhelmed by the complexities.

We have to work both in the short run and in the long run. We have to set clear and concrete goals that we can start to implement immediately, but we also have to direct more long-term research effort to prepare ourselves to meet the challenges ahead of us.

The new phase of Challenges Project is clearly taking off in a promising way. As the Swedish Armed Forces are transforming to meet the defence needs of the future, the international tasks ahead of us are very much at the centre of my attention. The tasks of the future indeed are different and in many ways more complicated than those of the past. I have pointed at some of the challenges that I see as particularly vital and urgent.

I am convinced that we need a broad approach with inputs from different parts of the world as well as from people with different backgrounds – military, diplomats, police and experts in a large number of civilian areas related to peace building and nation building. I will follow and support the Challenges Project as it evolves with great interest.

Thank you for your attention.

Annex A

List of Contributor's CV

Alyson J.K. Bailes graduated from Oxford in 1969 with a Bachelor of Arts degree (First Class Honors) in Modern History and a Master of Arts in 1971. She joined the London Foreign and Commonwealth Office in 1969. In 1979, Alyson Bailes was on loan to the British Ministry of Defence. She took a further leave of absence from the British Diplomatic Service to work as Vice President for the European Security Programme at the Institute for EastWest Studies (now EastWest Institute) in New York 1996-1997. She was then selected as Political Director of the Western European Union in Brussels. Returning to the Diplomatic Service, Alyson became British Ambassador to Finland from November 2000-June 2002. She left that appointment, and resigned from the British Service, to take up her post as Director at SIPRI July 2002.

Dr William J. Durch is a Senior Associate at the Henry L. Stimson Center in Washington, D.C, where he co-directs the Future of Peace Operations Project. A graduate of Georgetown University School of Foreign Service and with a doctorate in political science from MIT, Dr. Durch has taught at Johns Hopkins Nitze School of Advanced International Studies and currently teaches in the Georgetown University Security Studies Program. He served as Project Director for the United Nations Panel on UN Peace Operations ("the Brahimi Report") and as Scientific Advisor in the Advanced Systems and Concepts Office of the U.S. Defense Threat Reduction Agency. Dr. Durch is also co-author of Studies on Arms Control in Europe and on US Military Roles and Missions for the Twenty-First Century, and author of several studies of strategic and theater ballistic missile defense.

Dr Michael J. Dziedzic is a Program Officer in the Research and Studies Program and a specialist on Peace Operations at the United States Insitute of Peace. A retired United States Air Force (USAF) colonel, Dziedzic was a senior military fellow at the Institute for National Strategic Studies, where he focused on peace operations, Latin American regional security affairs, and transnational security threats. During his thirty-year career with the Air Force, he served in a variety of capacities including tenured professor in the Political Science Department at the USAF Academy; professor of national security studies at the National War College; strategic military planner for the United Nations Mission in Kosovo; political-military planner at the Pentagon; air attaché at the United States Embassy in El Salvador; and visiting fellow at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London.

Major General Timothy Ford (Retd) is based in Sydney as an international peace and security consultant. He retired from the Australian Army in January 2003, following an extensive career in the Australian Defence Force and the United Na-

tions. During his military career, General Ford served in a wide variety of command, staff, and training appointments in Australia and overseas. General Ford has provided support through the Australian Permanent Mission in New York to the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO). General Ford was the Chief Military Adviser to the United Nations Headquarters (UN HQ), New York, from September 2000 until September 2002. He commanded the Military Division in the DPKO and provided strategic military advice to UN Headquarters including the Security Council, Member States and the 15 UN peacekeeping missions in the field.

General Johan Ivar Hederstedt completed his officer's training at Karlberg Military Academy 1965-66 after which he joined the Swedish Armed Forces. During 1976-81 he worked for the Defence Staff Operations following UN service in Cyprus 1981. In 1988 General Hederstedt served as Chief of Operations UN Battalion in Lebanon. In 1996 he was appointed Deputy Chief of Operations, International Relations, Armed Forces Headquarters. During 1997-2000 General Hederstedt worked as Chief Military Adviser to the Minister of Defence. In 2000 he was promoted to General and appointed as Supreme Commander of the Swedish Armed Forces.

Dr Claire Heristchi is a Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Plymouth, England. She holds a BA (Government), a postgraduate Honours degree from the University of Queensland (Australia), and a PhD from the University of St Andrews (Scotland). Her main areas of research are Middle Eastern Studies, Francophone North Africa in particular, and Postcolonial Studies. Her current publications include an article for a special issue of *Democratization* (forthcoming 2004) and a book entitled *Postcolonial Studies and the Middle East* (under review from Lynne Rienner publishers). She is also one of the editors and a contributor to a special issue of the *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* on Critical Middle Eastern Studies which is due for publication in the spring of 2004. Her research comes under the aegis of the Plymouth International Studies Centre, headed by Dr Michael Pugh.

Annika Hilding-Norberg is Project Leader of the Challenges Project (*Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century*) at the Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden (2003-). She holds a Bachelor of Science (International Relations) from the London School of Economics & Political Science (LSE), a Maitrise (Politique Internationale) from University of Brussels. The Challenges Project originated in 1996 as part of her research at the LSE on comparative approaches to peace operations. She was employed between 1997 and 2003 by the Swedish National Defence College (NDC) as Challenges Project Director and Coordinator.

Ambassador Farouk Kasrawi is since 2002 President of the Jordan Institute of Diplomacy and Advisor at the Royal Hashemite Court in Jordan. In 1962 he grad-

uated with a B.A. from the American University at Beirut, in 1976 with an M.Sc. from the University of London (Econ.) and in 1980 with an M. Phil. from George Washington University. Ambassador Kasrawi served as Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations in New York in 1983-1986 following service as Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the United Nations Office and Specialized Agencies, Geneva, Non-Resident Permanent Representative to the United Nations Office, IAEA and UNIDO, Vienna. In 1990-2000 he served as Ambassador to Japan, non resident Ambassador to the Republic of Korea and the Philippines. In 2000-2002, Farouk Kasrawi served as Ambassador to Germany.

Anna Lindh was Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sweden from October 1998 until September 10th 2003. Anna Lindh was born on 19 June 1957 in Enskede, Sweden. She graduated 1982 with a Bachelor of Laws, Uppsala University after which she worked as a Court Clerk in Stockholm District Court. Anna Lindh became a MEP 1982-85 and served as a Member of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Taxation. During 1984-90 she served as Chairman of the Swedish Social Democratic Youth League. In 1986 she was appointed Chairman to the Government's Council on Alcohol and Drug Policies. In 1991 she was elected Member of the Social Democratic Party Executive Committee following service as Chairman, Stockholm City Culture Committee and Leisure Services Committee and Chairman of the Stockholm City Theatre. During 1992-94 she served as Chairman to The Committee for Home Affairs, Party of European Socialists (EPS). Anna Lindh was appointed and served as Minister and Head of the Ministry of the Environment in 1994-98.

Ambassador Chief Arthur C.I Mbanefo served as the Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations from October 1999-July 2003. Chief Arthur Mbanefo is a Fellow of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales and of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria being the President of the latter Institute in 1978-79. Over the years, Chief Mbanefo has worked as a formal and informal adviser to some of the Governments of Nigeria, particularly the Federal Government, and has served on numerous national committees, commissions and investigative bodies both as a member and Chairman. At the United Nations, he was the Chairman of the Group of 77 and China for the year 2000. He is currently the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and also Chairman of the United Nations Special Committee of Peacekeeping Operations.

Lt General Satish Nambiar was commissioned from the Indian Military Academy in 1957, and has since served in various positions in the Indian Armed Forces, including as deputy Chief of the Armed Forces. General Nambiar was appointed the first Force Commander and Head of Mission of the United Nations forces in the former Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR) in the grade of an Under-Secretary-General (1992-1993). Holding a Masters Degree in Defence Studies from the University of

Madras, he has been actively engaged since retirement, in the study and analysis of UN peacekeeping operations, national security matters, including defence strategy, and international relations. Elected to the Council of the United Service Institution of India in end 1995, he assumed charge as the Director of the Institution on 1st July 1996. Under General Nambiar's leadership the United Service Institution of India Centre for United Nations Peacekeeping was established in 2000.

Commissioner Lars Nylén is Commissioner and Head of the National Criminal Investigation Department, Stockholm, Sweden. After graduating (Master of Laws LL.M.) from the Faculty of Law at Uppsala University and from the Swedish Police Academy he was with the Tierp police department from 1977 to 1992 as deputy chief and chief of police. 1992-1996 he was chief of police in Uppsala County and Uppsala police department. He is a graduate of the FBI National Academy 1985 (143rd Session). Since 1978 he has participated in and led working groups at the Swedish National Police Board in Stockholm concerning nuclear terrorism, physical protection, disaster preparedness and evacuation of regions where nuclear power plants are located, including protection of nuclear transports, response to major incidents and operational command. In 1996 he attended the Senior Management Course and in 2000 the Senior Executive Course at the National Defence College.

Ambassador Michael Sahlin is since 2002 Director General of the Folke Bernadotte Academy. Michael Sahlin graduated with a PhD in Political Science from Uppsala University where he worked as a lecturer in Political Science 1973-1977. In 1977 he joined the Swedish Foreign Service. In 1982-83 he worked as secretary in the Submarine Commission following service as First Secretary at the Embassy of Sweden, Madrid 1983-84. In 1984 he served as Head Secretary in the Defence Commission after which he served as Secretary, Standing Committee of Defence in the Swedish Parliament during 1987-91. In 1991-1994 Michael Sahlin served as State Secretary in the Swedish Ministry of Defence. During 1995-98 he was appointed and served as Ambassador of Sweden to Turkey followed by service in 1998-2000 as Ambassador at large, responsible for Swedish support to EU candidate countries. Michael Sahlin was Ambassador of Sweden to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Macedonia (FYROM) 2000-2002.

Dr Ralph Zacklin is since 1998 Assistant Secretary-General for Legal Affairs at the United Nations, New York. Ralph Zacklin holds a LL.B. (Honours) from Faculty of Laws, University College of London, 1956-59, a LL.M. from Graduate School of Law, Columbia University, 1959-60, and a Docteur Science Politiques from Institut de Hautes Etudes Internationales, Geneva, 1963-67. In 1967 he was appointed Director of the International Law Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, which was followed by service as Legal Officer in the General Legal Division, Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations. In 1989

Ralph Zacklin was appointed Director and Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General, Office of Legal Affairs. During 1997-1998 he was Officer-in-Charge and Acting Deputy High Commissioner, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Geneva. In 1999 he was elected a Fellow of University College of London.

Annex B

Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism Seminar Participants

	Name	*Title*	*Position*	*Organisation/Country*
1	Jonas Alberoth	Mr	Deputy Director General	Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden
2	Betsy Anderson	Ms	Deputy Chief of Mission	Embassy of the USA, Sweden
3	Sven-Arne Andreasson	Mr	Superintendent	National Criminal Investigation Department, Sweden
4	Krister Andrén	Mr	Defence Policy Adviser to Supreme Commander	Swedish Armed Forces
5	Alyson J.K. Bailes	Amb	Director	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
6	Tomur Bayer	Amb	Ambassador	Embassy of Turkey, Sweden
7	Murat Bilhan	Amb	Chairman, Center for Strategic Research	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey
8	Ove Bring	Prof	Professor	National Defence College, Sweden
9	Alaciel Campos Dugone	Ms	Education and Doctrine Adviser	Armed Forces Joint Staff CAECOPAZ, Argentina
10	Ayse Betul Celik	Dr	Associate Professor	University of Sabanci, Turkey
11	Christopher Coker	Prof	Professor	London School of Economics and Political Science, United Kingdom
12	André Colautti	Lt	Head Overseas Study Programme	École Militaire de St Cyr, France
13	Nils Daag	Amb	Ambassador	Embassy of Sweden, Ireland
14	Sandra Dunsmore	Ms	President	Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, Canada
15	William J. Durch	Dr	Senior Associate	Henry L. Stimson Center, United States
16	Michael Dziedzic	Dr	Program Officer Balkans	United States Institute of Peace
17	Stig Elvemar	Amb	Ambassador, Political Affairs	Swedish Mission to the United Nations
18	Michael Esper	Lt Col	Training Officer	United States Army Peace Keeping Institute
19	Timothy Ford	Maj Gen (Retd)	Consultant International Peace and Security, Former Military Adviser to UN Department for Peacekeeping Operations	International Peace and Security, Australia
20	Martin Hallqvist	Amb	International Adviser	National Police Board, Sweden
21	Johan Hederstedt	General	Supreme Commander	Swedish Armed Forces
22	Birger Heldt	Dr	Researcher	Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden
23	Claire Heristchi	Dr	Lecturer, International Relations	University of Plymouth, United Kingdom
24	Isabel Hight	Ms	Civilian Police Division	United Nations Department for Peacekeeping Operations
25	Annika Hilding-Norberg	Ms	Project Leader, Challenges	Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

	Name	*Title*	*Position*	*Organisation/Country*
26	Mark Hoffman	Dr	Dean of Undergraduate Studies	London School of Economics and Political Science, United Kingdom
27	Farouk Kasrawi	Amb	President	Jordan Institute of Diplomacy
28	Yunosuke Kawazu	Col	Defence Attaché	Embassy of Japan, Sweden
29	Ben Klappe	Lt Col	Special Assistant to the Military Adviser	United Nations Department for Peacekeeping Operations
30	Henrik Landerholm	Mr	President	National Defence College, Sweden
31	Harvey Langholtz	Dr	Director	United Nations Institute for Training & Research Programme of Correspondence
32	David Lightburn	Mr	Director, Special Projects	Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, Canada
33	Anna Lindh	Ms	Minister for Foreign Affairs	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden
34	Mingde Liu	Col	Defence Attaché	Embassy of China, Sweden
35	Guillermo Lucotti	Mr	Deputy Head of Department	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Argentina
36	Göte Lundmark	Lt Col	Training Adviser	Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden
37	Mark Malan	Mr	Head of Peacekeeping Programme	Institute for Security Studies, South Africa
38	Arthur C.I. Mbanefo	Amb, Chief	Permanent Representative / Chair, United Nations Special Committee for Peacekeeping Operations	Nigerian Mission to the United Nations
39	Kenneth MaCartney	Mr	Chargé d'Affaires	Canadian Embassy, Sweden
40	Camilla Mellander	Ms	Desk Officer	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden
41	Satish Nambiar	Lt Gen	President	United Services Institution of India
42	Chitra Narayanan	Amb	Ambassador	Embassy of the Republic of India, Sweden
43	Lars Nylén	Comr	Head of Criminal Department	National Criminal Investigation, Sweden
44	Bruce Oswald	Mr	Lecturer / Associate Director	University of Melbourne/Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, Australia
45	Raj Kumar Rajput	Col	Coordinator	Indian Armed Forces, United Service Institution of India Centre for United Nations Peacekeeping
46	Paul Risley	Mr	Senior Programme Officer, Democracy and Dialogue and Conflict Management Programme	International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance
47	Richard Rowe	Amb	Ambassador	Australian Embassy, Sweden
48	Michael Sahlin	Amb	Director General	Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden
49	Keiko Sakata	Ms	Researcher	Embassy of Japan, Sweden
50	Elda Beatriz Sampietro	Amb	Ambassador	Embassy of the Argentine Republic, Sweden

	Name	*Title*	*Position*	*Organisation/Country*
51	Jussi Saressalo	Col	Training Adviser	International Peace Academy
52	Paul Stares	Dr	Director of Research and Studies	United States Institute of Peace
53	Ekaterina Stepanova	Dr	Senior Researcher	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
54	Frank Steyn	Mr	First Secretary	Embassy of the Republic of South Africa, Sweden
55	Tony Stigsson	Maj Gen	Deputy Force Commander Joint Operations	Swedish Armed Forces
56	T.A. Suleiman	Mr	Special Assistant	Nigerian Mission to the United Nations
57	Charlotte Svensson	Ms	Project Assistant, Challenges	Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden
58	Vollrath Tham	Mr	Minister, Department for International Law, Human Rights and Treaty Law	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden
59	Bakhtiyar Tuzmukhamedov	Ass. Prof	Associate Professor	Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Federation
60	Sha Wu	Mr	Research Fellow	China Institute for International Strategic Studies
61	Ralph Zacklin	Mr	Assistant Secretary-General of Legal Affairs	United Nations Office for Legal Affairs
62	Ragnar Ängeby	Amb	Ambassador	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden

Annex C

List of Acronyms

AU	African Union
C34	United Nations Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations
CBRN	Chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear materials
CPU	Close Protection Unit
CTC	United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EU	European Union
EUROPOL	European police Office
FARC	Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia
FYROM	Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Macedonia
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IAPTC	International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centers
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICJ	International Court of Justice
IJPs	International Judges and Prosecutors
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMTF	Integrated Mission Task Force
INTERPOL	International Criminal Police Organization
IRA	Irish Republican Army
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
KFOR	Kosovo Force
LSE	London School of Economics and Political Science
MONUC	United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NBC	Nuclear, Biological and Chemical warfare
NDC	Swedish National Defence College
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OHCHR	The United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

P5	Permanent Members of the UN Security Council
PKO	Peace Keeping Operation
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
PO	Peace Operation
PRIO	International Peace Research Institute Oslo
PSO	Peace Support Operation
ROE	Rules of Engagement
RoL	Rule of Law
SGTM	Standardised Generic Training Modules
SHIRBRIG	United Nations Standby High Readiness Brigade
SIPRI	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
SRSG	Special Representative of the Secretary-General
TCC	Troop Contributing Country
UNAMSIL	United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone
UNCC	United Nations Compensation Commission
UNCHR	United Nations Center for Human Rights
UNDPKO	United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations
UNHCHR	United Nations High Comissioner for Human Rights
UNHCR	United Nations High Comissioner for Refugees
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UNMIK	United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo
UNMOs	United Nations Military Observers
UNMOVIC	United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
UNSECOORD	Office of the United Nations Security Coordinator
UNTAET	United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor
UNTSO	United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (Middle East)
USAF	United States Air Force
USIP	United States Institute of Peace
WMD	Weapons of Mass-Destruction

CHALLENGES OF PEACE OPERATIONS: INTO THE 21ST CENTURY

PEACE OPERATIONS AND COUNTER-TERRORISM

The present report is a product of the 12th International Seminar in the series: Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century, and was titled "Peace Operations and Counter-Terrorism". The aim was to elaborate on how and to what extent, if any, the recent global terrorist dimensions of threats to security will have an impact on the way in which peace operations are being conducted in the years to come.

The aim of the Challenges Project is, first, to bring to bear, in a collegial and informal setting, the collective knowledge and views of participants on the challenges of peace operations as the world enters the 21st century. Second, to foster and encourage a culture of cross-professional co-operation and partnership between organizations and individuals from a wide variety of nations and cultures.

The seminar was not necessarily intended to seek agreement on terminology, but rather to consider what effects and implications, if any, terrorism and counter-terrorism have on the nature, planning and implementation of peace operations. Are the actions to counter terrorism limited to those of the military and security services? To the extent that terrorism is the problem, is strengthening the sinews of the state an answer? – or the answer? Or do they include civil actions to promote better governance, improve societal stability, build sustainable peace and thereby isolate militant factions to the minority fringe where they belong and where they are unable to recruit followers? In such efforts, do counter-terrorism activities compete with peace operations, or are they compatible and complementary with them? Those were only some of the aspects and issues that were being explored during the seminar at Krusenberg, Sweden 23-25 May 2003.

The Challenges Project was initiated in Sweden in 1997 and is a joint effort by a multiplicity of Partner Organizations around the world. The project is coordinated by the newly established Folke Bernadotte Academy in cooperation with the Swedish Armed Forces, National Police Board and National Defence College. Over the years, some 240 organizations and 55 countries have exchanged experiences and ideas on how to enhance the planning, preparation, conduct and effectiveness of multinational peace operations. A concluding report with recommendations of the first phase of the project was presented on behalf of the Partner Organizations by the late Foreign Minister Anna Lindh to the Secretary General of the United Nations Kofi Annan in 2002. The next cumulative report of the project will be presented at a major conference in 2005.