

THE UNITED NATIONS FORCE INTERVENTION BRIGADE: PEACE
ENFORCEMENT AS A CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IN THE
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

by

KELLY KRISTEN HOWELL

A THESIS

Presented to the Conflict and Dispute Resolution Program
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Arts

September 2015

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Kelly Kristen Howell

Title: The United Nations Force Intervention Brigade: Peace Enforcement as a Conflict Management Strategy in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

This thesis has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in the Conflict and Dispute Resolution Program by:

Ibrahim Gassama	Chairperson
Paul Slovic	Member
Joyce Leader	Member
Nicholas Macdonald	Member

and

Scott L. Pratt	Dean of the Graduate School
----------------	-----------------------------

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded September 2015

© 2015 Kelly Kristen Howell
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (United States) License.

THESIS ABSTRACT

Kelly Kristen Howell

Master of Arts

Conflict and Dispute Resolution Program

September 2015

Title: The United Nations Force Intervention Brigade: Peace Enforcement as a Conflict Management Strategy in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

This research explores developments within the United Nations that have led to the creation of the Forward Intervention Brigade (FIB). It will consider the political, legal, economic, and ethical issues surrounding armed defensive-intervention during humanitarian crises. Topics explored include the effectiveness of armed intervention during crises and ethics concerning the use of arms when intervening for humanitarian or peacemaking purposes.

How success and failure is being defined and the current status of the mission will be discussed. The question of the possible costs of non-intervention is raised. This case example is linked to the failure of the UN to effectively respond to the genocide that occurred in Rwanda in 1994 and the subsequent cost of that failure. The development of powers within the UN is considered in terms of the creation of this armed force, as are the ways this may impact the interpretation of international law regarding armed intervention.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Kelly Kristen Howell

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene, OR
Grand Valley State University, Allendale, MI
Grand Rapids Community College, Grand Rapids, MI

DEGREES AWARDED:

Master of Arts, Conflict and Dispute Resolution, 2015, University of Oregon
Bachelor of Arts, International Relations, 2012, Grand Valley State University
Associate of Arts, 2009, Grand Rapids Community College

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

International Conflict and Peacekeeping
Post-Conflict Community Building, Restorative Justice, Justice Reform

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Research Manager, Association for the Development of Peoples with Disabilities,
July-October 2013

Program Associate, Conflict Resolution Services, University of Oregon
2012-2013

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

Peace Fellow, Vietnam, The Advocacy Project Washington D.C., 2013

Freeman Fellow, Center for Asian and Pacific Studies, University of Oregon,
2013

Stern Fellow, Genocide Prevention Initiative, University of Oregon, 2013

Conflict and Dispute Resolution Academic Scholarship, University of Oregon
School of Law, 2012

McNair Scholar, War and Economy, Grand Valley State University, 2011

PUBLICATIONS:

Howell, Kelly. (2012) War and Economy. *McNair Scholars Research Journal*,
86, 16-22.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to Professors Gassama, Slovic and Macdonald for their assistance in the preparation of this manuscript. Each contributed a specialized perspective from the point of view of international law, psychology, and professional experience. In addition, special thanks are due to Ambassador Joyce Leader, whose familiarity with the middle Africa region and the politics of the time period was so helpful during the development of this undertaking. A special thank you goes out to the CRES team, Kata Bahnsen-Reinhardt and Anna Shamble for their support and encouragement.

To my adventurous daughter, Ara. You are my light and inspiration, thank you for being you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE UNITED NATIONS FORCE INTERVENTION BRIGADE.....	1
Preface.....	1
Introduction.....	2
A Brief History of United Nations Peacekeeping.....	5
II. CASE STUDY OF THE DRC	12
The Rwandan Genocide.....	14
Events Precipitating the Force Intervention Brigade	16
III. THE CREATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FORWARD INTERVENTION BRIGADE	21
Regional Cooperation of the FIB.....	26
Analysis of the FIB: Success or Failure?.....	28
After Demobilizing M23.....	31
The Present Mission of the FIB	33
The Credibility of the Mission.....	35
Discussion	36
IV. THE CHANGING FACE OF PEACEKEEPING	40
Considerations of Intervention.....	43
Conclusions: The Future of Peace Enforcement as a Peacekeeping Model	49
REFERENCES CITED.....	55

CHAPTER I

THE UNITED NATIONS FORCE INTERVENTION BRIGADE

PREFACE

Kofi Annan famously said (1998), “Why was the United Nations (UN) established, if not to act as a benign policeman or doctor? Our job is to intervene...that is what the world requires of us and what the UN charter expects of us (p. 2).” Meanwhile, David Reiff (2003), an American humanitarian aid worker and pundit who writes about his experiences in war torn areas of the world declared that “Those who want to go to war to stop human rights abuses should not use the moral warrant of humanitarianism to justify their actions...the recourse to a moral imperative like humanitarianism puts war beyond debate, and war should never be beyond debate (p. 218).”

In the 20th century over 180 million people were killed as a result of wars and political violence, and the majority of those were civilians (Hobsbawm, 2002). In the past twenty years, an important public and policy concern has been the issue of genocide and mass atrocity-forms of large-scale violence that sometimes take place within states, usually for political reasons.

In response to this, an atrocity prevention community has developed, made up of citizens and activists, as well as authors of government policy and academic scholars who contribute to researching and defining the problems and possible responses to those problems.

Members of the atrocity prevention community inside and outside of the UN are continuing to improve the quality of their analyses and response tool kit in a number of

areas. This research focuses on the introduction of an armed intervention brigade into the equation of peacekeeping, as well as the prevention of organized mass killing.

INTRODUCTION

Military intervention in humanitarian crises has been actively studied for some time now, and yet scholars have not come to a consensus about its effectiveness, its ethical considerations, or its relationship with state sovereignty. In light of the recent development of an armed UN Force Intervention Brigade (FIB) that has been deployed by the UN within the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) as part of its peacekeeping forces there, it is an even more pressing issue (Boutellis, 2013).

Since the end of the cold war, the United Nations has begun to exercise its power in new and different ways. Some of the UN's modern activities have included the use of force to end inter-state and intra-state violence, the prosecution of violations of international humanitarian law, the elimination of threatening weapons, the resolution of state boundary issues, and the compensation of victims of war (Matheson, 2001)

At times, issues can arise wherein state governments find themselves for various reasons unable to maintain the integrity of the state. This could occur for reasons such as war, civil strife, secessionist movements, or governmental collapse. The United Nations has intervened with peacekeepers in such situations, altering the course of events, or on occasion has been asked to address issues within a state after NATO has altered the course of events in such a nation (Langholtz & Leentjes, 2001).

A specific kind of UN intervention, called post-conflict peace building, involves the institution of a UN controlled interim government that is sometimes put into place in order to re-establish the stability of a region and maintain its security. Sometimes such

interim governments are also responsible for activities that are similar to those used in state building, such as the creation of state institutions or the oversight of elections (Langholtz & Leentjes, 2001).

Such activities on the part of the UN and NATO are relatively unprecedented, and mark a change in UN policy and interpretation of international law. There have been relatively few of these events, and some of the UN's activities have sparked international controversy. These activities raise serious questions about sovereignty and international respect of a nation's rights, as well as the idea of UN neutrality.

The most recent of these events is the creation of the FIB. In late March of 2013 the UN announced its intention, via UN resolution 2098, to send an armed brigade into the eastern portion of the DRC, which has been wracked by conflict of varying intensity for decades.

Since the mid 1990's, while beleaguered by a flux of Hutu refugees and genocidaires from the Rwandan genocide, the DRC has been suffering from abject poverty, crumbling state security, ongoing militia violence, foreign interference, and other factors that have combined to create one of the world's most intractable wars and persistent atrocity situations (Stearns, 2011).

The FIB is an extension of MONUSCO (formerly known as MONUC), the current UN mission in the DRC and the initial length of the mandate was one year. It has since been extended twice, and the current mandate expires in April of 2016 (UN Resolution 2147, 2015).

The FIB was deployed into eastern DRC in the Spring of 2013. It initially consisted of 3000 soldiers within the present MONUSCO troop ceiling of 19,815: three Infantry Battalions, one Artillery and one Special force and Reconnaissance Company. Headquarters were stationed in Goma, under direct command of the MONUSCO Force Commander (UN SC/10964, 2013).

In the DRC, the FIB is not only there to help stabilize the country and reduce the risk of war in the region, but to address the human rights abuses being committed by rebel forces, and as this research will argue, to help prevent a recurrence of genocidal killings similar to what occurred in neighboring Rwanda two decades ago.

Because of this new UN initiative, the face of intervention is changing yet again. Although this directive was created only in regard to the DRC, and it is stated explicitly that it is not meant to create a precedent, it still does so.

It is important to analyze and critique the UN's contemporary peacekeeping actions because they are precedent-setting events in the history of UN peacekeeping, as well as a move within the international arena toward peace enforcement activity. The FIB also creates a need for the re-evaluation of such concepts as UN neutrality, concerns that the UN is acting outside of its charter, state sovereignty, and international law.

We are witnessing an evolution within UN conflict management processes. It has heretofore mostly been executed using non-violent means by which to stop or inhibit the parties' capacity to direct violence against each other, usually by deploying what are termed impartial soldiers from neutral nations to contain and limit the violence, with varied outcomes.

Organized mass violence continues to be a major problem faced by people in the 21st century. It threatens the lives of thousands of people around the world at this very moment. Sudan, Syria, the Central African Republic, and the DR Congo, among other countries, are all currently in an active stage of genocide, according to Gregory Stanton of Genocide Watch (2012).

It could be that this new UN move toward the use of a credible threat of force might lead us into a new era of peacekeeping, one in which peacekeepers are enabled and expected to react to actively protect civilians who are living in some of the most dangerous conflict zones in the world.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING

The basis of new developments in peace enforcement is the heretofore historically accepted tradition of UN peacekeeping. Peacekeeping at its most basic is the employment of a set of procedures that reduces the likelihood that people will engage in violent action. While in peace building an attempt is made to establish mechanisms that preclude the need for future violence, peacekeeping attempts to stop or inhibit each side's capacity to commit direct violence against the other, usually by deploying impartial soldiers from neutral nations to contain and limit the violence (Langholtz, et. al., 2001).

Peacekeeping falls under the category of conflict management, and it helps peacemakers, mainly by protecting them and maintaining ceasefires while they carry out negotiations and build peace agreements. UN peacekeeping evolved following the founding of the UN in 1945. The mandate of the UN when it was founded was to prevent wars of the scale of the two world wars, as well as to reaffirm human rights, and to ensure

that armed force should not be used, except when in the common interest (www.un.org/charter).

In addition to the above, the UN was meant to address the failings of the international community in regard to the atrocities of the Holocaust. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, UN Resolution 260, was signed into being in December of 1948 (Schabas, 2015).

Authored by the lawyer Raphael Lemkin who invented the word and whose campaigning with the support of the United States brought the concept to the UN, it defined genocide in legal terms as specific acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group (Ibid, 2015).

In addition, it defined the crimes that could be punished under the convention as genocide; conspiracy to commit genocide; direct and public incitement to commit genocide; attempt to commit genocide; and complicity in genocide. As of 2014, 146 states have ratified or acceded to the treaty (Ibid, 2015).

Peacekeeping was never explicitly mentioned in the UN Charter but became defined through use. Peacekeeping now falls between Chapters VI and VII of the UN Charter, which are the Pacific Settlement of Disputes and the Action with Respect to Threats sections, respectively. In brief, Chapter VI states that non-violent means must first be used to settle disputes before means of any other kind can be used, and Chapter VII states that the UN can settle disputes militarily or non-militarily if they threaten international peace (<http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/>).

When first instituted, UN peacekeeping missions were constrained. The UN could only deploy peacekeepers with the consent of the warring parties, after a cease fire was in place and the armies were disengaged. Peacekeeping was meant to be temporary with its primary goal to maintain the ceasefire while diplomats tried to hammer out more permanent solutions via peace agreements.

Between 1948 and 1988, the UN only deployed 13 peacekeeping or observer forces despite the fact that more than 80 wars were fought during that same period, resulting in the deaths of at least 30 million individuals. The end of the cold war signaled a shift in the psychological climate in terms of peacekeeping. The international community and thought leaders were pioneering new ideas about what constituted sovereignty and just war. Since 1988, there have been 56 missions (Langholtz et. al., 2001).

Although peacekeeping was once thought to be best used only in extreme situations, and with great respect to state sovereignty, a number of scholars and leaders during this period had proposed the idea that the international community should not simply wait for violence to emerge before taking action, but should intervene before violence broke out or escalated (Ibid, 2001).

There was a shift toward more cooperation within the international community when it came to troop coordination in the event of a peacekeeping deployment, and the emergence of the controversial idea that peacekeeping was a possibly acceptable way of imposing peace *on behalf* of civilian populations who faced war.

Peacekeeping missions began to be undertaken before cease-fires were declared, and in the absence of the agreement of the warring parties. State sovereignty was slowly beginning to be called into question when the states in question were involved in violent conflicts, especially when innocent civilians were at risk. Peacekeeping operations also began to sometimes include the implementation of complex agreements and settlements, with the UN force supervising or monitoring agreements that included not only military but civilian components (Ibid, 2001).

Preventive deployment, when it occurred, involved UN forces serving as a preventive military barrier meant to discourage cross-border aggression, without the consent of one or both nations involved in the dispute. Soldiers were also sometimes deployed to provide security and transportation for aid workers, and to bring refugees to safe areas, and peace enforcement began to take shape. By definition, peace enforcement is the use of military force to impose the will of the international community on violators of standing peace (Ibid, 2001).

The rationale behind these changes included the idea that the deployment of peacekeepers without the consent of parties can induce consent which can then lead to peace, as well as the importance of addressing situations such as those of a state whose internal conditions have deteriorated catastrophically but the state continues to refuse the entry of peacekeepers. In such circumstances, the likelihood of humanitarian offenses rises drastically, and regional security can fall into great peril.

Much as the terrible experience of the Holocaust influenced the development of the Genocide Convention, the genocide in Rwanda in 1994 and the genocide in

Srebrenica (Bosnia and Herzegovina) in 1995 spurred the creation of a new concept, known as the Responsibility to Protect.

The genocide in Rwanda took place during the Rwandan civil war that began in 1990 between the Hutu led government and the Rwandan Patriotic Front, largely made up of Tutsi who had previously fled Rwanda during a past conflict. Over 800,000 people were killed in less than 100 days, at least 20% of the Rwandan population and by some estimates, as high as 70% of the Tutsi living in the country (Gourevitch, 1998).

In Srebrenica over 8,000 people were killed, mainly men and boys, although the area had been declared a UN “safe zone” in 1993, and was under the protection of at least 400 peacekeepers. The UN peacekeepers failed both in keeping the town from being taken and preventing the massacre from being conducted by members of the Bosnian Serb Army (Yannis, 2004).

In the wake of the many failures by states and international bodies in responding to or preventing these and other atrocities, many people were left with the unshakeable knowledge that something more needed to be done to protect the human rights of people living in unpredictable environments.

In the Responsibility to Protect Doctrine, the International Convention on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) proposed in 2001 that being a sovereign state did not only mean state rights, but state responsibilities. The main tenets of the document hold that:

The State carries the primary responsibility for the protection of populations from mass atrocities such as genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic

cleansing. The international community has a responsibility to assist States in fulfilling this responsibility. The international community should use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to protect populations from these crimes. If a State fails to protect its populations or is in fact the perpetrator of crimes, the international community must be prepared to take stronger measures, including the collective use of force through the UN Security Council (<http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/about-rtop>, p. 1).

R2P is a different concept from humanitarian intervention in that humanitarian intervention generally refers to military intervention alone. R2P seeks to prevent crimes and includes many measures such as sanctions, negotiations, and political pressure among others. States are expected to take the primary responsibility in prevention. Military intervention is considered a last resort, only to be used when authorized by the Security Council and after all other measures have failed. The three pillars of R2P are as follows:

1. **The responsibility to prevent:** addressing root causes of internal conflict. The ICISS considered this the most important obligation.
2. **The responsibility to react:** responding to situations of compelling human need with appropriate measures that could include sanctions, prosecutions, or military intervention.
3. **The responsibility to rebuild:** providing full assistance with recovery, reconstruction, and reconciliation

(<http://www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/adviser/responsibility.shtml>).

At the 2005 World Summit, R2P was unanimously adopted. It is understood that the use of force is considered only as a last resort. R2P stresses preventative measures as highly important to avoid the need for drastic intervention measures. R2P represents the last major change in the evolution of peacekeeping until the creation of the FIB in the DRC in 2012. Peacekeeping has changed enough to allow the addition of an armed brigade to be used in a UN peacekeeping mission. The following is a case study of the unique situation the DRC finds itself in, and the basis for the UN intervention there.

CHAPTER II

CASE STUDY OF THE DRC

It is not the purpose of this paper to recreate a history of the DRC. The history of the region is rich and varied, and impacts directly on the needs of the region, however, a synopsis must serve for the purposes of this paper. A much deeper analysis of the history of the region can be found in the book *King Leopold's Ghost*, by Adam Hochschild (1998). A more recent contemporary history can be found in *Dancing in the Glory of Monsters*, by Jason Stearns (2011).

The DRC is an exceptionally large state, as large as most of Western Europe, at over 900,000 square miles, and boasts a population of over 60 million. 60% of the nation's area is forested, creating the central Congo River basin region of the state (Stearns, 2011).

This creates a barrier between the capital of Kinshasa in the west, the Southern mineral-rich areas, and the Eastern part of the Congo. The East is also quite mountainous, adding to impassability problems faced by the Congolese government when attempting to fight back rebel forces (Ibid, 2011).

The DRC is also highly diverse, home to over 250 ethnic groups who speak at least 700 local languages and dialects. The people live in crippling poverty, with a GDP per capita of around \$600, or under two US dollars a day. The mainstays of the economy are Agriculture, Fishing, and Forestry (Ibid, 2011).

The land is a mineral-rich with Cobalt, Copper, Industrial Diamonds, as well as 70% of the world's Coltan, a major component of electronics. This wealth, coupled with

an unstable government, has led to smuggling rings that have adversely affected the economy of the DRC. Infighting among groups as to whom has mining and distribution rights is common (Ibid, 2011).

In part, this is what has led to the creation of at least five main or more powerful armed groups in the DRC, while by some approximations there are hundreds of smaller and less influential rebel groups. It also important to consider, however, how the climate of conflict created a situation wherein it was more plausible to mine illicitly than to farm in the DRC. Many civilians turned to illicit mining when the land was destroyed by war or the profitability was demonstrated to be so much higher that it seemed the only option to many (Kakala & Evans-Pritchard, 2011).

To understand the DRC it is important to briefly explore the history of the region. The DRC has been in touch with European powers since the 1400s, and by the 16th century it was a steady trade partner. Countless slaves were taken from the Congolese state. By the 1870s, Belgium had a stake in the Congo, and by 1885 the infamous King Leopold of Belgium installed himself as King of what he named the Congo Free State (Hochschild, 1998).

Under Leopold's rule many atrocities were committed. Under his regime 2 to 15 million people died; the exact numbers are unknown, but likely underreported. The population of the Congo was reduced by half in 23 years. Leopold was a brutal and greedy ruler, bent on extracting as much wealth from the region as possible at the expense of the people who lived there (Ibid, 1998).

By the early 20th century, news of Leopold's brutal policies in the Congo had reached Europe, primarily due to returning Missionaries and other travelers who witnessed what was happening and reported on what they had seen. In 1908, thanks to the efforts of those who opposed him, Leopold was forced to sell the Congo to the Belgian government (Ibid, 1998).

He immediately burned all of his records, and with them his accountability evaporated. The country was decimated, the social fabric completely rearranged, and between 1908 and 1960 there was development of the now Belgian-Congolese state, but also racial segregation and significant unrest between the Congolese and the new Belgian leadership (Ibid, 1998).

In 1965 Joseph Mobutu led a successful Coup d'etat, and renamed the state Zaire. His rule lasted until 1997, through the 1994 genocide that occurred in the neighboring Rwandan state. The events that occurred during and after this atrocity set the stage for the destabilization of the DRC and the entire region (Ibid, 1998).

THE RWANDAN GENOCIDE

The genocide took place during the Rwandan civil war that began in 1990 between the Hutu led government and the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF). The RPF was largely made up of Tutsi who had previously fled Rwanda during a past conflict. After several years of fighting, the 1993 Arusha Accords were signed. This agreement created a power-sharing government allowing representation for the Tutsi people, and it appeared briefly that a more peaceful time had come to Rwanda (Stanton, 2004).

However, there were groups of Hutu within the government as well as within the population that felt that they had given too much ground. Tensions increased, and on April 6, 1994, a plane containing the moderate Hutu Rwandan President, Juvenal Habyrimana, was shot down. President Habyrimana did not survive, and the genocide began the next day, executed by Hutu soldiers, police, and militia (Prunier, 2009).

Tutsi people were the main target, but Hutu moderates were killed as well, and at least 800,000 people lost their lives in less than a hundred days. Most of them were civilians, many of them women and children. Countless others were maimed, or suffered other disabilities. The people of Rwanda were deeply traumatized, and their society and state were forever changed (Ibid, 2009).

On July 19th, 1994, the Tutsi resistance won and gained control of the government in Rwanda. As this occurred, as many as 2 million Rwandans, mostly Hutu, fled into the DRC to avoid accountability and possibly retribution. Many of these refugees were people who were directly involved in the genocide, called *genocidaires* (Ibid, 2009).

Regrouping within refugee camps began to take place along the Congolese border of Rwanda, and there were new militant factions formed. Soon after this, the Rwandan government sent military excursions into the DRC to fight the factions, fearing further killings and also the security of the new Rwandan state. The Rwandan government also stated at this time that it was concerned for the lives of the ethnic Tutsi people who had already been living in the DRC for generations, who lives might be threatened by the new factions (Ibid, 2009).

Following this, there were two civil wars in the DRC, the first of which erupted in 1996 and continued until 1997. In 1998 a second war erupted and continued until 2003. The second war, known as the Great War or Africa's World War, involved 9 African countries. It also involved at least 20 independent armed groups. It was the deadliest war since WWII and killed over 5 million people through violence, disease, and famine (Stearns, 2011).

An outcome of the first war was that the decades-long dictator of the DRC, Mobutu Sese Seko, was deposed and replaced by the rebel leader of the Tutsi in the DRC, Laurent Kabila. However, in 2001, the senior Kabila was assassinated and replaced by his son, Joseph Kabila (Ibid, 2011).

After several attempts at failed peace agreements, in 2003, a transitional government was set up, headed by Joseph Kabila. During the decade between 2003 and 2012, Rwandan troops left the country, a new constitution was created, general elections were held, and the junior Kabila was announced as President. However, there was reported strife during the election process of 2008 and renewed clashes in the East that continued into 2012 (Ibid, 2011).

EVENTS PRECIPITATING THE FORCE INTERVENTION BRIGADE

In 2012, there was little government control in the east, and as many as 25 rebel factions operating there. The eastern part of the country was overcome with different groups vying for control of the area's economic resources, as well as control of the people. MNCs such as Heinekin added to the destabilization of the region by creating a "checkpoint economy," paying off checkpoint soldiers. In a country with poor

infrastructure like the DRC, as much as \$700,000 a year can be made at one checkpoint. This creates a pivotal source of revenue for rebels (UN S/2008/773).

Because the Congolese army and police could not control the entire state, swaths of territory were left wide open to grabs for control. Of the groups that were active in the DRC in 2012 probably the most important and powerful of these was the M23. Made up of Tutsi rebels and reputedly backed by Rwandan resources, though denied by Rwanda, the M23's control reached deep into the eastern DRC region. The M23 was originally controlled by Laurent Nkunda before his incarceration, a Congolese Tutsi who was previously a general in the Congolese army, who then fought for the RPF against the Hutu in Rwanda during the Rwandan Genocide (Prunier, 2009).

After the RPF won, Nkunda returned to the DRC and fought in the ensuing Congolese wars. During the transition period he did a stint in the formal government, but later defected and created the Congress for the Defence of the People (CNDP). Most of the members of M23 were formerly in the CNDP, formed in 2007 (Ibid, 2009).

Nkunda stated that he was defending the interests of the Tutsi minority in eastern DRC who were subjected to attacks by Hutus who had fled after their involvement with the Rwandan Genocide. Nkunda and his army of 8000 was accused of many human rights abuses, including rape, murder, and child soldier recruitment. He was arrested in 2009, and succeeded by Bosco Ntaganda (Ibid, 2009).

In 2012, the former members of the CNDP mutinied against the government of the DRC, within which they had been integrated. They then formed the M23, so called

because of the March 23rd peace deal which had ended the CNDP and incorporated everyone into the national structure (UN SC/10964).

M23 claimed that the Congolese government did not adhere to the structure of the agreement in terms of proper salaries, repatriation of Congolese refugees, and Tutsi representation. So again, a situation arose wherein the Tutsi minority population felt it was not getting equal civil rights and representation within government-the exact precursors to the genocide in Rwanda in 1994 (Rodriguez, 2013).

The Congolese government claimed that the CNDP was an army within the army and running its own power network in the Eastern part of the DRC while smuggling minerals illegally. The Congolese government had begun to try to break up this power structure when the rebellion was launched in November of 2012 by the former CNDP and current M23 (Stearns, Verweijen, & Baaz, 2013).

The rebels managed to seize the eastern capital of Goma on November 20th, 2012, a city and surrounding area of about 1 million people. The M23 eventually withdrew under a new agreement with the Congolese government. This occurred with operation MONUSCO in full force and over 17,000 UN peacekeepers on the ground (Stearns, et. al., 2013).

This is this event was the tipping point that led to the creation of the FIB in March of 2013. It became clear that the current force could not keep the region stable, and an offensive force was necessary to create stability, as well as a credible threat of force that might subdue the rebel forces in the region.

Just prior to the creation of the FIB, in February of 2013, what is known as the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the Democratic Republic of Congo and the Region came into being and was signed by eleven countries in the region and the leaders of four international organizations: the Chairperson of the African Union Commission, the Chairperson of the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region, the Chairperson of the Southern African Development Community and the Secretary-General of the United Nations (UNSG, Framework of Hope, 2013).

The agreement contained commitments for the DRC, the region, and the international community. The DRC committed to security sector reform, consolidating state authority, structural reform, improving the economy, and reconciliation. The region, including states bordering the DRC, committed to respect the sovereignty of surrounding states, to decline to provide assistance to armed groups, to strengthen regional cooperation, and to not harbor those accused of war crimes. The international community agreed to remain engaged with the region, to support economic revitalization, to keep MONUSCO under review, and to provide a special UN envoy (Ibid, 2013).

The eleven signatories of the Framework in addition to the international leaders are: Angola, Burundi, the Central Africa Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, South Africa, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia (Ibid, 2013).

The FIB was created as part of the UN's international commitment to the DRC and the stability of middle Africa. In summary, the main circumstances under which the FIB was created include decades-long and intense conflict and instability within the DRC, the loss of millions of lives in the biggest war since WWII, the loss of billions of

dollars in resources, the fall of Goma and the lack of effectiveness of MONUSCO, the participation of regional entities, the participation of the DRC which helped assuage sovereignty issues, the agreement and cooperation of the UNSC, and the lack of another viable option.

Next, this research will conduct a focused examination of the creation & implementation of the FIB, including a discussion of the FIB's successes and failures.

CHAPTER III

THE CREATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FORWARD

INTERVENTION BRIGADE

As previously discussed, the UN has been using peacekeeping strategies in conflict-stricken DRC for around 19 years. The violence taking place in the DRC over the last two decades has been extreme, rendering the state one of the most dangerous places on earth. Sexual violence is rampant, with one recent study citing 48 rapes an hour of women and girls, including infant girls (Peterman, 2011). The UN has called the country the center of rape as a weapon of war. Some have said that the DRC is the worst place on earth to be female.

Child soldier recruitment is a major concern; the UN has documented almost 4,200 cases of recruitment of boys and girls by both government and rebel forces between 2010 and 2013. According to the 5th UN report on Children and Armed Conflict in the DRC, one-third of the cases involved children below the age of 15. Recruitment numbers have also increased since the conflict has intensified in the last several years. Armed groups in the region do not follow local statutes or the laws of armed conflict (2014).

Add to this the enormous problem of refugees and internally displaced people: There are some 2.7 million internally displaced people (IDPs) within the country in 2014 due to ongoing armed conflict in the east. Also due mainly to the conflict in the eastern part of the country, approximately 430,000 refugees from the DRC remain in neighboring

countries, particularly Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania (UNHCR Country Operations Profile DRC, 2015).

As the second largest country in Africa, with an area around the same size as all of western Europe, and with borders alongside Uganda, Rwanda, the Central African Republic, Angola, Tanzania, Zambia, South Sudan, Burundi, and Republic of the Congo, the stability of the DRC greatly affects the stability of its neighbors, as well as the entire African continent (Stearns, 2011).

Rebel groups such as M23 and others have operated with impunity within the country, vying for control of territory and mineral resources. The most unstable region is in the Eastern part of the DRC, including the North and South Kivu mountains, where most of the state's mineral reserves and other major resources lie (Boutellis, 2013).

In November of 2012, the notorious rebel group M23 occupied the eastern DRC provincial capital of Goma for one week. This happened in the face of a Peacekeeping force of nearly 20,000. A number of human rights violations were recorded during the occupation of the city (Ibid, 2013). This was an important culminating event in a decades-long fight for power and control of government and economic resources that has left the DRC shattered and dangerous.

After the successful occupation of Goma, the credibility of UN Peacekeeping was called into question within the DRC and the International community. In the DRC in Kisangani, UN vehicles were burned by protesters while MONUSCO buildings were stoned. French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius said after the fall of Goma that "...it was

absurd that MONUSCO couldn't stop the rebels from taking over the city (Dixon, 2012, p. 1).”

The Congolese government, steeped in corruption and lacking infrastructure as well as a well-trained and well-equipped army, has had little capacity to meet the challenges presented to its security. The Armed Forces of the DRC (FARDC) is not equipped to handle the challenges of the state. It is this lack of capacity, coupled with both the DRC government and the regional leadership's hope for a new solution that led to the creation of the FIB.

The current operational UN mandate in the state is called the UN organization stabilization mission in the DRC, or MONUSCO, and was established in 2010. It represents a reworking of the original UN mandate in DRC called the Mission in DRC, or MONUC, established in 1999, four years after the genocide in neighboring Rwanda. The mandate comprises, in addition to the appropriate civilian, judiciary, and correction components, a maximum of 19,815 military personnel, 760 military observers, 391 police personnel and 1,050 members of formed police units (UN S/RES/2098).

Under the mandate established in 2010, MONUSCO was already authorized to use *all necessary means* to carry out its mandate relating, among other things, to the protection of civilians, humanitarian personnel, and human rights defenders under imminent threat of physical violence as well as to support the government of the DRC in its stabilization and peace consolidation efforts (Ibid, 2010).

However, there are obstacles that stand in the way of motivating UN peacekeeping forces to actually use military force to protect civilian lives. Many states

have contributed troops to the standing force and command can get tricky in regard to the interpretation of a specific mandate.

Governments interpret the directives differently, and give conflicting authorizations to their troops. In addition to this, peacekeeping forces are unused to fighting battles, may be gravely under-armed, and have a history of backing down with impunity when battles loom, which has created a culture of bystanderism among UN peacekeeping forces. States also have little taste for risk-taking in peacekeeping missions, for ethical, political, and economic reasons (Raghavan, 2013).

Previous failures of MONUSCO to protect civilians or create stabilization in the DRC created a need for a review of current operations and the consideration of new ideas. The concept of the FIB was created at the International Conference of the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR) and was supported by the African Union (AU) and South African Development Community (SADC), later adopted by UN resolution in 2014 (UN S/RES/2147).

The time was right for a more confrontational move on the part of the Congolese government and the UN. After intense and decades long instability within the DRC and the region, the loss of over 5 million lives during the ongoing wars since 1994, the loss of billions of dollars in revenue for the DRC from the illicit resource trade being conducted in the country, a lack of consistent leadership within MONUSCO, the lack of effectiveness of MONUSCO and the fall of Goma, and the lack of consensus within the UNSC, there was a shift toward collaboration between regional entities, the UN, and the DRC (Boutellis, 2013).

Regional states, and most importantly, the DRC itself, supported the move. Countries such as Tanzania pre-emptively offered to contribute troops to the FIB. Because of the instability that regional actors were forced to endure over decades during the disintegration of the power structure in the DRC, the time was finally ripe for a consensus around the necessary measures of address. This greatly enhanced the opportunities for the success of the mission.

The UN adopted the proposal and incorporated it into MONUSCO in 2012. Although this is not the first time the UN has authorized force, the FIB does represent a move from peacekeeping to “peace enforcement” in the opinions of many (Cammaert, 2013).

In late March of 2013 the UN announced its intention through UN Resolution 2098 to send the FIB into the eastern portion of the DRC. The FIB was created as an extension of MONUSCO and the initial length of the mandate was one year (UN S/RES/2098).

The FIB consists of 3000 soldiers within the MONUSCO troop ceiling of 19,815: three infantry battalions, one artillery, and one Special Forces and Reconnaissance Company. Troops were contributed by Tanzania, South Africa, and Malawi. Headquarters are stationed in Goma, under direct command of the MONUSCO Force Commander (UN SC/10964, 2013).

This brigade is the first-ever offensive combat force created by the UNSC. The mandate of the FIB was highly specific: “to carry out targeted operations to neutralize and disarm the notorious 23 March Movement (M23), as well as other Congolese rebels

and foreign armed groups in strife-riven eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (Ibid, 2013).

REGIONAL COOPERATION OF THE FIB

It is important to highlight the regional cooperative nature of the FIB. It is not a unilateral action on the part of the UN, but as previously outlined, a highly cooperative effort between the UN, UNSC, AU, and others.

The regional aspect of this intervention is important in light of the fact that African powers such as Rwanda, Uganda and South Africa as well as other neighboring governments have seen the DRC's instability as a threat to regional stability, as well as an opportunity to exploit the DRC's abundant unprotected natural resources, and have previously been accused of being part of the problem by backing up certain armed factions within the DRC (Cammaert, 2013).

The Rwandan government, specifically, has had a heavy hand in the affairs of the DRC. According to many experts, Rwanda's support for armed groups as well as its sometime direct intervention in Congo have been a primary force for continuing the conflict (Lezhnev and Prendergast, 2013).

Rwanda has many interests in the DRC, ranging from security to economic. The Rwandan government's concern about security centers on the armed group called the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR). This group is situated in Eastern DRC, and is populated by Hutu Genocidaires that helped perpetrate the Rwandan genocide (Ibid, 2013).

In addition, the FDLR has at times worked in concert with Congolese forces, although an attempt to incorporate the FDLR into the FARDC failed. The FDLR has between 1500 to 2500 troops, but Rwanda has concerns that there are troops waiting in the wings (Ibid, 2013).

Some analysts believe that the FDLR does not present as much of a threat as the Rwandan government has stated. However, the FDLR "...has a long history of creating instability and spawning reactionary armed groups in eastern Congo, has a hardcore leadership, has committed terrible atrocities against Congolese communities since 1994, and has reportedly attacked Rwanda four times over the past year (Ibid, 2013, p. 2)."

The Rwandan government has stated that while the FDLR continues to operate in the DRC, it poses an existential threat to the Rwandan government in no small part because it continues to operate under the same ideology that helped create the Rwandan Genocide. In addition to the security risk that Rwanda faces due to an unstable DRC, there are also its economic interests in the region, which are many and varied. It is not alone in this, as Uganda and others have also been involved in the illegal smuggling of DRC minerals (Ibid, 2013).

According to a report by the Enough Project, "Rwanda has allegedly benefited significantly from minerals traders smuggling Congo's conflict minerals—in particular, tin, tantalum, and tungsten- for several years, with some Rwandan traders allegedly relabeling Congolese minerals as Rwandan and selling them on the global marketplace, according to numerous U.N. Group of Experts' investigative reports (Ibid, 2013, p. 3).

Rwanda has its own minerals sector but is also a convenient trading post for Congolese minerals. Rwanda's economy is dependent on trading Congolese minerals because of its trade deficit, something that the Rwandan leadership very aware of as a problem (Ojulu, 2013).

As part of a solution to this dependence on the Congolese mineral trade, the Rwandan government was placed under heavy diplomatic pressure and offered a financial package by the World Bank to ensure the cooperation of its government in the new initiative to stabilize the region. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the government of the DRC also agreed to cooperative efforts with the FIB and formally invited MONUSCO to take further action to help the government achieve its goal of security of the state and the state's economic resources (Boutellis, 2013).

ANALYSIS OF THE FIB: SUCCESS OR FAILURE?

Unfortunately, it is very difficult to find fully substantiated data on exactly what is going on currently in the DRC in regard to FIB's actions there. Likely, more information will become available at a later date. What can be gleaned from newspaper reports, academic research blogs, and UN statements, is presented here.

Upon arrival to the DRC in July of 2013, the UN Special Representative Martin Kobler commented "Our task is to dissolve political blockage, to end occupation by armed forces, to restore state authority, and to bring back hope to the people (Kulish & Sengupta, 2013, p. 1)." Soon after implementation, FIB completed its first objective: the defeat of the armed group M23.

After years of the Congolese government battling the notorious group, it took only four days, from October 25 to October 28 in 2013 for the DRC to defeat the group with the FIB's help. The FARDC led the initiative, with the FIB playing a supporting role under its commander at the time, Lieutenant General Carlos dos Santos Cruz (Ibid, 2013).

The FIB engaged via artillery, aerial attacks, and snipers, among other means. There were no reports of human rights abuses committed during this offensive. In terms of combatant deaths, there have been two UN soldiers lost from FIB since boots have been on the ground (Vogel, 2014).

This represented the first major success of the FIB. M23 was successfully compelled to return to the negotiating table and signed the Uganda-mediated Joint ICGLR-SADC Kampala Dialogue agreement in November of 2013. The points of the agreement are as follows:

- (i) Decision by M23 to end rebellion and transform itself into a legitimate political party;
- (ii) Amnesty to members of M23 only for acts of war and insurgency;
- (iii) Transitional security arrangements leading to disarmament;
- (iv) Release of M23 members under detention by the DRC Government for acts of war and rebellion;
- (v) Demobilization of the former M23 combatants;
- (vi) Return of refugees and internally displaced persons to their homes;

- (vii) Formation of a commission to handle confiscated, extorted, stolen, looted and destroyed properties, including land;
- (viii) National reconciliation and justice;
- (ix) Social, security and economic reforms;
- (x) Implementation of the conclusions of the review of the implementation of the 23rd March 2009 Agreement; and
- (xi) Implementation, monitoring and evaluation mechanism for the agreed positions (p. 1-2).

In an article by the Al Jazeera network, DRC Government spokesman Lambert Mende said that "The document is very clear: there is no blanket amnesty. Those who are presumed to have committed criminal behavior in terms of international law, war crimes or crimes against humanity will not be reinserted into society." (Al Jazeera, 2013).

The talks were originally begun in December of 2012, after M23 seized control of the eastern capital of Goma and the DRC government agreed to negotiate, but stalled when the M23 decided to return to military engagement of the DRC government (Jones & Smith, 2012).

The FIB successfully contributed to deterring the M23 from continuing its onslaught on the cities of eastern DRC and to agree to cease and desist and demobilize. The M23 has maintained its status as demobilized and there have been no further reported instances of the group reforming or launching attacks within the DRC (UN General Assembly, 2014).

However, Human Rights Watch reported that unidentified rebels killed more than 180 civilians in the eastern DRC from September to December 2014. Although this in no way has been linked to any elements of M23, it is important to note that there were no defense of those civilians on the part of the UN peacekeeping mission, and no identification of the rebel forces, according to their report on the DRC (2014).

AFTER DEMOBILIZING M23

After the demobilization of the M23, the Congolese army and the FIB set their sights on the Allied Democratic Forces (ADF) in January of 2014, an anti-Ugandan group that lurks at the border of the DRC and Uganda, carrying out attacks against Ugandans and Congolese (Vogel, 2014).

With the help of the FIB over a six month period, it has been reported that the majority of ADF bases have been destroyed, and the ADF itself weakened. Major human rights violations did not occur. However, UN officials as well as humanitarian aid workers have been targeted by armed groups since the attacks on the ADF (Vogel, 2014). There was no word about how they were targeted or if lives were lost.

The next target for the FIB and the FARDC was a rebel group known as the APCLS, or the Alliance of Patriots for a Free and Sovereign Congo. According to reports, this occurred due to an attack by APCLS on army units. There were three FARDC officers killed in an ambush in northwest Masisi, according to an unsubstantiated report (Mueller, 2014).

There were many battles, in Nyabiondo, Kashebere, Kibarizo, Lwibo, and Lukweti. In a skirmish in April of 2014, three South African peacekeepers with the FIB

were wounded, and six Congolese soldiers were killed with three wounded. In these particular battles, there were reports of human rights abuses being committed by Congolese soldiers (Ibid, 2014).

Because the mandate of the FIB specifies that it may not work with soldiers or leaders that have been accused of HR violations, this is problematic. Violations on the part of the Congolese army have been reported all through the conflict in the DRC. Part of the agreement the UN has with the DRC government is that it must not allow these abuses to occur, or forgo cooperation with the FIB.

Also of concern is a report that the APCLS cooperated with the Congolese FARDC in its attempt to root out the M23. Following this, there was an attempt to integrate the APCLS into the Congolese army which failed. At some point after, the APCLS attacked factions of the army (Ibid, 2014).

The APCLS is mainly Hunde in ethnicity, and some Hunde have reported that they believe the FARDC is hoping to destroy their group. Allegedly, in February of 2013 when fighting broke out between the FARDC and the APCLS in Kitchanga, 146 people were killed and 516 houses burned. These claims remain unconfirmed (Ibid, 2014).

It is definitely of concern that the UN brigade could be perceived as participating in a movement to eliminate an ethnic group in the DRC, as unlikely as the idea may be, perceptions do matter. When MONUSCO was falling out of favor with Congolese people, as previously discussed, there were demonstrations and rock-throwing, as well as the burning of some UN vehicles.

Lessons learned from the past must be applied today in regard to the FIB's actions. The mission can only succeed so long as it has the support of the majority of Congolese people. The UN must be careful in its dealings with the FARDC, and uphold the structure of the mandate in order to avoid this.

THE PRESENT MISSION OF THE FIB

The FIB has been attempting to engage the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR) since prior to engaging the ADF, but has faced obstacles to cooperation from the Congolese FARDC. It is unclear as to the exact reasons why this is so. The FDLR have been a grave threat to DRC security since the Rwandan genocide, when a majority of its members fled into eastern DRC. Additionally, this is the group that is of most concern to Rwanda, and has previously prompted Rwandan intervention in the DRC (Vogel, 2014).

The group resides in the North and South Kivu areas of the DRC, the areas that have seen the most instability and conflict during the wars. These are remote areas with mountainous terrain, and very difficult to navigate. The FDLR has reputedly taken over many local villages, committed atrocities, and is a major participant in the mineral smuggling game. It supports itself through its illicit activities and various checkpoints, where the group extorts crossing fees (Long, 2014).

The FIB has not begun unilateral engagement of the FDLR, but is waiting for the participation of the Congolese government. As of now, Tanzanian and South African troops within the FIB also do not have clearance from their governments to engage the FDLR; it is unclear as to why this particular group seems to resist address (Vogel, 2014).

In February of this year, the FARDC finally attacked FDLR forces, but without the cooperation of the FIB. President Joseph Kabila told ambassadors in Kinshasa, including Martin Kobler, Special Representative of the UN Secretary General in the DRC, that the Congolese government would not avail itself of any help from the UN in this operation, according to an ISS Peace and Security Council Report (2015).

The announcement by government spokesperson Lambert Mende was as follows: ‘The head of state officially announced to its partners that the DRC renounces any cooperation with MONUSCO in the operation of disarmament against the FDLR (Ibid, 2015, p. 4).’

According to Mende, Kabila also told the DRC’s partners and ambassadors to refrain from making statements that do not respect the state. “We want to say to the various actors, the DRC is not under guardianship of the UN or anyone else (Ibid, 2015, p. 4).”

In terms of the apparent falling out between the UN peacekeeping mission and the DRC government, this statement was discovered:

The conflict between the DRC and the UN seems to have started when the UN requested that the Congolese government replace two generals appointed to head the military operation against the FDLR, due to their alleged involvement in human rights abuses. The generals, Bruno Mandevu and Fall Sikabwe, have been on the UN’s red list for years. To cooperate with the Congolese government with the generals involved would have been a violation of MONUSCO’s mandate. The DRC’s motive for these actions is unclear (Ibid, 2015, p. 5).

According to a UN spokesperson, “It is a contradiction of basic UN principles for UN peacekeepers to cooperate with a military operation led by individuals who stand accused of war crimes and grave human rights abuses (Ibid, 2015, p. 5).”

The Congolese army stands accused of all the same crimes as the rebel groups in the DRC. Rapes, murders, corruption, and smuggling are among the reported crimes. According to the UN, the FIB is not working with any known offenders and if an officer witnesses anything illegal they are mandated to stop the illegal activity and to not cooperate in directives with that section of the army. However, at times, even UN peacekeepers themselves have been accused of rape, smuggling, and other crimes (UN MONUSCO, 2015).

After its initial announcement, the DRC stated that nothing was stopping MONUSCO from "...carrying out its own operations against the FDLR." Allegedly, Mende told Radio Okai that "This...doesn't concern other missions that MONUSCO has been charged with."(ISS Report, 2015, p. 4)

The UNSC resolution 2098 (2015) does indeed include in the mandate that the FIB can find and disarm armed groups with or without the FARDC, but UN leadership has elected to refrain from unilateral action.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE MISSION

The FIB's continued engagement in the APCLS operations is likely to undermine MONUSCO's position in Masisi, according to some analysts. There are concerns that a backlash may arise if MONUSCO continues against the APCLS, and it is perceived as taking sides. (Vogel, 2015).

According to Christoph Vogel, "...the FIB will also be judged by its performance as regards the FDLR ...MONUSCO itself and the FIB are not to be blamed because...the real problems are located at the level of the DRC government, regional diplomacy, and

high-level politics at the UN Security Council and troop-contributing countries. (Vogel, 2014).

DISCUSSION

The success of the FIB may also be measured in terms of the success of demobilizing armed groups, civilian lives saved, decreases in the instance of rape and child soldier recruitment, increased security within the DRC as well as at its borders, and securing the DRC's natural resources.

So far, the FIB has been successful in helping the FARDC defeat the armed groups they have faced in concert. However, the FIB has not been able to contribute to the FARDC's offensive against the FDLR, due to being restrained by its mandate in regard to FARDC's current leadership, as well as the DRC government's request that the FIB act independently if it acts against the FDLR.

The FIB's mandate, as mentioned before, does not require it to act in cooperation with the FARDC. It can launch independent missions. However, it is clear that MONUSCO wishes to remain cooperative with the DRC government.

If the FIB were ordered to attack the FDLR independently of the DRC government, even though the DRC forces are engaging the FDLR as well, future cooperation between the two parties could be jeopardized within an already strained relationship. However, if it does not act, and the FARDC does not act seriously to combat the FDLR, the local civilian population will remain at risk and the credibility of MONUSCO could be further compromised.

The FDLR also presents a threat to regional stability in the eyes of the Rwandan government. Populated by genocidaires, and having perpetrated attacks on local DRC enclaves of ethnic Tutsi, it is one of the main reasons Rwanda has been so closely involved in the DRC. If this issue is not addressed to the satisfaction of the Rwandan government, its continuance of a hands-off policy may be compromised.

Lives have most definitely been saved as a result of demobilizing several of the armed groups in the DRC, however, it is difficult if not impossible to quantify how many lives have been saved. Future research on the rates of the loss of civilian lives previous to and post the FIB could shed some light.

The demobilization of these groups has hopefully decreased instances of rape, as well as child soldier recruitment. However, as above, to truly get a sense of the effectiveness of the FIB in these areas, future research will have to be conducted to compare current trends with previous data. The intensification of the current conflict in late 2011 and early 2012 did lead to increased child soldier recruitment levels (UN General Assembly, 2014).

The ICC's conviction in March 2012 of Thomas Lubanga, who was found guilty of the war crime of enlisting and conscripting children under the age of 15 and using them in hostilities, was an important step towards ending impunity for such crimes. However, the Congolese government has consistently failed to fully investigate and bring to justice militants who are recruiting and using children in the conflicts in the DRC (Ibid, 2014).

In October of 2012, the UN-DRC coalition did make some progress on this issue. The government of the DRC and the United Nations officially committed to ending the recruitment and use of children by Congolese armed forces and security services by signing an Action Plan, which will allow for consistent assessment of the child soldier epidemic in the DRC (Ibid, 2014).

The question remains as to whether anything like the FIB could ever be appropriate for conflicts such as the Syrian conflict. If the host state is non-cooperative, and yet there remains a great humanitarian crisis that has compromised regional peace and security, could the UN be within its legal rights to intervene?

Although the UN has declared the FIB to be a development unique to its mission in the DRC, there has been an unverifiable report that a similar force might be deployed in the Central African Region (CAR) (Reuters, 2014). Similar forces may well be used in other intractable conflicts like that seen in CAR.

Presently, it is most likely impossible for the UN to act unilaterally in most cases. In the case of Syria, for example, the UN must respect the UNSC's failure to act due to the lack of Russian and Chinese support for intervention in the region. However, there have been suggestions made toward UNSC reform made by both the UK and France. It is possible that someday future use of the veto could be governed by an external council.

The final deliverables of the FIB remain to be seen, and future research should shed some light on its effectiveness, failures, and possible best practices for future endeavors of this kind. Until then, forces like the FIB remain a possibly quite effective

modern addition to present-day peacekeeping missions, barring its abuse as a possible weapon of international politics.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHANGING FACE OF PEACEKEEPING

One of the main concerns surrounding the creation of the FIB is the idea that UN neutrality, as well as state sovereignty, is being compromised. This is a legitimate concern, for the UN charter clearly states that the UN is a servant for the states-it generally cannot act independently of states.

The FIB has created a situation wherein the UN has become a party to the conflict, in the opinions of some. This means that not only the FIB, but perhaps other UN peacekeepers, could be seen as legitimate and legal targets. It is even possible that under the laws of war they *could* be legitimately legal targets. This could restrict the UN's movements in other states and in future crisis situations (Cambanis, 2014).

Further, this new move could endanger humanitarian aid work. Humanitarian aid workers, although not entirely safe, have generally been perceived as a protected class of citizens within conflict zones. The UN's move toward militarizing peacekeeping to a degree could also create perceptions that protected classes such as aid workers are legitimate targets as well (Rieff, 2003).

However, the international arena today is in flux. There are conflicts that exist that defy resolution and that place tens of thousands of people in great humanitarian danger. The DRC is one such case, a special case, a conflict that has remained for too long and harmed too many people.

As the development of the international community has progressed, the enhancement of individual state power has been on the downswing. Although for over

300 years, the nation-state has been the main organizing principle in the world, the power of the state is now being challenged more than ever.

With the rise of technology, independent non-state actors capable of waging war such as ISIL, multi-national corporations that challenge state power in such ways as paying fees that finance warfare at the checkpoints of anti-government armed groups, and the new fluid state border, there is a need for support of the independence of states as well as the independence of oppressed people from states that harm their citizens.

The UN is a partial answer to this power vacuum. By assisting states like the DRC in cooperation with other regional entities in stabilizing its borders and securing its resources, as well as in creating a safer state for its citizens, it is helping to ensure peace, which is one of its primary goals.

The DRC is as large as Western Europe and bordered by nine African countries; it is key to regional stability. To allow the DRC to remain under the unrelenting influence of various armed groups creates a state of chaos on the African continent that affects all neighbors of the DRC directly, as well as the stability of the rest of the country.

However, one of the primary questions remains, what if the UN, in the future, acted with force with the approval of the UNSC but without the permission of the state it was intervening within? It has been done before, within Libya and utilizing a multi-state coalition and NATO, with mixed results (Kuperman, 2013).

The idea that the UNSC would act without a coalition of states and regional support is unlikely. Even in the DRC, where we see the UN making its most prominent

moves, it is acting not only with UNSC consent, but with the cooperation of many international and regional entities.

The UN is responding to the changing times. The times demand a new response to the humanitarian crises that affect people in long war-torn states, as well as the need for state stability to create regional stability and cohesiveness within the international arena.

Further, in recent times we have witnessed an increase of civilian deaths in war and the continuation of events such as genocide and mass killing. Sometimes these events are perpetrated by states against their citizens, or not contained by states that perceive an event as occurring or about to occur.

According to UNICEF, Civilian fatalities in wartime climbed from 5 per cent of total war fatalities at the turn of the century, to 15 per cent during World War I, to 65 per cent by the end of World War II, to more than 90 per cent in the wars of the 1990s (UNICEF, 2015).

Another large problem is the unprecedented increase in refugees and IDPs, a major humanitarian crisis. According to a UN report, in 2013 the number of people living as refugees exceeded 50 million, for the first time since WWII. The number has also increased by six million since 2012, largely due to the conflict in Syria. Add to this the fact that developing countries are host to 86% of the world's refugees, with wealthy countries caring for only 14% (UNHCR, 2015).

The international community has been moving toward a better response system for such events. Failures such as the non-address of the Rwandan Genocide and the

failures in Sudan illustrate the need to continue searching for ways to successfully keep violence against civilians as contained as possible.

However, this move toward peace enforcement on the part of the UN should not be undertaken without serious scrutiny. There are many things state governments and international institutions must take into consideration when contemplating intervention in conflict. In the following, this research will briefly touch upon some of these topics.

CONSIDERATIONS OF INTERVENTION

In light of the post-cold-war changes taking place in the international arena in 1995, Eva Bertram asked what the perils and promises were of UN peace building activities, and whether or not this bold new move in the international world was a violation of legal state sovereignty. Bertram claimed that the record of UN peace building activities were mixed, and that the UN faced serious challenges because of specific dilemmas that she saw as the tension between peace building and the basis of the UN charter on principles of sovereignty, neutrality, and democratic peace processes.

Bertram illuminated the contradictory nature of the UN value of democratic elections and people's rights, versus UN activity when actively backing governments or conversely, rebel factions, militarily, especially when that action on the part of the UN will affect the course of history.

Bertram saw the primary conflicts between principle and practice to be pivotal. Her theory pointed out that even beyond these dilemmas, the UN faced other constraints, such as the limits of the political will of other member states and local institution capacity.

The post-cold war generation of peacekeeping, in Bertram's opinion, reflected two marked departures from traditional peacekeeping. The first was the move of the UN toward greater military involvement and the transition to the idea of peace enforcement. The second was the move toward a more prominent role for the UN as an agent of democratic transitions. This translated into building the political conditions for a democratic peace that was sustainable, instead of merely keeping peace between hostile states.

This creates unique difficulties in terms of neutrality, relative power, and questionable motivations. The UN's neutrality falls under scrutiny in these situations because it appears difficult if not impossible to take a stance of neutrality while actively trying to help one party to the conflict relatively unequally to the other. This is something that the UN has great difficulty avoiding, however, because its involvement is often sparked because of human rights violations or state instability concerns.

Jean d'Aspremont (2008) addresses the question of UN intervention as a democracy-building instrument. D'Aspremont analyses the use of international administrations of territories to create or to reconstruct democratic states. It is his claim that modern administrations of territories have proven to be democracy-building machines, but that this has positive practical effects in the long term. To make his case, d'Aspremont cites the cases of East Timor, Kosovo, and Iraq.

In East Timor, the UN established local democratic institutions under the interim government, including an independent human rights institution and the transfer to these institutions of its administrative and public service functions. There was a consensus among the major powers that the institutions that were made must be democratic. East

Timor eventually claimed its independence in 2002, and declared itself a democratic state. It has been accepted as a UN member state, completing its successful transition.

In Kosovo, d'Aspremont states that the UN had an express mandate to build democratic institutions. It was felt by the international community that no matter what the final status of Kosovo, it would be democratic. It was made clear that the new territory would not be recognized as a state or admitted to the UN unless it was so.

In Iraq, although the UN did not create a full post-conflict administration, the powers at work in Iraq directed the establishment of a new democratic government. The interim government, however, was not democratic. It was to be representative of the differing political, religious, and ethnic parts of Iraq, and was not required to be elected.

It was not until 2004 that democratic elections were thought to be necessary. D'Aspremont acknowledges that although establishing democratic institutions in Iraq did not end the violence, it was confirmation of the international trend of UN intervention toward the successful establishment of democratic states.

Conversely, in his examination of rebuilding governance in failed states and post-conflict societies, Derick W. Brinkerhoff (2005) discusses how nation-building templates, especially if they reflect a certain ideology such as democracy, can risk oversimplification and do not pay enough attention to the impact of the situational or historical factors in a specific country. However, he also notes that analysts and practitioners have made some progress in filling the knowledge gap, especially post 9/11.

Brinkerhoff states that building or rebuilding governments is ultimately the responsibility of a state's citizens and its leaders in post-conflict situations and that

external intervention alone cannot repair a state's government. However, he believes that they can support reconstruction and reform. Brinkerhoff notes that the way forward will require methods of bringing outside actors such as the UN and local actors together to work toward a better structured and more productive governance system.

It is also important to note that the act of bringing democracy to a government in and of itself can spark civil strife, ethnic cleansing, and even war. Since many genocides have included a minority population that is seeking to further the people's civil rights and representation in the government instrument, imposing democratic measures on such a state could result in a backlash either political or social, or both, that can have unexpectedly horrific results.

Let us not forget that one of the precipitating events to the tragic genocide in Rwanda was a peace agreement that granted the Tutsi minority a power-sharing government and more rights overall. Some of the Hutu majority felt this was a betrayal and an overextension of privileges-this helped spark the move toward genocide (Prunier, 2009).

Any UN actions toward a democratic government in a divided state must take these historical lessons into deep consideration, and a clear plan must be outlined that includes measures to be taken if unrest erupts, rather than the cut and run approach that has been the hallmark of many peace agreements.

Perhaps too fast a move toward democracy in a power-imbalanced society should be avoided, and a modern step-by-step approach employed, if it is possible to gain the

consensus of the parties in question and the safety of civilians can be acceptably maintained. Change may be more readily accepted by societies if it is gradual in nature.

In terms of the legality of intervention, today UN intervention in conflict zones under the authority of the UNSC has been accepted as legal under Chapter 6 and VII of the UN Charter and the R2P doctrine. If the intervention is done with a coalition of states and international organizations, its legitimacy only increases (Gassama, 2013).

Arguments today against intervention should be based less upon ideas of such interventions being illegal under international law, and instead examine them on a case by case basis, utilizing an effective analysis model of the conflict situation and a weighing of possible outcomes.

Possible negative outcomes of intervention in conflict include an inadvertent increase rather than a reduction in civilian fatalities, the jeopardizing of humanitarian aid workers and missions, the transformation of UN peacekeepers from legally protected military personnel to military targets, the further destabilization of the state in question, leaving the state in question open to manipulation by more powerful states if a power vacuum is created, and having an exit strategy that does not include time and resources for post-conflict reconstruction and reform efforts to stabilize the state (Alston & MacDonald, 2008).

As with all interventions, costs and possible benefits must be analyzed. However, there will always be some failures and some successes. Simply because failure is a possibility, this does not preclude a responsibility to act on the behalf of people who are

in danger, not only because of armed conflict, but because of disease, poverty, sexual violence, natural disaster, refugee crises, and other humanitarian crises.

The R2P Doctrine is clear about the criteria for military interventions: right authority, just cause, right intention, last resort, proportional means, and reasonable prospects. Under the UN charter, military intervention can only be engaged in after all means of conflict resolution have been tried, such as negotiation and mediation. Some emergency situations might preclude the time it would take to try to mediate certain crisis situations-cases of genocide and mass atrocity fall under that criteria (Gassama, 2013).

The Holocaust and the Rwandan Genocide, among other tragedies, has taught the international community that too much time spent ruminating can have disastrous consequences for hundreds of thousands if not millions of people. Action in the DRC has actually taken too long, and millions of lives were lost as a result.

Interventions have provided lessons that the UN has learned from and utilized in its latest mission in the DRC. Whether or not MONUSCO and the FIB will be considered successful remains to be seen. However, even in the light of some failures, an attempt to create a more stable and safe state for civilians in the DRC was a necessary action, and agreed upon by the UNSC and a broad coalition of states and international institutions.

However, it is important to weigh costs. In 2012, Malaria claimed the lives of over 500,000 people, most of them children under the age of 5 years. Although great strides have been made in protecting vulnerable populations from the disease, more needs to be done. Some scholars argue that the treatment of poverty and disease could save

more lives than intervention in conflicts, which have more visibility because of their media coverage and spectacular nature (Ibid, 2013).

CONCLUSIONS: THE FUTURE OF PEACE ENFORCEMENT AS A PEACEKEEPING MODEL

Interventions in crises, by their nature, are not designed to deal with the root causes of conflict. Had the international community intervened in Rwanda and DRC when it had the chance, it is very possible that the resources that have been spent in the DRC thus far could have been much less.

An ounce of prevention may well be worth a pound of cure. We have very limited resources. Just as cancer is more destructive and less treatable when it is fully developed, so too is conflict. It is much cheaper to intervene early, when the signs are identified, rather than wait for a spectacular event to “justify” intervention.

What does the future look like in terms of evolving peacekeeping? Without state support of interventions in armed conflict, there will be little that can be done. States must cooperate in the face of humanitarian emergencies to address not only immediate concerns, but problems that are seen as developmental in nature.

Further work within the area of prevention is needed. The UN does have criteria that it uses to identify problem situations in the world, and that it observes. Scholars such as Gregory Stanton of Genocide Watch have identified stages of genocide. According to Stanton’s research, the building blocks of genocide are often laid down decades before any atrocities are committed (2004).

In addition to this is the idea that scholars such as Ibrahim Gassama have suggested: that R2P should be expanded to include other humanitarian crises events such as the poverty that abounds in the poorest countries, food insecurity, lack of clean water, and diseases like Ebola and Malaria. Gassama puts forth the idea of a “Responsibility to Aid,” a redefinition of global responsibilities to act prior to crisis; an obligation to address widespread misery such as that being experienced by those global citizens living in the most abject poverty (2013).

In addition to the above, there has been some talk about reformation of the UNSC by the UK and France. Both states’ governments have suggested that, rather than an unaccountable veto, there be added an expectation that the state in question resorting to it has to be asked to explain the reason for the action, in particular with regard to its consistency with the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, and to circulate a copy of the explanation as a Council document.

There is a center for UN reform, which released a recent document (UN SC/6A, 2015) in collaboration with the member states within the UN. Each state representative made a statement about where they felt UN reform should head.

The consensus seems to be a pledge to not use the veto in cases of mass atrocity crimes, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and genocide. In addition to this is the idea of many within the General Assembly that there should be a phasing out of the veto, but some believe in an expansion of the UNSC with an extension of the veto to new members, and with higher accountability to the GA (Ibid, 2015).

However, it seems clear that such change is far off into the future. According to UNSC documents, “The framework document indicates that with a few exceptions, stated positions have not significantly changed during the last few years. In most of the submissions, support for specific expansion models remains qualified in ways that cannot easily be reconciled. The notion of a comprehensive framework resolution emerging and succeeding anytime soon seems quite unrealistic (Ibid, 2015, p. 3).

The FIB represents a new era in Peacekeeping strategy. The UN has now effectively helped to create, train and man a force that is capable of leveling a credible threat of force when attempting to use successful peacekeeping strategies. It has done so in concert with the government of the DRC and the surrounding states.

Difficulties were to be expected, however, and the UN is navigating through present obstacles by working with the DRC government. This is a policy that will perhaps enhance the UNs credibility in terms of not acting as an independent force, but in collaboration with the host state.

So too does the UN’s non-action in regard to the FDLR speak to its respect for the boundaries of the host state. Although not necessarily guaranteeing the success of its mandate, the leadership of the FIB is demonstrating its unwillingness to act as an invading force acting independently within the DRC, which is a prudent course of action. The mandate must be balanced with the reality of the arrangement itself, and the limits of UN powers.

Intervention can have unpredictable outcomes, as occurred in Libya, where a civil war is now taking place within the vacuum of power that was left when Muammar Gaddafi was deposed. Libya also stands as a testimony to the necessity for a realistic exit plan that includes post-conflict capacity building of the state (Kuperman, 2013).

However, situations like that which was about to occur in Libya can escalate quickly and unpredictably, destroying millions of lives, as happened during the Holocaust in Germany during World War II when over 11 million people were killed, or during the genocide in Rwanda in 1994, when nearly a million people were killed in less than 100 days (Stanton, 2002).

Today, when we are faced with these kinds of crises, even before they occur, we have a responsibility to act. Organized mass violence is a human problem, engineered by people and carried out by people. It requires calculation; the labeling of some people as being unfit to live, the destruction of the normal human imperative to protect and defend others of our own species, the procurement of weapons, the breakdown of the fabric of a society to allow for the destruction of some of the people who exist within it, overcoming the aversion to violence that most people have, and an engineering of the ability of people to murder other people on a mass scale through encouragement, training, and in general, a promise of immunity for one's crimes. Organized mass killing requires a plan.

Any person is capable of it, if we are to believe the reports and the historical documents wherein people describe their transformation from cooperative neighbor to murderer of their neighbors. It isn't specific to any one region or country-it has happened all over the world and within many different types of societies and cultures-it is a human problem.

When we are witnessing these events, it is an understatement to say that we are observing a severe breakdown and failure of human cooperation and society. How we respond to this problem will define not only whether or not it is ever successfully solved, but how humanity is evolving. In answering this problem, we are telling each other who we are.

The damage of events like the Holocaust cannot be easily measured in terms of lives lost, for the damage to the fabric of human society is unknowable and far-reaching-echoing into the future for an unimaginable period of time. The losses cannot be fully comprehended by the affected culture and society, the people of the region or of the world; they are unknown and unquantifiable.

This is an extraordinary problem that is relatively new to human history and will require extraordinary measures to solve. Human brains have difficulty even apprehending the reality of such events.

According to the research of Paul Slovic and others, “The [high] numbers fail to spark emotion or feeling and thus fail to motivate action (Slovic & Ziontz, 2011, p. 6).” This is something akin to the “psychic numbing” described by Robert J Lifton, who said “[There is an] incapacity to feel or to confront certain kinds of experiences due to the blocking or absence of inner forms, or imagery, that can connect with experience (1999).”

Humans are simply not equipped to comprehend the reality of the number of lives that are lost, nor understand in full the long-term costs imposed. It is beyond our capacity to grasp the enormity of the problem. In part, this is what is behind our inability or failure at times to act (Slovic & Zionts, 2011).

This is why it is necessary to have laws and institutions in place to protect those who are victimized by conflict, whether by armed groups, other states, their own governments, or their neighbors. The FIB represents a step toward UN accountability and its ability to protect. By using a credible threat of force, the UN is creating real change in the DRC.

Although there are many challenges to be met and overcome, they do not preclude the necessity of having the option of using a credible threat of force when dealing with some of the world's most intractable conflict zones, while protecting civilians, and being as cognizant of the risks as possible.

It is impossible to believe that an intervention in Rwanda that had protected the Rwandans with armed force could have possibly done more harm than the inaction that took its place. All of Africa is experiencing the long-term results that such inaction contributed to: war, disease, famine, insecurity, crimes against women and children on an incomprehensible scale, and millions of deaths-and it will haunt the international community and humanity long into the future.

REFERENCES CITED

- Alston, P. & MacDonald, E. (Eds.). (2008). *Human rights, intervention, and the use of force*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bertram, E. (1995). Reinventing governments: The promise and perils of United Nations peace building. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 39, 387-418.
- Boutellis, A. J. (2013). From crisis to reform: Peacekeeping strategies for the protection of civilians in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Stability: International Journal of Security & Development* 2, 1-11.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2005). Rebuilding governance in failed states and post-conflict societies: Core concepts and cross-cutting themes. *Public Administration and Development*, 25, 3-14.
- Cambanis, T. (2014, November 28). In Congo, Peacekeepers at War. *Boston Globe*. <https://www.bostonglobe.com/ideas/2014/11/28/congo-peacekeepers-war/zfBirYjxsokst0dZahfWCJ/story.html>.
- Cammaert, P. (2013). Issue brief: The UN intervention brigade in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *International Peace Institute*, 1-14.
- Caplan, R. (2005). *International governance of war-torn territories: Rule and reconstruction*. New York, N.Y: Oxford University Press.
- Conrad, J. (1988). *Heart of darkness*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company.
- D'Aspremont, J. (2008). Post-conflict administrations as democracy-building instruments. *Chicago Journal of International Law*, 9, 1-16.
- Dixon, R. (2012, December 22). U.N. Force in Congo, MONUSCO, Criticized as Ineffective. *Los Angeles Times*. <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/dec/22/world/la-fg-un-congo-20121223>.
- Donnelly, J. (1989). *Universal human rights in theory and practice*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Doswald-Beck, L. (2011). *Human rights in times of conflict and terrorism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Forsythe, D. P. (2000). *Human rights in international relations*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Gassama, I. J. (1994). World order in the post-cold war era: The relevance and role of the United Nations after fifty years. *Brooklyn Journal of International Law*, 2, 255-330.
- Gassama, I. J. (2013). Dealing with the world as it is: Reimagining collective international responsibility. *Washington University Global Studies Law Review*, 12, 695-753.
- Government and M23 sign peace deal. (2013, December 12). *Al Jazeera and Agencies*. Accessed on Aljazeera website:
<http://www.aljazeera.com/news/africa/2013/12/drc-government-m23-sign-peace-deal-20131212172146798110.html>.
- Gourevitch, P. (1998). *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Hobsbawm, E. (2002, February 22). War and Peace. *The Guardian*.
<http://www.theguardian.com/education/2002/feb/23/artsandhumanities.highereducation>
- Hochschild, A. *King Leopold's ghost: A story of greed, terror, and heroism in colonial Africa*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hunt, N. (2010). *Memory, war, and trauma*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Human Rights Watch. (2014, December 16). *DR Congo: Scores Killed in Rebel Attacks*. Retrieved from Human Rights Watch website:
<https://www.hrw.org/news/2014/12/16/dr-congo-scores-killed-rebel-attacks>.
- International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect. *Introduction to R2P*. Retrieved from Responsibility to Protect website:
<http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/about-rtop>.
- Issafrica. (2015, March 3). *ISS Peace and Security Council Report: Kinshasa attacks FDLR Rebels without the UN*. Retrieved from issafrica website:
<https://www.issafrica.org/pscreport/situation-analysis/kinshasa-government-attacks-fdlr-rebels-without-the-un>.
- Jones, P. & Smith, D. (2012, November 20) Congo Rebels Take Goma with little Resistance and to little Cheer. *The Guardian*.
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/nov/20/congo-rebel-m23-take-goma>.

- Kakala, T. T., & Evans-Pritchard, B. (2011). *Illegal Mining Fuels DRC Conflict*. Retrieved from Global Voices Africa website : <https://iwpr.net/global-voices/illegal-mining-fuels-drc-conflict>.
- Kulish, N. & Sengupta, S. (2013, November 12) New UN Brigade's Aggressive Stance in Africa Brings Success, and Risks. *The New York Times*.
- Kuperman, A. J. (2013). A model humanitarian intervention?: Reassessing NATO's Libya campaign. *International Security*, 38, 105-136.
- Langholtz, H. J. & Leentjes, P. (2001). *Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology for the 21st century*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Open Access.
<http://u.osu.edu/christie/about/peace-conflict-and-violence-peace-psychology-for-the-21st-century/>.
- Lezhnev, S. & Prendergast, J. (2013). *Rwanda's Stake in Congo*. Retrieved from The Enough Project website: <http://www.enoughproject.org/reports/rwanda's-stake-congo-understanding-interests-achieve-peace>.
- Lifton, R. J. (1999) Interview. Retrieved from Berkeley website:
<http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/people/Lifton/lifton-con3.html>
Long, N. (2015, April 1). DRC Army Putting Pressure on FDLR. *Voice of America News*.
- Matheson, M. J. (2001). United Nations governance of post-conflict societies. *The American Journal of International Law*, 95, 76-85.
- Mueller, T. (2014, September 12). *What Happened to the APCLS Rebel Group in 2014?* Retrieved from Timo Mueller's website:
<http://muellertimo.com/2014/09/12/what-happened-to-the-apcls-rebel-group-in-2014/>.
- Office of the Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide. *The Responsibility to Protect*. Retrieved from United Nations website:
<http://www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/adviser/responsibility.shtml>.
- Ojulu, E. (2013, August 16). Rwanda Tackles Trade Deficit. *The Independent*.
<http://www.independent.co.ug/rwanda-ed/rwanda/8128-rwanda-tackles-trade-deficit>.
- Peterman, A., Palermo, T., & Bredenkamp, C. (2011). Estimates and determinants of sexual violence against women in the Democratic Republic of Congo. *American Journal of Public Health*, 6, 1060–1067.

- Prunier, G. (2009). *Africa's world war: Congo, the Rwandan genocide, and the making of a continental catastrophe*. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.
- Raghavan, S. (2013, January 3). Record Number of UN Peacekeepers Fails to stop African Wars. *Washington Post*. http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/record-number-of-un-peacekeepers-fails-to-stop-african-wars/2014/01/03/17ed0574-7487-11e3-9389-09ef9944065e_story.html.
- Ratner, S. R. (1993). The Cambodia settlement agreements. *American Journal of International Law*, 1, 1-41.
- Reuters. (2014, March 4). *UN Plans another Force Intervention Brigade, this time for CAR*. Retrieved from defenceweb website: http://www.defenceweb.co.za/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=33833:un-plans-another-force-intervention-brigade-this-time-for-car&catid=56:diplomacy-a-peace&Itemid=111.
- Rieff, D. (2003). *A bed for the night: Humanitarianism in crisis*. New York, N.Y.: Simon and Schuster.
- Rodriguez, M. (2013, October 1). *Is it the end of M23? The Need to Make a Stand*. Retrieved from ieee.es website: http://www.ieee.es/en/Galerias/fichero/docs_analisis/2013/DIEEEA52-2013_FinDelM23_BPI_ENGLISH.pdf.
- Schabas, W. A. *Introductory Note, The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*. Retrieved from the United Nations Audiovisual Library of International Law. <http://legal.un.org/avl/ha/cppcg/cppcg.html>
- Simms, B. & Trim, D.J.B. (Eds.). (2011). *Humanitarian intervention: A history*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Slovic, P, Zionts, D, Woods, A.K., Goodman, R., & Jinks, D. (2011). Psychic numbing and mass atrocity. *The Behavioral Foundations of Public Policy*, 126-142.
- Stahn, C. (2013). Syria and the semantics of intervention, aggression and punishment. *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 11, 955.
- Stanton, G. (2012). *Countries at Risk Report-2012*. Retrieved from Genocide Watch website. <http://www.genocidewatch.org/alerts/countriesatrisk2012.html>.
- Stanton, G. (2004). Could the Rwandan genocide have been prevented. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 6, 211-228.

- Stearns, J. (2011). *Dancing in the glory of monsters: The collapse of the Congo and the great war of Africa*. New York, N.Y.: Public Affairs.
- Stearns, J., Verweijen, J. & Baaz, M. E. (2013). *The National Army and Armed Groups in the Eastern Congo: Untangling the Gordian Knot of Insecurity*. Nairobi, Kenya: Rift Valley Institute. Retrieved from Rift Valley Institute website: http://riftvalley.net/publication/national-army-and-armed-groups-eastern-congo#.VeTu_5Zkk30.
- Toft, M. (2010). *Securing the peace*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- UNICEF. *Impact of Armed Conflict on Children*. Retrieved from UNICEF website: <http://www.unicef.org/graca/patterns.htm>.
- UN Peacemaker. International Conference on the Great Lakes Region. (2013, December 12) *Joint ICGLR-SADC Final Communique on the Kampala Dialogue*. Retrieved from UN website: <http://peacemaker.un.org/drc-kampala-final-declarations2013>
- United Nations. (2008). *Final Report of the Group of Experts on the Democratic Republic of the Congo S/2008/773*. Retrieved from Scribd website: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/8921493/UN-Final-Report-of-the-Group-of-Experts-on-the-DRC>.
- United Nations. *United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission (MONUSCO) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo*. Retrieved from United Nations website: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/monusco/mandate.shtml>.
- United Nations. (2013, March 28). *Security Council Resolution S/RES/2098*. Retrieved from United Nations website: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/monusco/background.shtml>.
- United Nations. General Assembly. (2014). *5th Report on Children and Armed Conflict in the DR Congo: report of the Secretary General*. Retrieved from United Nations website: <https://childrenandarmedconflict.un.org/press-release/5th-report-on-caac-rc/>.
- United Nations. General Assembly. (2015). *Security Council Reform Framework Document as Populated by Member States*. Retrieved from the Center for United Nations Reform website: http://centerforunreform.org/sites/default/files/050515_security-council-reform-framework-document.pdf#overlay-context=.
- United Nations. General Assembly. *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Article III*. Retrieved from the United Nations website: <http://www.un-documents.net/cppcg.htm>.

- United Nations Joint Human Rights Office. (2013, May 8). *Report of the UN Joint Human Rights Office on Human Rights Violations Perpetrated by Soldiers of the FARDC and Combatants of the M23 in Goma and Sake, North Kivu Province, and in and around Minova, South Kivu Prince, from 15 November to 2 December 2012*. Retrieved from the reliefweb website:
<http://reliefweb.int/report/democratic-republic-congo/un-denounces-sexual-violence-other-serious-violations-eastern-drc>.
- United Nations Office of the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes Region of Africa. (2013, February 24). *A FRAMEWORK OF HOPE: The Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the Democratic Republic of Congo and the Region*. Retrieved from the United Nations website:
<http://www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/undpa/shared/undpa/pdf/SESG%20Great%20Lakes%20Framework%20of%20Hope.pdf>.
- United Nations Press Release SG/SM/6613. (1998, June 26). *Secretary-General Reflects on 'Intervention' in Thirty-Fifth Annual Ditchley Foundation Lecture*. Retrieved from United Nations Website:
<http://www.un.org/press/en/1998/19980626.sgsm6613.html>.
- United Nations Press Release SC/10964. (2013, March 28). *Intervention Brigade Authorized as Security Council Grants Mandate Renewal for United Nations Mission in Democratic Republic of Congo*. Retrieved from United Nations website: <http://www.un.org/press/en/2013/sc10964.doc.htm>.
- United Nations Refugee Agency. (2014, June 20). *World Refugee Day: Global forced displacement tops 50 million for first time in post-World War II era*. Retrieved from UNHCR website:
<http://www.unhcr.org/53a155bc6.html>.
- United Nations Refugee Agency. (2015). *UNHCR Country Operations Profile Democratic Republic of the Congo*. Retrieved from UNHCR website:
<http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49e45c366.html>.
- United Nations Security Council Meeting 6943. (2013). Accessed on United Nations website: <http://www.un.org/en/sc/meetings/records/2013.shtml>.
- Valentino, B. A. (2011). The true costs of humanitarian intervention. *Foreign Affairs*, 90, 60-77.
- Vines, A. (2010). Rhetoric from Brussels and reality on the ground: the EU and security in Africa. *International Affairs*, 86, 1091–1108.

Vogel, C. (2014, July 14). *DRC: Assessing the Performance of MONUSCO's Force Intervention Brigade*. Retrieved from African Arguments website.
<http://africanarguments.org/2014/07/14/drc-assessing-the-performance-of-monuscos-force-intervention-brigade-by-christoph-vogel/>.

Yannis, A. (2004). The UN as government in Kosovo. *The Politics of International Administration*, 10, 67-81.