A study on India's contribution to United Nations Peacekeeping

[1]Mr. Gayasree Ramesh Behra,
[1]Assistant Professor,
[1]Department of Management Studies,
[1]Guru Ghasidas University, Bilaspur, CG, India

Abstract: The objective of the study is to understand the concept of peacekeeping operation in international relation. The study is being divided into two parts: In the first part, we studied the Indian view point of understanding the concept of peacekeeping in the context of international relation. Then, at the second part we studied how India carried out various peacekeeping operations. The article is an analysis of the literature provided by policymakers, academics and military writers in India and abroad. The analysis shows that there is a difference in the level of their contributions in peacekeeping by India. India has become more sensible and realistic in their foreign affairs. Indian involvement in a variety of missions that are beyond the traditional way has evolved in the international perspective and the development of the country's foreign policy, perhaps their growing global status and peace system. There is a need to use as much as partnership as possible between the member countries for Global Governance System.

IndexTerms - **Peace keeping, International Relation, Indian Contribution.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Since United Nations commencement, India has been one of the largest troop's contributors. In August 2017, India ranked third in terms of their current deployment of peacekeepers to United Nations mission. So far India has taken part in 43 Peacekeeping missions with a total contribution exceeding 180,000 troops and a significant number of police personnel having been deployed. According to the UN, of the 3,737 peacekeepers who have died since 1948, 163 have been from India, the highest total from any troop contributing country.

Academic research on peacekeeping operation has focused either on challenge of operationalization, or on the evolution of peacekeeping as a concept. However, relatively little academic attention has been focused on how peacekeeping is understand by troop-contributing countries like India and how this affect their position in world and their foreign policy. India has seen how international peace keeping operations have evolved from "First generation Peace keeping" to "Modern or Multidimensional Peace keeping". Apart from that we would be discussing the term Peacekeeping and Peace building.

The term peacekeeping implies a multinational force, sometimes with a civilian component, mandated to administer, monitor or patrol areas of conflict in a neutral and impartial manner. Most peacekeeping operations in the post-Cold War era are associated with and carried out under Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter, which allows "[t]he Security Council […] at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 […] [to] recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment" (United Nations, 1945). Pugh (2004) argues that old-style peacekeeping tended to be represented by UN officials as part of an idealist or liberal internationalist framework where peacekeepers represent impartial or neutral parties in the conflict. As Fabian (1971) notes, they were often characterized by the phrase "Soldiers without enemies". Since the end of the Cold War, UN peacekeeping operations (UNPKO) have tended to become more comprehensive and have moved beyond cease-fire monitoring. Redefined under the provisions of Chapter VII of the UN charter, these are now labelled as "multi-dimensional peacekeeping", including missions such as "peace enforcement", "second generation peacekeeping", etc. The end of the Cold War and the humanitarian crises of the mid-1990s have also necessitated a new conceptual backing, coined "peacebuilding".

Peacebuilding is a highly debated concept. There seem to be two points, however, on which scholars agree, namely that "peacebuilding addresses intrastate, rather than interstate conflicts and foreigners have a substantial role to play in the process" (Merlingen&Ostrauskaite, 2006, p. 11). These outside interventions are to create a "sustainable peace", which by definition implies a broader role for peacekeeping forces including addressing the root cause of the conflict and creating political and socio-economic stability. According to the UN Secretary-General's Policy Committee, "peacebuilding involves a range of measures targeted to reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities at all levels of conflict management, and to lay the foundations for sustainable peace and development. Peacebuilding strategies must be coherent and tailored to specific needs of the country concerned, based on national ownership, and should comprise a carefully prioritized, sequenced, and therefore relatively narrow set of activities aimed at achieving the above objectives". In practice it often takes the form of post-conflict interventions, and includes actions to "identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict". Thus, while peacekeeping prevents the resumption of conflict by monitoring ceasefires, etc., it does not address underlying causes of conflict in a comprehensive manner as peace building does. This distinction will be valid for the rest of the paper, while in general the term 'peace operations' shall be used. The paper attempt to provide a background for identifying what kind of theoretical frameworks has been used for Indian involvement in UN peacekeeping operations.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

After the Cold War ended, there was considerable progress in the systematic study of the international peace system. The following paragraphs will introduce UNPKO's main ideological policies.

Professor Michael Pugh

He identified the previous studies of peacekeeping and peace intervention for crisis management practices developed in Europe in the 19th century, which is a way of dealing with the struggles that emerge from the revolutionary struggles and revolutionary struggles in post-war times. He argued that the nineteenth-century European capitalist peace-support campaign was the modern nostalgia. He governs peace-loving governments in a virtual framework, to increase its international standard or subsidize the management of the armed forces. Conservation of peace with diplomatic intentions to investigate the intensity of intellectual forces in a realistic / neo-realistic framework is historically clear as a reduction in interest in peace programs and decrease in operating performance. Humanitarian consequences of action are both economic and strategic goals.

In the first decade of the 21st century, other Western writers were criticized for lack of peace, more controversial and legitimate issues. Michael Pag called it "New York Orthodox", where law and order activities were simplified and America Major world system. Pugh sees the peace building as the continuation of "the model of economic transformation in societies emerging from the struggle to gain free peace".

John Mearsheimer

According to the neo-realistic approach, states use the IR framework in international organizations such as competition) and establish rules for reflecting energy and interest, which would support participation in UN peacekeeping programs under UN is.

Professor Nicholas J. Wheeler

According to the English School theorists, according to the interests adopted by the countries participating in peacekeeping operations, they restrict the terms and conditions and establish an international society for legal rules.

The English school theory used to describe the peace process is solidarity. Solidarists argue that expressing solidarity by dealing with states is a moral fate of states which violate the violation of rights on a large scale, regardless of the legal standard of determining legitimate human intervention. Several authors have tried to apply rational choice theory and public good theory to peacekeeping (Bobrow& Boyer, 1997; Khanna, Sandler, & Shimizu, 1998; Shimizu & Sandler, 2002.

Professor Laura Neack

They saw the peace campaign of the Cold War and did not recognize any specialty in supporting a liberal interpretation to participate in the mission to protect international peace, rules and values. Instead, he found that he "participated in law and order to fulfill his interests." After the theorists of their new-realistic critics are surprisingly positive with analytical

Professor A.J. Bellamy

The above-mentioned processes are widely referred to as Belme's "problem-solving principles", which focuses on practice of peace-practice, . However, there are three major disadvantages of these principles: i) the role of character politics in building architecture activities, fuel policy, ignoring the peace agenda interfering with it, and iii) a vigilant approach to the theory and practice, of which its own Prejudice is Theories of theories are unknown. The above-mentioned procedures are broadly related, which are called "problem-solving theories" by the Bellamyi, focus on practice of peace-practice, and see peace as a goal of struggle.

Former Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson articulated the key principles of peacekeeping at the time, namely "monitoring, consent, neutrality, nonuse of force, and unarmed peacekeeping".

Several theoretical frameworks can be implemented to analyze and analyze the peacekeeping operations, which emphasize the relationship between state and inter-state governments, such as to maintain and maintain peace-like UN peacekeeping . The main turning point of practice for law and order is the end of the Cold War and it ends with bipolarity and clear alliances. This is a change in the analysis of international peacekeeping operations in western education circles.

III. PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION IN PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS: MISSION SIZE AND TYPE

India has contributed nearly 195,000 troops, the largest number from any country, participated in more than 49 missions and 168 Indian peacekeepers have made the supreme sacrifice while serving in UN missions.

PAST MISSIONS

1.   Korea (1950-54):

India provided Paramedical Unit comprising 17 officers, 9 JCOs and 300 other ranks was deployed to facilitate withdrawal of sick and wounded in Korea. Lt Gen K S Thimmaya was appointed as the Chairman of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission (NNRC) set up by UN. India also provided a custodian force under Maj Gen SPP Thorat comprising 231 officers, 203 JCOs and 5696 other ranks.

2.   Indo-China (1954-70):

India provided an Infantry Battalion and supporting staff for control of Indo-China comprising three states of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. Tasks included monitoring, ceasefire and repatriation of prisoners of war, among others. A total of 970 officers, 140 JCOs and 6157 other ranks were provided during the period from 1954- 1970.

3.   Middle East (1956-67):

United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF), where for first time armed troop contingents were deployed. India's contribution was an infantry battalion and other support elements. Over a period of 11 years, 393 officers, 409 JCOs and 12383 other ranks took part in the operations.

4.   **Congo (1960-64) (ONUC):**
 Two infantry Brigades comprising of 467 officers, 401 JCOs and 11354 participated and conducted operations. A flight of six Canberra bomber aircraft of the IAF also participated in ops. 39 personnel of the Indian contingent laid down their lives. Capt GS Salaria was awarded posthumously the Paramvir Chakra for action in Katanga, Southern Congo.

5.   **Cambodia (1992-1993) (UNTAC)**
Was set up to supervise ceasefire, disarm combatants, repatriate refugees and monitor conduct of free and fair elections. A total of 1373 all ranks participated from Indian Army.

6.   **Mozambique (1992-94) (ONUMOZ)**
 Two Engineer companies HQ Company, Logistics Company, staff officers and military observers were provided. In all 1083 all ranks participated.

7.   **Somalia (1993-94) (UNITAF & UNOSOM II)**
 The Indian Navy and Indian Army took active part in UN Operations. Indian Army deployed a Brigade Group comprising of 5000 all ranks and the navy deployed four battleships.

8.   **Rwanda (1994-96) (UNAMIR)**
An Infantry Battalion group, a Signal Company, and Engineer Company, staff officers and Military Observers were provided. Total of 956 all ranks took part.

9.   **Angola (1989-1999) (UNAVEM)**
 Besides providing a Deputy Force Commander, an Infantry Battalion group and an engineer company comprising a total of 1014 all ranks. India contributed 10 MILOBS for UNAVEM-1, 25 for UNAVEM-II and 20 MILOBS, 37 SOs, and 30 Senior NCOs for UNAVEM-III.

10.   **Sierra Leone (1999-2001) (UNAMSIL)**
 Two Infantry Battalion groups, two engineer companies, Quick Reaction Company, Attack helicopter unit, medical unit and Logistic support in addition to sector HQ and Force Headquarters staff.

11.   **Ethiopia-Eritrea (2006-08) (UNMEE)**
Indian contribution comprised oneinfantry battalion group, one construction Engineer Company and one force Reserve Company, apart from staffing at various HQs and MILOBs.

CURRENT MISSION

1.   **Lebanon (UNIFIL) (Since Dec 1998)**
 One infantry battalion group, Level II Hospital comprising 650 peacekeepers from all ranks and 23 staff officers till date have been deployed. The current situation in the Mission is tense and volatile due to the crises in Syria. UNIFIL's mandate is renewed by United Nations Security Council annually. Current mandate expires on 31 August 2014.

2.   **Congo (MONUSCO) (Since January 2005)**
 Extended Chapter VII mandate with Augmented Infantry Brigade Group (four infantry battalions with level III Hospital), Army aviation contingent with utility helicopters along with a large number of military observers and SOs have been contributed. In addition, two Formed Police Units (FPU) ex BSF and ITBP have also been deployed since 2009. Lt Gen Chander Prakash of India was, till recently the Force Commander in MONUSCO. MONUSCO's new mandate vide Resolution 2098 (2013) has been implemented with an Intervention Brigade provided by AU, deployed under UN Command. The FARDC along with the support of MONUSCO were able to destroy the M-23 Rebel Group, however the situation continues to be volatile and uncertain due to the presence of other armed groups.

3.   **Sudan and South Sudan (UNMIS/UNMISS) (Since April 2005)**
Two Infantry Battalion groups, sector HQ, Engineer company, signal company, Level-II Hospital and a large number of military observers and staff officers (SOs) have been deployed. The mission has a Deputy Force Commander Brig Asit Mistry (Indian Army) and until recently a Deputy Police Commissioner Mr Sanjay Kundu (Indian Police Service) was also present there. The latest political developments in the Mission led to widespread inter-tribe violence and large displacement of locals. In the ensuing intra state conflict two Indian Peacekeepers lost their lives while ensuring Protection of Civilians. The current situation continues to be highly volatile and sporadic clashes between the tribes are being reported regularly.

4.   **Golan Heights (UNDOF) (Since February 2006)**
A Logistics battalion with 190 personnel has been deployed to look after the logistics security of UNDOF. Maj.Gen. I.S. Singha is the Force Commander since July 2012. Current crisis due to Syrian conflict has impacted the mission and exchange of fire between the Syrian Forces and the armed groups have put the Peacekeepers in grave danger.

5.   **Ivory Coast (UNOCI) (Since April 2004)**
 The mission has been supported by Indian staff officers (SOs) and military observers since its inception.

6.   **Haiti (MINUSTAH) (Since December 1997)**
Apart from three Indian Formed Police Unit (FPU) there, i.e. from CISF, CRPF and Assam Rifles, which have been successful, the mission has been supported by Indian Army staff officers since its inception.

7.   **Liberia (UNMIL) (Since April 2007)**

India has been contributing both male and female Formed Police Units from CRPF and its specialized unit RAF in Liberia. The Female Formed Police Unit (FPU) has especially become an inspiration for the women of the host nation and has become trendsetters for other such female FPUs across the Globe. Till recently, Mr GautamSawang of India was the acting Police Commissioner there.

Involvement at senior/decision-making levels as Mission Commanders has been significantly less. Indian presence is 'troop heavy', with significantly less representation at the decision-making level at UN headquarters in New York – an issue that comes up frequently in interviews with army personnel who have participated in Peacekeeping Operations.19 Police personnel and the civilian component of the peacekeeping contingents have only recently increased.

IV. GEOGRAPHICAL CLOSENESS

India's peacekeeping activities are traditionally outside Asia, because regional intervention leads to danger of balance of power. The principle of peaceful co-theory is the key to its foreign policy and the value of establishing the worst and delicate relationship with its neighbors is. Therefore, it is argued that India is more comfortable in peace-keeping operations outside Asia, such as the Asian continent. As a result of its engagement in areas in Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, there is limited participation in Afghanistan in the form of only financial support and reconstruction. In the South Asian region, India is very cautious to violate any sovereignty conditions and which is considered political dissolution.

V. INDIA'S LOOKOUT OF PEACEKEEPING

In the beginning peace campaigns were considered a tool of diplomacy, which allowed the government to retain large armies. In defense of India's role in peace-keeping, in the newly-made countries, especially the non-alignment movement plan, India has three historical reasons for international peacekeeping operations. The size of its armed forces the absence of such forces in other parts of the newly disputed world, the impact in the world affairs-power movement. As a commitment to international peace and security written in Article 51 (Part IV) in the Constitution of India, in promoting dissolution with long-term foreign policy commitment, As a foreign policy tool, India has used international peace campaigns, has established solidarity and good relations with the newly stratified countries and has maintained an effective position and leading role in the non-shelling movement.

VI. SOVEREIGNTY LAWS AND RULES

India's approach towards peace can be seen in two aspects of the UN framework. First, it is always your As part of the non-guiding an intermediate path "The purpose of the approach is and is not to violate the rules of sovereignty, that is, it is committed to participating in peace when the host State remembers. Secondly, there is also a criterion of selectivity applied for participation in UNPKO; For instance, India had refused to participate in the East Timor conflict, which had erupted on the subject of ethnic separatism, as it was close to the house and the conflict in Kashmir. Moreover, India has traditionally stayed away from regional groups and security structures like NATO and, as a matter of policy, do not participate in areas where the strategic interests of the other states are more pressing and willing to commit troops. India does not participate in non-UN missions as it strives to maintain autonomy in foreign policy and avoid excessive interventions that are often regarded as a byproduct of participation in regional alliances. India has also shown a tendency to normalize bilateral relations in its foreign, security and trade policy.

VII. NON- UN MISSION (HUMANITARIAN)

India's attitude towards human intervention can be described in both directions, India in the first place considers it a peace mandate by a UN Security Council and, secondly, it assumes that it has a wide range of sanctions as well as the use of Saiya and active combat force. Gharash finished. But experts in India are in favour of peacekeeping missions in the east and are strongly arguing against "interference" in the other. Human interventions are used by powerful nations to violate national sovereignty, resulting in a weakening of the state structure. The Indian representatives of the United Nations have repeatedly said that the UN Security Council should respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States; "Until that position "A clear threat to peace international security The non-UN mission, such as the NATO-led intervention in Kosovo in 1999, also refers to the unhealthy and blatant condemnation in India, which was seen as a violation of international standards and the UN Charter against its provisions which an unprovoked Constitutes aggression.

VIII. CONCLUSION

To assess the roles of Indians in UN peacekeeping, we have identified that India has a much greater history of participation and is a big contributor in UN missions. Moreover, India has a long tradition of sending combat troops and police units as Shatirkashko, unlike the blue helmets of other countries mainly are medical equipment, transport personnel and engineers. India becomes compliant with peacekeeping operations and domestic policy. India's foreign policy based on the five Principles of peaceful coexistence: mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, interference in other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and coexistence of peace with other countries. The participation of Indians in a variety of campaigns going beyond the traditional peace campaigns also indicates a change in the international perspective and the development of foreign policy, as a peace to reinforce participation in the world situation and global governance system. Need to be used. In its permanent membership offer to the UN Security Council, India is using its peace record in this regard. India's role in world politics is shifting cautiously.

REFERENCES

Journals

1.   Bobrow, D. B., & Boyer, M. A. (1997). Maintaining System Stability: Contributions to Peacekeeping Operations. The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 41(6), 723-748. doi: 10.2307/174428

2.   Neack, L. (1995). UN Peace-Keeping: In the Interest of Community or Self? *Journal of Peace Research*, 32(2), 181-196.

Books

1.   Bellamy, A., Williams, P., & Griffin, S. (2010). *Understanding Peacekeeping*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

2.   Bellamy, A. J. (2004). The "Next Stage" in Peace Operations Theory? *International Peacekeeping*, 11(1), 17-38.

3.   Bellamy, A. J., & Williams, P. (2004). Thinking Anew about Peace Operations. *International Peacekeeping*, 11(1), 1-15.

4.   Doyle, M. W., &Sambanis, N. (2006). *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

5.   Mearsheimer, J. (1994-1995). The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security*, 19, 5-49

6.   Merlingen, M., &Ostrauskaite, R. (2006). *European Union Peacebuilding and Policing: Governance and the European Security and Defence Policy*. London: Routledge. Page 11

7.   Pugh, M. (2004). Peacekeeping and Critical Theory. *International Peacekeeping*, 11(1), 39-58.

8.   Pugh, M. (2005). The Political Economy of Peacebuilding: A Critical Theory Perspective. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 10(2), 23-42.

9.   United Nations. (1990). *The Blue Helmets* (2nd ed.). New York: United Nations

10.   Wheeler, N. J. (2002). *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Websites

1.   https://www.pminewyork.org/adminpart/uploadpdf/49151pkeeping.pdf

2.   https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_Army_United_Nations_peacekeeping_missions

3.   United Nations. (1945), from http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter6.shtml

4.   The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) from http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/

5.   http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors.shtml

6.   Peacebuilding   and   the   United   Nations (http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/psbo/pbun.shtml), United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office.

7.   http://www.un.org/en/sc/repertoire/89-92/Chapter%208/GENERAL%20ISSUES/Item%2029_Agenda%20for%20peace_.pdf