NGO'S ROLES IN HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS AND PEACE SUPPORT OPERATIONS

Daniela Irrera
University of Catania
dirrera@unict.it

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are increasing the influence they are able to play on global politics. As far as they represent political values, interests, and demands that cut across the borders of the states. Furthermore, they participate in many trans-national and world-level actions and programs, and are recognized also by policy-makers as actors of the world political system, the reserved domain of the states. For this reason, it is quite safe to say that they have an impact on the transformation of the structure and processes of world politics. At the same time, it is safe not concealing that the NGOs effective actorness continues to depend on the access given to them by state governments and international organizations (IOs) to international institutions and common decision-making processes and actions.

This chapter analyses the participation of NGOs in humanitarian intervention and peace operations. Knowledge about this area of action is of great importance to understand both the international role(s) of the NGOs and the transformation of the nature, composition, and actions of multilateral peace missions. In section one, NGOs are examined as actors whose international role has been institutionalized by the United Nations (UN), namely by means of the well-known consultative status procedure. In section two, the NGOs increasing participation in the management of civil conflicts is highlighted as the factor enhancing their role in the affirmation of the principle of humanitarian intervention. NGOs specific roles in multilateral security are also defined and explored in this section. NGOs are recognized as actors exercising the knowledge-provider, peace-facilitator, and voice-articulator role. In section three, NGOs effective actorness and roles are empirically tested by analysing their participation in the UNPREDEP mission in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM).

The NGOs recognition by the United Nations

Galtung (1987), one of the earliest and leading analysts of contemporary social movements, describes the "power" of NGOs in negative and positive terms. In the former, NGOs power is not economic, not military and non-violent. In the latter, NGOs power is primarily cultural (ability to engage public opinion), political (autonomy in program management; contacts with national and international centres of power); moral (adherence to values, and the principles of international law);

and ideational (forwarding original and captivating projects and campaigns). Thanks to this power base, NGOs are a distinguished class of civil society organizations. At the same time, thanks to the resources they are able to mobilize, NGOs are perceived as a threat to the state. For this reason, governments may prefer to ignore them, and even obstruct their activities. However, the rise of civil society organizations does not mean that the state is either in decline or at risk. According to Cakmak (2008), the case is quite the opposite. Civil society has opportunities to flourish in conditions of strong, stable and effective government. In addition, NGOs play significant roles unaccomplished by the state and international actors like intergovernmental organizations. For this reason, dialogue with NGOs has been institutionalized by the United Nations. They gave to the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) the task of creating and administering a special procedure of accreditation and provision of consultative status to NGOs. Thanks to this procedure, accredited NGOs have been allowed to take part in UN conferences and a wide range of dialogue practices with the other UN bodies, the Security Council included.

The formal mechanism for accreditation was a deliberate choice of the American administration led by President Roosevelt at the San Francisco conference in 1945. Civil society organizations were invited to attend the conference. More than 1200 representatives of organizations of various nationalities were present in San Francisco. They received authorization to articulate their own ideas about the Charter. The accreditation clause, defined in the Charter, was a sort of compromise that gave to NGOs great opportunities, but was very rigid in the definition of actors and procedures. Article 71 delegated to ECOSOC the task of providing "*sustainable arrangements for consultation with NGOs*". Participation of civil society was restricted to advisory function, and limited to organizations in possession of definite requirements. ECOSOC began to implement the provisions of the Statute by issuing the two resolutions (288B/1950 and 1968/1296) that created the mechanism of accreditation and recognition. Once registered, non-governmental organizations are given the right to be consulted. The high number of organizations which immediately decided to apply to consultative status forced ECOSOC to work on an immense amount of demands and pressures. Consequently, it came to the decision of creating appropriate means for maintaining disciplined ties with non-governmental organizations. The multifaceted structure created by ECOSOC is presently the filter between the UN and NGOs. A section of the Council collects and scrutinizes all requests for accreditation. The Department of Public Information (DPI) is responsible for maintaining relations with all the NGOs, not only the accredited ones. Accredited NGOs are divided into three distinct categories: *General*, organizations working in areas generically related to the ECOSOC competence (e.g. the World Federation of United Nations Associations); *Special*, organizations active in very specific areas (e.g. Amnesty

International, Caritas Internationalis); and *Roster*, all the remaining organizations that are occasionally consulted. Inclusion in a category indicates the scope of the organization, and corresponds to different consultation status.

Achieving consultative status is the first step to give to non-governmental organizations the possibility to open a series of informal practices and behaviours that enable them to strengthen their presence in the UN system, and gradually build a dialogue with other important bodies. Consultative status gives to NGOs the opportunity to be part of special working groups, and promote a series of parallel activities, including written and oral statements to ECOSOC hearings, and seminars. Given their limited powers, however, the NGOs action has been developing through an informal process described as "learning to learn". Actually, NGOs learn how to persuade policy-makers to adjust and change their projects. It appears to be a very slow methodology, but destined to produce effective results in the long term. The first important learning step is to seek for supporters within the UN system. In the earliest years of the Cold War, NGOs preferred a bottom-up approach, and started by searching for partners acting at their own level. Over time, the creation of alliances among NGOs has been changed into a permanent practice. Alliances are created for working on specific and general issues, and pursuing permanent and temporary objectives (Gordenker and Weiss, 1995). The main function of networks is to harmonize common needs and resources in order to strengthen the NGOs position in presenting issues to the competent bodies. The alliance practice is mostly used at the General Conferences promoted by the United Nations, mainly by its specialized agencies. Resolution 1996/31 provides specific rules for the participation of accredited NGOs to conferences on issues related to human promotion (Hartwick, 2003). Admission to a conference grants NGOs many privileges, including the possibility to participate in preparatory meetings, and submit requests and written documents. In addition, NGOs use to set up a parallel forum, at the same time and place of the conference, that frequently produces results diametrically opposed to the official ones. During the forum, normally the organizations produce two types of documents, a declaration and an operational program, that are presented to the official conference, and approved by the General Assembly. The document follow-up is in the responsibility of ECOSOC, and NGOs – individually and in networks – monitor and exert pressure on this body.

Over the years, NGOs have enlarged their areas of participation, and number of interlocutors. This change required a gradual approach to other UN bodies, especially those dealing with high politics. In November 1993, a representative of the NGO Planning Committee took the floor, for the first time, at the meeting of the Second Committee of the General Assembly for the preparation of the International Conference on Population and Development, that took place in

Egypt a year later. Subsequently, NGOs participation to the General Assembly Commissions became a common and extremely useful practice. Dialogue with the Security Council, however, was possible only after 1989 as the result of a unexpected event. In March 1992, during the war in the former Yugoslavia, Diego Arria, the Ambassador of Venezuela, a temporary member of the Security Council, had a formal interview with a Bosnian priest on the conditions of the country's populations, and brought the priest's comments to the Council. It was the beginning of an informal mechanism of consultation with NGOs on the issues of peace and international security, named as the "Arria Formula". In 1995, the "Working Group of NGOs on the Security Council" was created with the aim of meeting delegations, the Permanent Representatives and the President of the Council. There is neither predetermined schedule nor obligation by the Council members to consult with NGOs, but the quality of the Working Group contribution was recognized by the Council members, and the practice was extended even to celebrations and social events.

In conclusion, by strengthening the dialogue with the main UN bodies, NGOs has been gaining a sort of gatekeeper position between national governments and societies, on one side, and international organizations, on the other. As some authors argue, this has beneficial effects on the transparency and accountability of international organizations (Grigorescu, 2007). Transparency is necessary condition and the most often considered tool for achieving accountability by any organization. However, the impact of NGOs on international organizations remains quite controversial. Several problems concern the selection of non-governmental organizations to take part in international organizations actions, the procedure governing their participation, the legitimacy and the reliability of their participation (Richter, Berking and Muller-Schmid, 2006). As Willetts (2001) remarks, however, an NGO has to meet six conditions in order to be recognized by the UN. First, it needs to work in furtherance of the aims of the UN. Second, it has to give fair representation to the members, have headquarters and officers. Third, it must be a non-profit organization. Fourth, it must stay at clear distance from violence. Fifth, it must abstain from any interference on the internal affairs of states. Lastly, NGOs will not be constituted by means of an intergovernmental treaty. These conditions are the model universally claimed by international organizations to rule their relations with civil society organizations in traditional as well as non-traditional areas like peace and security. This is a reassuring factor about the currently increasing presence of NGOs in world affairs.

Roles for NGOs in relief and peace-building activities

Understanding the increasing participation of NGOs in relief and peace-building activities requires the analysis of the transformation of two main aspects of global security, the nature of contemporary civil conflicts, the so-called new wars, and the attributes of humanitarian intervention

in contemporary world politics. At the end of the Cold War, the world witnessed the rising importance of the problems of so-called weak states and, in some case, their collapse. Institutional weakness, no rule of law, and economic backwardness became the cause of "new" wars (Holsti, 1999). These wars have not the same characteristics, but some common traits distinguish all of them from traditional wars. The most important trait, frequently mentioned by scholars, is the shift from the interstate to intrastate war dimension. This distinction does not imply that effects of conflict are contained within state borders. On the contrary, conflict normally spreads from a country to neighbouring countries and region. An additional and important common feature of these wars is the active, and sometimes conditioning, presence of non-state actors. New wars are fought by a wide range of political and social groups that have different identity and alliance relations. However, conflicting parties are sometimes inclined to easily change alliance alignment (Kaldor, 1999). In many cases, states are not the aggressor, and have no role in the causes and development of conflict (Monteleone and Rossi, 2008). Lastly, in these wars, the clear distinction between civilians and combatants dramatically fades out. In many cases, civilians are deliberately chosen as target of military action, with the consequence of increasing dramatically the number of casualties. All these conditions make the management of civil wars no longer dependent only on military means. For this reason, Doyle and Sambanis rightly observe that peacekeeping missions with extensive civilian functions, including economic reconstruction, institutional reform, and election oversight are needed in order to improve the chance of success in containing violence and achieving peace building (Doyle and Sambanis, 2000). Collaboration between civil and military actors, then, is increasingly important to manage and solve civil conflicts, as acknowledged by governments and international institutions. Briefly, the changing nature of conflict entails a parallel transformation of the tools for conflict management and humanitarian intervention.

The presence of NGOs in conflict areas started in the Cold War time. NGOs were active mainly in relief assistance, and in human rights and minorities protection. The birth of Amnesty International (AI) in 1961, Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) in 1971, and the organization that subsequently became Human Rights Watch (HRW) in 1978 are important steps on the road towards the formation of the new culture of humanitarian intervention. Indeed, a broad array of intervention action was started by such organizations, and continues to be so at the present time. Actually, the number of NGOs in and near armed conflict zones has been increasing during the years. In 1980, there were 37 foreign relief agencies in a major Cambodian refugee camp along the Thai border. By 1995, more than 200 NGOs were present in Goma; and in 1996, 240 NGOs were active in Bosnia (Cooley and Ron, 2002). Their action priority is on human and civil rights, peace promotion, and environment and social issues. Peace Brigades International, created in 1981, is a special example

of NGOs presence in peace operation areas. This organization mission is dispatching international volunteers to areas of conflict in order to protect human rights defenders under threat of violence. In general, NGOs participate in humanitarian intervention as moderate actors and specialized groups of experts (Rucht, 2006). However, it is worth reminding that some groups, like War Resisters International, stand on a radical campaigning position. They believe that the system must be reformed from the roots; accuse capitalism and globalization for fomenting civil conflicts; do not accept co-operating to intergovernmental organizations actions and programs; and blame on peace missions for spreading *interventionism* throughout the world (Rucht, 2006).

Operational and campaigning NGOs exercise actions in peace operations by different methods. Operational NGOs participate directly to peace operations by mobilizing human, financial and material resources; carrying out projects and programs; and offering expertise and advise. Campaigning NGOs participate indirectly by seeking for the wider public support to operations, and also by fund-raising on a smaller scale (Willetts, 2001). A better typology of NGOs, however, is needed to aptly analyze the NGOs approach to conflict management and humanitarian intervention. To this end, a typology is created here by merging two NGO attributes. These are (a) the NGO's identity and principles of action, and (b) the NGO's concept of conflict management and humanitarian intervention.

According to Stoddard (2003), three types of NGOs are distinguished by referring to the identity attributes: (1) the Wilsonian type organization (so named after the American President Woodrow Wilson's ideas), which accepts the principles of cooperation and multilateralism as practiced by governments and international institutions (CARE is example of this type); (2) the Dunantist type organization (so named after the social activist Henry Dunant), which adheres to the principles of impartiality, neutrality, and independence (MSF, and AI are example of this type); (3) the faith-based type organization, which acts in harmony with religious principles (Christian Aid, and Islamic Relief are example of this type). By distinguishing NGOs also along with the second attribute, the conflict resolution approach, including willingness to work with local partners and/or international institutions, the following comprehensive type list is created and applied here below to the analysis of NGOs roles in peace and humanitarian operations:

1. the pragmatist Wilsonian NGOs. These organizations are ready to participate even in highly-politicized missions;
2. the principle-centred Dunantist NGOs. These organizations participate in peace operations only on condition that conflict management will respect the basic principles of humanitarianism;

3. the solidarist NGOs. Focused on the root causes of conflict as the main problem to solve, these organizations like Oxfam accept to participate in peace operations on condition that military and civilian intervention takes care of the root causes of conflict;

4. the faith-based NGOs. These organizations participate in peace operations responding to charity and compassion values.

The range of NGOs approaches to peace operations matches, to some extent, to the range of conflicts and different forms of intervention required to manage humanitarian problems. It is worth reminding here also that, as Clarks remarks, *"The economic, informational and intellectual resources of NGOs have garnered them enough expertise and influence to assume authority in matters that, traditionally, have been solely within the purview of state administration and responsibility"* (1995: 507-508). By all means, humanitarian intervention is one of these matters that concern NGOs but in different ways, i.e. in accordance with the identity and approach preferences of the NGO's type here above listed. For this reason, scholars (see, for example, Donini, 2006) put on the table the issue of setting out a body of shared rules on the participation and conduct of NGOs in peace operations. On this regard, the task of this chapter is now to single out the NGOs' proper roles in peace operations in order to lay down the ground for rules. By taking stock of the existing knowledge on NGOs as peace operations and humanitarian intervention actors, three specific roles are singled out. The knowledge-provider role pertains to the NGOs contribution to diffusing information and common practices on humanitarian actions. The peace-facilitator role refers to the NGOs support of UN and international organization peace missions. The voice-articulator role applies to NGOs commitment to amplify the local actors' expectations on social, political, and practical needs.

NGOs as knowledge-provider

The first role is the concern of all NGOs types. In performing this role, NGOs profit from both the scientific community's study of security, and their own practical experience in dealing with new tools of management of security challenges. The traditional concept of security, as known, is associated to the nature of the state, the image of the enemy, and the use of military violence. Change in armament technology, the rising importance of non-state actors, and political innovations, namely the adoption – initially by the European countries - of the concept of cooperative and comprehensive security, contributed to change this view of security. Buzan, a leading scientist in security studies, has pointed to three levels of analysis (the individual, the state, and the international system), and different dimensions (the political, economic, and social one) in managing security issues in addition to the military one (Buzan, 1991). Later, he and the

Copenhagen School members, worked at the concept of comprehensive security because a wide range of factors (military, environmental, economic, societal, and political) bring in different actors and forms of action as determining security matters. Lastly, the Copenhagen School drew the attention of the specialists to the importance of the securitization of any social issue, that political actors change into a threat by means of speech acts, to respond to by means of emergency measures. In subsequent years, the scientific debate continued, and tried to merge the new concepts in order to develop a perspective useful also to practitioners. As Knight (2001: 14) rightly remarks, terms like comprehensive security, common security, and human security "*are being utilized to embrace the range of issues that are being placed on a revised security agenda of an emerging global polity*". Consequently, Knight continues, security "*must change from an exclusive stress on national security to a much greater focus on people's security, from security through armaments to security through human development, from territorial security to food, employment and environmental security*".

NGOs – especially the Wilsonian ones - have been particularly responsive to the suggestions of the scientific debate, and have developed *their own* security management language as well as processes and best practices connected to those scientific concepts. At the same time, a wide range of tools has been institutionalized by the pragmatist and solidarist NGOs in their practice of security management. The institutionalization process include different actions and sectors like information; analysis of threats, risks and vulnerabilities; and the organization of practical and logistic aspects (Avant, 2007). On their turn, Dunantist NGOs have underlined the importance of non-partisan, fast, non-bureaucratic, and risk-taking nature of humanitarian intervention. The Wilsonian and Dunanist organizations have been able also to supply knowledge useful to regulating conflict solving and peace management like rule-making procedures, and methods of interpretation and application of norms and standards (Beck, 2008). It is worth mentioning also that, in recent years, the NGO community has been particularly keen in diffusing the responsibility to protect (R2P) principle. Especially the faith-based NGOs worked adamantly to sustain the movement aimed at advancing the responsibility to protect in order to confront the global community's inadequate response to morally indefensible mass atrocities.

NGOs as peace-facilitator

NGOs are commonly considered as independent agencies in peace operations because they are not part of the military structure. Normally, however, the NGO personnel work alongside the official, military and civilian, personnel of the peace missions but to assist local parties in fields like promoting human security, strengthening the rule of law, and economic and social development.

Peacekeeping was initially conceived of as a mechanism to help countries torn by conflict create conditions of peace. However, during the years, it has been changing in aims, methods, and participating actors. The enlargement of the mandate, in particular to humanitarian and political assistance, brought in a massive increase in the number of civilian personnel and non military activities, and the organization of complex, multifunctional operations with both military and civilian tasks. On this condition, NGOs were accepted as participants supporting the execution of civilian tasks. The term Civil-military co-operation (CIMIC) was coined to name the close cooperation between military troops and civil society actors (Rietjens, 2008). The reconstruction of Germany, on the aftermath of the Second World War, can be cited as the first case of this co-operation. Today, it is also an important element of the doctrines of international and regional organizations, like NATO and the EU (Klose, 2006). All the military and civil, state and non-state personnel operate in the same environment, and decide to work either separately or together, in close or loose co-operation (Rietjens, 2008).

Generally, the Wilsonian and Pragmatist NGOs prefer to cooperative relations with the military personnel in order to be more effective in relief operations, and facilitate the peace mission success. This is acknowledged by the UN Department for Peace-keeping. In a recent document, the Department affirms that "*responsibility for the provision of humanitarian assistance rests primarily with the relevant civilian United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programmes, as well as the range of independent, international and local NGOs which are usually active alongside a United Nations peacekeeping operation* (UN DPKO, 2008). Also the new UN Peacebuilding Commission *"recognizes the important contribution of civil society, including non-governmental organizations and the private sector, to all stages of peacebuilding efforts, given that one of the main purposes of the Commission is to bring together all relevant actors, in particular national stakeholders"* (UNPBC, 2007). Actually, NGOs have been given the right to be consulted by the Peacebuilding Commission on all the matters they are able to provide functional resources. In addition, NGO participation in UN and other international organizations peace missions is an important instrument of control of the operation actions, and of the mission transparency (Grigorescu, 2007). Actually, NGOs use to put on the table many questions concerning the impartiality and neutrality of peace missions.

NGOs contribute directly also to the political success of humanitarian missions. The Sant'Egidio Community, for example, has been an important actor in mediation and diplomatic negotiation. It promoted, and sometime bring to positive results, peace process in conflict zones like in Burundi, Mozambique, and Palestine. The Dunantist NGOs, like Amnesty Interantional, and the Solidarist ones, like Oxfam, have been successful in creating humanitarian civil pressure. In other

cases, they help to improve the mission performance. Their disapproval of misconduct, fopr example, contributes to reshape the operation mandate on as different aspects as the legal basis of the operation, the definition of practical effects, and the behavior of military personnel. Sexual exploitation of local populations by peacekeeping personnel, human trafficking to provide prostitution, and the consequent spread of HIV/AIDS in conflict areas are the content of an increasing number of denouncement and condemnation by NGOs activists (Human Rights Watch, 2002; Amnesty International, 2004; Mendelson, 2005). This criticism has effects on the co-operation with the personnel of the official mission, and may hinder the NGOs role as peace-facilitator. In general, the independent and neutral status of many humanitarian NGOs – namely the Dunantist and Solidarist ones - is a problem for good civil-military co-operation. Co-ordination and the sharing of aims and tools is essential to good co-operation. For this reason, experts advise NGOs to change their ideological stand, and take part in coordinated actions (see, for example, Klose, 2006). However, Pragmatist NGOs usually prefer to compromise on their principles in order to work together with the military, and facilitate assistance management. Even some faith-based NGOs have shifted towards a moderate approach. However, a recent NGO report concluded negatively that "The policies and guidelines set by UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) about sexual exploitation and abuse in missions are not always followed in the field" (Lipson, 2007).

Though quite controversial, the NGOs role as peace-facilitator remains essential concerning logistics. Generally, NGOs manage facilities like site selection and access procedures for offices, residences, warehouses; personnel matters like hiring local personnel and making them accept professional norms; transportation, like providing vehicles, drivers, and tracking; communication systems, like broadcasting daily news and extreme emergency information; and incident reporting such as what gets to report, and to whom. Briefly, they show a good ability to maintain procedures for keeping on, updating, and monitoring the whole security planning process. All these tasks contribute to good relations with the local population, and are linked to the third peace and humanitarian role of NGOs.

NGOs as voice-articulator

Although the military put large effort in mission preparation, often they remain unaware of the actors in the area in which they are deployed. Normally, the military do not participate in coordination meetings, refute to make information accessible, and are not interested in civil programs. Consequently, peace missions are frequently blamed for neglecting local demand-driven co-operation. Furthermore, in some cases, co-operation programs are selected and prioritized based

on the capacity of the military and civil personnel of the mission rather than the needs of the local beneficiaries. As experts remark, little attention is paid to the involvement of the local population in many partnership actions (see, for example, Rietjens, 2008). On the contrary, the relations NGOs are able to establish with the local actors (individuals and associations) are much stronger than those created by the peace operation personnel.

Wilsonian, Dunantist and faith-based NGOs give great importance to giving voice to local civil society. For this reason, they involve local associations and groups in different phases of the intervention. NGOs like MSF and Oxfam are quite successful in this respect, probably because of their identity and approach attributes. The majority of NGOs, however, are very much committed to exercise the role of voice-articulator. They are keen to stay in dialogue with local actors and obtain their confidence because on this condition depends the successful outcome of the mission. Normally, this objective is achieved by providing help and basic goods to the local population. The help NGOs supplied to countries in conflict and victims of disasters and emergencies was impressive also throughout the 1980s. In 1989, European-based NGOs delivered about 180,000 tons of food aid to Africa, and 450,000 ones in 1991. In 1994 NGOs accounted for over 10 per cent of the total public development aid, amounting around to $8 billion. It is estimated that some 400 to 500 international NGOs are currently involved in humanitarian actions worldwide, and that NGOs collectively spend an estimated $9-10 billion annually, reaching out some 250 million people in absolute poverty (Abiew, 1998).

The good performance of NGOs emergency relief work has the positive consequence of obtaining the confidence of the local population. This is an advantage to the NGOs voice-articulator role especially in complex civil conf1icts. In other terms, the practical assistance NGOs provide makes them more effective in the objective of humanitarian intervention, facilitates the building of mutual confidence relations, and increases the likelihood that the local population will embrace the reconstruction process. This is neither a simple nor automatic outcome. Above all, it is obtained thanks to the way NGOs activists work. As an NGO field staff member remarks in commenting the work done in Somalia in 1993–94: "It has always been dangerous to operate in a war zone, and the likelihood of being stopped for extortion has always been very high. These things come with the territory. We have to live among those we help. Our best protection is our behaviour" (quoted in Rubinstein, 2005: 541).

NGOs in UNPREDEP mission

UNPREDEP is known as the first case of *preventing deployment*, i.e. the stationing of troops between two hostile parties in order to deter the onset of violence and war (Diehl, 1998). The mission was deployed to Macedonia in order to avoid the spreading of mass atrocities following the

approval of the country independence by the September 8, 1991, national referendum. The population of Macedonia is a mixture of Slavic Macedonians (the majority), Albanians, and small ethnic minorities of Turks, Roma, and Serbs.

After independence, the Albanians were allowed to organize their own political parties but continued to experience discrimination. Three months after the independence declaration, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 795 authorizing the establishment of the UN Protection Force in the Former Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR) in Macedonia, later changed into the UN Preventative Deployment Force (UNPREDEP). On March 24, 1999, NATO went to war on Yugoslavia in order to stop the Serbian armed attack to Kosovar Albanians. Fighting in Kosovo had the spill-over effect of destabilizing fronts, and causing ethnic tensions in Macedonia. Fighting erupted between Albanian insurgents and Macedonian government security forces, and soon the country conditions deteriorated. However, on July 26, 2001, a ceasefire was announced, and, on August 13, Macedonian and Albanian leaders signed a political agreement, the Ohrid Framework Agreement, that guaranteed civil rights protection to Albanians on condition of Albanian insurgents disarmament. In September 2002, the parliamentary elections led to the signature of the power-sharing arrangement between the Social Democrat-led Macedonian coalition and Albanian party. Scholars and policy-analysts agree on acknowledging that the positive result of the crisis was favoured by the preventive deployment of UNPREDEP as well as its peculiar structure. In fact, the mission consisted of three pillars and phases of operation. The first pillar was the traditional work of peacekeeping mission, namely stationing troops and military observers along the Macedonia's borders in order to assist the country's security forces to deter attacks. The second pillar included the broader political mandate of "good offices" in order to maintain peaceful relations, and the deployment of a UN police force to prevent human rights violations against the minorities.

The third pillar is described as the "human dimension" phase. It was focused on Macedonian civil society institutions, and international aid and cooperation. The two priority areas of this phase were enhancing social development and strengthening crime-prevention efforts. In particular, international and local NGOs took part in five social development projects. They supported the establishment of a social policy and social care think tank; organized the instruction of trainers on developing theory, practical skills, and professional ethics; provided home-based childhood education; trained on non-violent conflict resolution; and reconstructed civil society in low-income multi-ethnic neighbourhoods. In addition, in the mid 1990s, and after year 2001, NGOs – mainly Solidarist and faith-based ones – and university-based research groups have been working to bring ethnically mixed groups to work together. Three NGOs are worth mentioning here for the specific nature of their actions in parallel with the UNPREDEP official mission. The Ethnic Conflict

Resolution Project at Sts. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, a faith-based organisation, contributed projects in the education field. Search for Common Ground (founded in 1982 in Washington, DC) and the European Centre for Common Ground (established in Brussels in 1995) contributed their experience to run programs of conflict solving and violence prevention.

Generally, in Macedonia, NGOs worked to help local government authorities to bring together ethnic communities that used to live in isolation from each other. Many NGOs projects carried out programs in the media and communication field with the explicit aim of integrating members of the different ethnic communities into common reporting programs. Two examples of these projects are *AIM Macedonia*, a multi-ethnic group of journalists that produced news in the Macedonian, Albanian, and Serbo-Croat language; and "Cross-Community Reporting Project", the joint project of Search for Common Ground Macedonia and the Institute of War and Peace Reporting that specialized in reporting on the Macedonian "New Accommodation". Last but not least to mention is the large network of human rights organizations that co-operated with the official Human Rights Ombudsman through projects aiming at demonstrating that respect of human rights should be irrespective of ethnic belonging.

In conclusion, UNPREDEP was a unique UN peacekeeping mission because it was organised as a preventive measure with military and civil mandates, including the human dimension. Working in parallel to UNPREDEP, NGOs humanitarian intervention contributed significantly to prevent ethnic violence and foster social dialogue.

Conclusions

The growing participation of NGOs to conflict management and humanitarian intervention is part of the NGOs struggle for effective international actorness in world politics. They began supporting UN peace missions in the 1990s, and adapted to the change peace missions encountered in their aims and methods in the following time. They have developed a wide range of approaches. Sometimes, NGOs approaches fit easily to the governments and international organizations practice. Sometimes, they differ considerably from it. These approaches are tightly connected to two attributes of the NGOs, their individual identity and their specific approach to conflict management and humanitarian intervention. These attributes influence the three roles - knowledge-provider; peace-facilitator, and voice-articulator - NGOs have in peacekeeping and humanitarian intervention that, as the Macedonia case demonstrates, are mutually interdependent.

Bibliography

Abiew F. K. (1998*), Assessing Humanitarian Intervention in the Post-Cold War Period: Sources of Consensus*, in "International Relations", vol. XIV, no. 2, pp. 61-90.

Attinà F. (2008), *The global governance of security, multilateralism, minilateralism, and Europe,* paper presented at International Conference on "European and Global Governance: Converging political cultures?", organized by the Institute of International Relations (IIR) and the Department of International and European Studies of Panteion University, Athens, May 16-17.

Attinà F. (2003), *Il sistema politico globale*, Bari, Laterza.

Avant D. (2007), *NGOs, Corporations and Security Transformation in Africa*, in "International Relations", 21 (2), pp. 143-161.

Beck U. (2008), *Reframing Power in a Globalized World,* in "Organization Studies", vol. 29, n, 05, pp. 793-804.

Brett R (1993), *Contribution of NGOs to the monitoring and protection of human rights in Europe: an analysis of the role and access of NGOs to the inter-governmental organisations*, in "Monitoring human rights in Europe: comparing international procedures and mechanisms", Dordrecht, Netherlands; Boston, Mass., 1993, p. 121-144.

Boyd R.– Oakeshott M. (2004), *On Civility, Civil Society and Civil Association* in "Political Studies", 52, pp. 603–622.

Bullard N. (2005), *Les Nations Unies et les mouvements sociaux*, in AA. VV. *ONU. Droits pour tous ou loi du plus fort?*, Genève, CETIM.

Buzan B. (1991), *People, States and Fear*, Essex, Pearson.

Cakmat C. (2008), *Civil society actors in International law and world politics: definition, conceptual framework, problems,* http://www.globalpolicy.org/ngos/intro/growing/2008/01civilintlaw.pdf

Caffarena A. (2001), *Le organizzazioni internazionali*, Bologna, il Mulino.

Carothers T. (2000), *Civil society*, in "Foreign policy", 117, pp. 18-29.

Chandler D. (2004), *Building global civil society 'from below'?* in "Millennium: journal of international studies", 33, 2, pp. 313-339.

Charnovitz S. (1997), *Two centuries of participation : NGOs and international governance*, in "Michigan journal of international law", 18, 2, pp. 183-286.

Clark A. M. (1995), *Non-governmental organizations and their influence on international society*, in "Journal of international affairs", 48, 2, pp. 507-525.

Cohen S. (2005), *États face aux "nouveaux acteurs"* in *" Politique internationale"*, 107, pp. 409-424.

Cooley A. – Ron J. (2002), *The NGO Scramble*, in « International Security », vol. 27, n. 1, pp. 5-39.

Diehl P. – Druckman D. – Wall J. (1998), *International Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution : A Taxonomic Analysis with Implications,* in « The Journal of Conflict resolution », vol. 42, n. 1, pp. 33-55.

Donini A. (2006), *Is Universality under Threat ? Humanitarian Aid and Intervention in the 2000s*, in Richter I. – Berking S. – Muller-Schmid R. (eds.)(2006), *Building a transnational civil society. Global issues and global actors*, Palgrave, London, pp. 217-240.

Doyle M. – Sambanis N. (2000), *International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis,* in "The American Political Science Review", vol. 94, n. 4, pp. 779-801.

Dunér B. (1997), *Fight for greater NGO participation in the UN* in "Security dialogue", 28, 3, pp. 301-315.

Etzioni A. (2004), *Capabilities and limits of the global civil society* in "Millennium: journal of international studies", 33, 2, pp. 341-353.

Fisher J. (2003), *Local and global: international governance and civil society* in "Journal of international affairs", 57, 1, pp. 19-39.

Fowler A. (1996), *Demonstrating NGO performance: problems and possibilities* in "Development in practice", 6, 1, pp. 58-65.

Gaer F. (1995), *Reality check: human rights nongovernmental organizations confront governments at the United Nations* in "Third World Quarterly", 16, 3, pp. 389-404.

Galtung J. (1987), *A New Era for Nongovernmental Organizations in the UN?*, in "Transnational Associations", 3, pp. 183-186.

Gellner E. (1991), *Civil Society in Historical Context*, in "International Social Science Journal", 43, 129, pp. 495–510.

Gizelis T. – Kosek K. (2005), *Why Humanitarian Interventions Succeed or Fail: The Role of Local Participation*, in "Cooperation and Conflict", Vol. 40(4), pp. 363–383.

Gordenker L. – Weiss T. (1995), *Non governmental organisations, the United Nations and global governance* in "Third World quarterly", 16, 3, pp. 355-555.

Grady H. (2005), *Opportunities for the UN and civil society to collaborate more effectively* in "Development in practice", 15, 1, pp. 70-76.

Grigorescu A. (2007), *Transparency of Intergovernmental Organizations*: *The Roles of Member States, International Bureaucracies and Nongovernmental Organizations*, in "International Studies Quarterly", 51, pp. 625-648.

Hartwick J. (2003), *Non-governmental organizations at United Nations-sponsored world conferences: a framework for participation reform* in "Loyola of Los Angeles international and comparative law review", 26, 2, pp. 217-280.

Holliday I. (2003), *Ethics of Intervention: Just War Theory and the Challenge of the 21st Century,* in "International Relations", Vol 17(2), pp. 115–133.

Holsti K. (1996), *The State, War, and the State of War*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kaldor : (1999), *New and Old Wars: Organised Violence in a Global Era*, Cambridge, Politiy Press.

Kyte R. (2000), *Civil society/UN partnerships for the 21st century* in "Transnational associations", 51, 1, pp. 5-7.

Klose G. (2006), *The Role of the Military in a Changing World – CIMIC: Military Stepping Stones on the Road to Civil Society,* in Richter I. – Berking S. – Muller-Schmid R. (eds.)(2006), *Building a transnational civil society. Global issues and global actors*, Palgrave, London, pp. 201-216.

Knight W. A. (2001), *Adapting the United Nations to a postmodern era: lessons learned*, New York, Palgrave.

Leech B. (2006), *Funding Faction or Buying Silence? Grants, Contracts, and Interest Group Lobbying Behavior* in "The Policy Studies Journal", 34, 1, pp. 17-35.

Lijphart A. (2004) *Constitutional Design for Divided Societies*, in "Journal of Democracy", 15, 2, pp. 96-109.

Lijphart A. (1999), *Patterns of Democracy*, New Haven CT, Yale University Press.

Lipschutz R. D. (2005), *Power, politics and global civil society,* in "Millennium: journal of international studies", 33, 3, pp. 747-769.

Lipson M. (2007), *Peacekeeping: Organized Hypocrisy?*, in "European Journal of International Relations", vol. 13, 1, pp. 5-34.

MacQueen Norrie (2006), *peacekeeping and the International System*, Routledge, London.

Mawdsley E. – Townsend J. – Porter G. (2005), *Trust, accountability, and face-to-face interaction in North-South ngo relations* in "Development in practice", 15, 1, pp. 77-82.

Martens K. (2000), *NGO participation at international conferences: assessing theoretical accounts* in "Transnational associations", 52, 3, pp. 115-126.

McDermott A. (1998), *UN and NGOs: humanitarian interventions in future conflicts* in "Contemporary security policy", 19, 3, pp. 1-26.

Mezzasalma F. (2002), *Participation des organisations de la société civile autres que les ONG et le secteur privé aux activités de coopération technique: expérience et perspectives du système des Nations Unies* in "Transnational associations", 54, 4, pp. 270-294.

Monteleone C. – Rossi R. (2008), *Security and Global Management: A Global Perspective,* in geistlinger – Longo – Lordkipanidze – Nasibli (eds.), « Security Identity and the Southern Caucasus », Wien, Verlag, pp. 49-80.

Otto D. (1996), *Nongovernmental organizations in the United Nations system: the emerging role of international civil society* in "Human rights quarterly", 18, 1, pp. 107-141.

Papisca A. (1995), *Democrazia internazionale, via di pace. Per un nuovo ordine internazionale democratico*, Milano, FrancoAngeli.

Paul J. (1999), *NGOs and the United Nations* in "Transnational associations", 51, 6, pp. 300-319.

Pietrzyk D. (2003), *Democracy or Civil Society?* in "Politics", 23, 1, pp. 38–45.

Pratchett L. (2004), *Local Autonomy, Local Democracy and the 'New Localism'* in "Political Studies", 52, pp. 358–375.

Richter I. – Berking S. – Muller-Schmid R. (eds.)(2006), *Building a transnational civil society. Global issues and global actors*, Palgrave, London.

Rietjens S. (2008), *Managing Civil-Military Cooperation*, in "Armed Forces & Society", vol. 34, n. 2, pp. 173-207.

Ritchie C. (2003), *Collaboration among entities of the UN system and of civil society, notably NGO's* in "Transnational associations", 55, 4, pp. 207-211.

Rubinstein R. (2005), *Intervention and Culture: An Anthropological Approach to Peace Operations,* in "Security Dialogue", vol. 36 (4), pp. 527-544.

Rucht D. (2006), *Critique of Capitalism in the Era of Globalization – Old Wine in New Bottles?, in* Richter I. – Berking S. – Muller-Schmid R. (eds.)(2006), *Building a transnational civil society. Global issues and global actors*, Palgrave, London, pp. 109-134.

Stoddard A. (2003), *Humanitarian NGOs: Challenges and Trends,* in Macrae and Harmer (eds), *Humanitarian Action and the 'Global War on Terror': A Review of Trends and Issues,* HGP Report 14, London.

Stone D. (2001), *Think Tanks, Global Lesson-Drawing and Networking Social Policy Ideas,* in "Global Social Policy", vol. 1(3), pp. 338-360.

Suy E. (2002), *New players in international relations* in "Transnational associations", 54, 3, pp. 162-169.

Vaux T. (2006), *Humanitarian Trends*, in Richter I. – Berking S. – Muller-Schmid R. (eds.)(2006), *Building a transnational civil society. Global issues and global actors*, Palgrave, London, pp. 187-200.

Willetts P. (2001), *Transnational Actors and International Organizations in Global Politics*, in Baylis J. B. and Smith S. (eds.), *The Globalisation of World Politics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York, pp. 356-383.

UN Department of Peace-keeping Operations (2008), *United Nations Peace-keeping Operations. Principles and Guidelines.*

UN General Assembly (2000), *United Nations Millenium Declaration*, A/RES/55/2, 18 september 2000.

UN General Assembly (2004), *We the peoples: civil society, the United Nations and global governance, Report of the Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations–Civil Society Relations*, A/58/817, 11 June 2004.

UN General Assembly (2006), *Resolution on Human Rights Council*, A/RES/60/251, 3 april 2006.

UN General Assembly (2006), *General Assembly elects 47 members of new Human Rights Council; marks "new beginning" for human rights promotion, protection*, Press release GA10549, 9 may 2006.

UN Economic and Social Council (1996), *Consultative relationship between the United Nations and non-governmental organisations,* 1996/31, 25 July 2006.

UN Peace-building Commission (2007), *Provisional guidelines for the participation of civil society in meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission, submitted by the Chairperson on the basis of informal consultations*, PBC/1/OC/12.

UN Secretary-General (2000), *UN Millenium Development Goals Report*, UN Department of Public Information.