ISAS Working Paper

India's Military Diplomacy:
Legacy of International Peacekeeping

C Raja Mohan[1]

Introduction

India's expansive tradition of sending its troops in large numbers to international peacekeeping operations under the aegis of the United Nations has been rightly described as a paradox. The contradictions between India's role as a regional belligerent and an international peacekeeper, its substantive participation in United Nations (UN) peacekeeping from its very inception and its ambivalence about post-Cold War peace operations have been identified by scholars.[2] Even more interesting is

---

[1] Dr Chilamkuri Raja Mohan is Visiting Research Professor at the Institute of South Asian Studies (ISAS), an autonomous research institute at the National University of Singapore. He is also a Distinguished Fellow at the Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi (India) and has non-resident association with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington DC, and with the Lowy Institute, Sydney. He can be contacted at isascrm@nus.edu.sg and crmohan53@gmail.com. Opinions expressed in this paper, based on research by the author, do not necessarily reflect the views of ISAS.
[2] Kabilan Krishnasamy, "The Paradox of India's Peacekeeping", *Contemporary South Asia*, Vol. 12, no. 2, 2003, pp. 263-280.

the apparent tension between its emphasis on non-intervention and non-use of force in international relations and its eagerness to send its troops out to keeping peace between nations and between warring groups within states. India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru resolved this tension by underlining India's responsibility to contribute to international peace and security. The post-Nehru years saw a prolonged period of India's international military isolation amidst a preoccupation with territorial defence and less hospitable environment for international peacekeeping.

As the demand for international peacekeeping surged after the Cold War, India once again became a major contributor for international peacekeeping. As of early 2014, India is the third largest contributor of troops (after Bangladesh and Pakistan) at around 7,848 personnel, out of which nearly a thousand are police, including a women's unit.[3] Indian contingents have provided various services including medical and humanitarian assistance, peace enforcement, military observers, and peace building. India is also one of the largest contributors of air assets to these UN missions.[4]

Yet, India's participation in international peacekeeping has not got the intellectual and policy attention, either in India or abroad, that it deserves. More recent and rather limited Chinese participation in international peace operations has attracted far more intensive discussion within the global strategic community. The discussion on the changing nature of international peace operations and its implications for India has been limited to a very small circle in the Foreign Office and the Indian Army. If the Foreign Office has in recent years seen participation in international peacekeeping as a valuable instrument in the quest for a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), the military establishment has underlined the professional benefits to itself from the peace operations. This paper is an attempt to look at India's participation in peace operations from a broader strategic perspective, assess some of

---

[3] "UN Peacekeeping Troop And Police Contributors", *Statistics*, United Nations Peacekeeping, available at http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors.shtml <accessed on 28 March , 2014>

[4] Hardeep Singh Puri, Permanent Representative of India, Statement on Peacekeeping at UN Security Council, 29 June 2009, http://www.un.int/india/2009/ind1581.pdf.

the new challenges confronting India in this domain and the prospects for integrating India's peacekeeping into a more effective national security strategy.

Past as Prologue: The Raj Legacy

India's intensive participation and that of other South Asian nations, in international peace operations cannot be understood without a serious look at the military legacy of the British Raj. From the late-18th century to the Second World War, the armed forces of undivided India were at the very centre of the imperial defence system of Great Britain in the vast region stretching from Eastern Mediterranean to the South China Sea. In the 19th century, the Indian Army helped the British expand their colonial possessions, put down frequent revolts in the empire, and underwrote the economic globalisation of the Afro-Asian world. From Egypt to China and from Southern Africa to the Philippines, the Indian armies participated in the "stability operations" of the 19th century.[5] In the 20th century, the Indian Army played critical part in the two world wars. More than a million Indian soldiers participated in both the world wars. By 1945, the Indian Army was the largest volunteer army the world had ever seen. India's material and human resources were of considerable value in tilting the war in favour of the victors.[6]

In the First World War, the Indian forces served with distinction in the European and Middle Eastern theatres. In the Second World War, Indian Army fought in North Africa and Southeast Asia. In what is now called the "forgotten war", nearly 750,000 Indian troops, under Lord Mountbatten's Southeast Asia Command, pushed Japan's armies out of Burma, Malaya, East Indies and Indo-China.[7] Besides the two World Wars, the Indian Army's experience in managing civil wars and rebellions against the empire has contributed to the emergence of contemporary military doctrines of counter-insurgency and counter-terrorism.[8] Given this extraordinary legacy of the

---

[5] For a comprehensive account of all Indian expeditionary operations from the late-18th to the end of the 19th century, see Intelligence Branch, Army Headquarters, *Frontier and Overseas Expeditions from India, Vol. VI* (Simla: Government of India, 1907), Reissued by Mittal Publications, Delhi, 1983.

[6] For a brief overview, see Daniel P. Marston and Chandar S. Sundaram, Eds., *A Military History of India and South Asia: From the East India Company to the Nuclear Era* (London: Praeger, 2007).

[7] Christopher Bayly and Tim Harper, *Forgotten Armies: Britain's Asian Empire and the War with Japan* (London: Penguin, 2005).

[8] Ashley Jackson, "The Imperial Antecedents of British Special Forces", *RUSI Journal*, Vol. 154, No. 3, 2009, pp. 62-68; see also, T.R. Moreman, "Small Wars" and "Imperial Policing": The British army

armed forces of undivided India, it is hardly surprising that its successor-states have emerged as the biggest participants in international peacekeeping in the post-war era. But it is not a legacy that is remembered let alone celebrated in South Asia (thanks to the post-colonial rejection of the imperial legacy); and the rest of the world does not make an organic connection between South Asia's military tradition from the Raj and its expansive contribution to international peace operations in the post-war world.

The armies of the Raj served many functions, including internal security, defence of the subcontinent's frontiers, and expeditionary operations in a vast region stretching from Eastern Mediterranean to the Western Pacific. The 1947 partition of the subcontinent broke up the centrality of India in the security system of a critical region of the world.[9] The creation of new borders in South Asia, the unresolved territorial issues and the unending war and conflict between India and Pakistan meant that the military energies of the subcontinent turned inward. Besides securing the post-partition borders in South Asia, Delhi had also to contend with the entry of China into Tibet and the eventual imperative of securing a long and contested frontier with Beijing.[10] Yet, the fact remains that the subcontinent has been the largest contributor to the international peace operations since the end of the Second World War. Despite the Indian and Pakistani preoccupations with territorial defence, both had sufficient military forces that could be spared for duties beyond their borders.[11]

We must remember, however, that India was not the only one from South Asia that relished a military role beyond the subcontinent. Although it inherited only a fraction of Raj's military resources, Pakistan acquired a strategic profile of its own beyond South Asian borders. Its military capabilities were strong enough to be an attractive partner for the West in constructing the Cold War alliances like the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). Although

---

and the theory and practice of colonial warfare in the British empire, 1919-39, *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 19, No.4, 1996, pp. 105-31.

[9] For a discussion see, Peter John Brobst, *The Future of the Great Game: Sir Olaf Caroe, India's Independence and the Defence of Asia* (Akron, Ohio: University of Akron Press, 2005).

[10] Srinath Raghavan, *War and Peace in Modern India: A Strategic History of Nehru Years* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)

[11] As of the end of March 2012, Bangladesh ranks as the first in international peacekeeping, sending 10,245 personnel, followed by Pakistan (9,401 personnel) and India (8,134 personnel.) The sum of those personnel from these three countries amounts to 28 per cent of all peacekeeping forces in the world.

these alliances did not survive for long, the Pakistan Army found itself training security forces in the Middle East and occasionally guarding the ruling families there.[12] Those who see Indian and Pakistani military roles from the perspective of UN peace operations tend to miss the larger significance of the internationalist military tradition in the subcontinent.

Nehru Years: Imagining International Responsibility

The initial impulse for South Asian peacekeeping came from India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, who had strong commitment to liberal internationalism and a desire to strengthen the UN. A small but influential elite of the Indian national movement was deeply influenced by the Western critique of power politics that led to the First World War, disappointed by the failures of the League of Nations, and drawn to the idea of "One World" that shaped the thinking of the liberal opinion in the inter-war period. Nehru visualised an active international role for India, despite its many pressing problems at home. Punching way above India's real weight, Nehru lent a strong voice to the liberal calls for international peace through the UN.[13] Insisting that India must do its bit for the maintenance of international peace and security, Nehru launched India's active participation in UN peace operations.

During the Korean crisis, Nehru was quite clearly confronted with the difficulties of judging aggression by one country or entity against another, and injecting oneself into great power conflict that India so assiduously sought to avoid in the name of non-alignment. The Korean War during 1950-53 severely tested India's commitment to international peace and security as well as its credentials as a non-aligned power. India's initial support to the initial US-sponsored resolution in the UN General Assembly in 1950, condemning North Korean aggression against South Korea and supporting the latter to help repel aggression, was received with disappointment in Moscow and Beijing. As the complexity of the situation in the Korean Peninsula became manifest, India sought to make its position more balanced. Nehru sought to promote a Western dialogue with Communist China and called for Beijing's

---

[12] For an early and insightful assessment, see, Stephen P. Cohen, *The Pakistan Army* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).

[13] Manu Bhagavan, *The Peacemakers: India and the Quest for One World* (New Delhi: Harper Collins, 2012).

membership of the UN Security Council. India opposed the creation of a UN command for use of force in Korea but decided to send a medical unit to the war to contribute to the humanitarian relief. "It was a clever stroke, for on the one hand it stood up to its earlier commitment by sending a force which did really take the risks of war since it was engaged on the battlefield, while on the other, they were not belligerent troops fighting the war".[14] The Indian military unit in the Korean Peninsula involved a field ambulance unit and a small contingent of officers and troops. Their services received much international commendation.

If the first phase of Indian involvement in the Korean Peninsula (1950-53) was complicated by the confrontation between the US and the Communist powers, its role during the second phase after the armistice agreement of 1953 turned out to be highly productive. India proposed the establishment of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission (NNRC) to facilitate the transfer of thousands of prisoners of war, which was one of the key elements of armistice agreement. India became the Chairman and Executive Agent of the NNRC, whose task between August 1953 and March 1954 was to assume custody of prisoners who initially declined to be repatriated. A custodial force (CFI) of Indian troops was formed in 1953 to oversee the repatriation of the POWs. In a fulsome acknowledgement of the Indian role, US President Dwight Eisenhower wrote to Nehru: "No military unit in recent years has undertaken a more delicate and demanding peacetime mission than that faced by Indian troops in Korea".[15] India learnt many lessons from the peacekeeping experience in Korea which became "instrumental in establishing the precedents for her participation in subsequent UN operations".[16]

The Nehru years also saw India actively participate in a variety of peacekeeping operations in Asia and Africa. Pursuant to the 1954 Geneva Accords, an International Control Commission (ICC) for Indo-China was set up in 1954. India was the Chairman of the Commission, which implemented the ceasefire agreement between Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and France. India provided one infantry battalion and

---

[14] Alka Gupta, *India and UN Peace-Keeping Activities: A Case Study of Korea, 1947-53* (New Delhi: Radiant Publishers, 1977), p. 112.

[15] Cited in Shiv Dayal, India's Role in the Korean Question: A Study in the Settlement of International Disputes under the United Nations (New Delhi: S. Chand, 1959), p. 196.

[16] Alan Bullion, "India and UN Peacekeeping", in Edward Moxon-Browne, ed., A Future for Peacekeeping (London: Macmillan, 1998), p. 61.

supporting staff until the ICC was wound up in 1970. Indian troops were part of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) in Gaza for nearly 11 years after the aggression against Egypt by Great Britain, France and Israel in 1956. At one time, the Indian contingent was the largest of the UNEF. The Indian presence ended when President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt demanded the withdrawal of the UNEF before the 1967 war. Elsewhere in the region, India also participated in UNOGIL (United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon), during 1958. Nehru provided Indian ceasefire observers for the UN Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA) in West Irian, which was transitioning from Dutch Colonialism to Indonesian sovereignty. Indian armed forces also served in the UNYOM (United Nations Yemen Observation Mission) during 1963-64. India did not contribute troops to the UN Force in Cyprus that was launched in 1964 amidst India's post-1962 preoccupation with territorial defence. But it chipped in with medical supplies and personnel manning the headquarters of the mission in Nicosia.

One of the major peacekeeping operations that India involved itself was in the UN Operations in the Congo, known through its French acronym ONUC (Organisation/Operations des Nations Unies au Congo) during 1960-64. The UN faced one of its worst crises when war between the government and the secessionist forces broke out in Congo. The UN operation in the Congo, ONUC, was unique in many ways. It was also the first time that the UN undertook an operation in an intra-state, rather than an inter-state conflict. The operation was aimed to uphold the national unity and territorial integrity of the Congo. The ONUC offered India the first taste of potential controversies that could arise from participation in complex international peacekeeping operations. India's initial enthusiasm for ONUC came from the strong support to the anti-colonial cause in Congo against the Belgian intervention. India was highly critical of the "limited authority" of the UN force and its general lack of remit to deal with the rising tide of anarchy in the country. Amidst the multiple controversies that affected the Congo operation, increasing number of Indian casualties and the growing domestic opposition in India, Delhi eventually pulled out of the operation in 1964 amidst domestic and international criticism.[17]

---

[17] Alan James, "The Congo Controversies", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 1. No. 1, Spring 1994, pp. 44-58.

A variety of explanations have been given for the extraordinary Indian contribution to international peacekeeping in the early years after its independence. One explanation focuses on the liberal international ideals of the Indian political elite at the time of independence and the commitment to international peace and security enshrined in Article 51 of the Directive Principles of the Indian Constitution.[18] A second explanation is India's commitment to non-alignment and the principle of solidarity with the newly-decolonised nations of the Afro-Asian region.[19] Other justifications included the absence of well-developed armed forces in the developing world and the reality of significant Indian military capabilities that it inherited from the British Raj.

Nehru's quest for a larger Indian role on the world stage is seen as another reason. Others have given a more self-interest justification and the benefits that the Indian military and diplomacy could gain from active participation in international peacekeeping.[20] Some have argued that India played pivotal roles in various East and Southeast Asian missions given the Indian perception of these areas being "vital to its conception of...regional stability".[21] Nehru, for example, justified Indian activism in Indo-China by stating that "Indo-China is a proximate area...the crisis in respect to Indo-China therefore moves us deeply and calls from us our best thoughts and efforts to avert the trends of this conflict towards its extension and intensification".[22] Likewise in the West Irian affair, India gave Indonesia its full support and Sukarno (the first President of Indonesia) in turn, "provided strong statement supporting India on Goa". Furthermore, "[t]he enthusiasm for Indonesia's nationalism in India matched the importance of the new nation in Indian external relations" – Indonesia's strategic location provided defence of the Indian Ocean, the island of Sumatra's close

---

[18] "The State shall endeavour to (a) promote international peace and security; (b) maintain just and honourable relations between nations; (c) foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another; and (d) encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration". Article 51, Part IV, Directive Principles of State Policy, The Constitution of India

[19] Francis Parakatil, India and the United Nations Peacekeeping Operations (New Delhi: S. Chand, 1975).

[20] Satish Nambiar, "India and United Nations Peacekeeping Operations", *Media Centre*, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, January 26, 2014, available at <http://mea.gov.in/articles-in-indian-media.htm?dtl/22776/India+and+United+Nations+Peacekeeping+Operations>

[21] Alan Bullion, "India and UN Peacekeeping Operations", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1997, pp. 98-114.

[22] Jawaharlal Nehru. Parliament Statement, 24 April, 1954, *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Vol.25 (New Delhi: JN Memorial Fund), p. 442.

range to Indian Nicobar islands, and the fact that the country was home to the largest number of Muslims.[23]

The most interesting justification for India's military activism on the global stage was the emphasis that Nehru put on the notion of India as a "responsible nation", a precursor to the contemporary phrase, India as a responsible power. He told the Indian Parliament in 1957: "...how can we keep away from the United Nations where all nations are represented? ...we have to play an active role in world affairs... We sent our troops to Korea… Our forces are still stationed in Indo-China. We have sent some troops to Palestine too…. We get drawn into these things because we are a responsible nation".[24] If Nehru saw the vision of India as playing a major role in world affairs, left-wing critics have seen Nehru's interest in peacekeeping as a continuation of two trends in the Indian mind - liberal internationalism as well as great power ambitions.[25] Whichever way one looks at it, the Indian activism on the peacekeeping front in the Nehru years was about Delhi stepping into the breach generated by the Cold War rivalry between America and Soviet Russia, their inability to bear the full burdens of international peace and security, and sustaining the centrality of the UN in international peacekeeping. While the rivalry opened up space for India in international mediation and active peacekeeping, it had to carefully ensure a constant adaptation to the complex great power dynamic. Nehru, for example, thought that the UN had the right to use military force whenever and wherever needed. Yet he recognised that the use of the UN as an enforcement agency amidst Soviet objections will not lead to peace.[26]

In the Nehru years, India also had to wrestle with the tensions between the notions of collective security, which he strongly supported, and territorial sovereignty which was central to the newly-independent India. Delhi was reluctant to support proposals for a permanent UN Force, despite its embrace of the UN role in collective security. There was some concern in Delhi that the West, then dominant in the UN General

---

[23] Heimsath and Mansingh, *Diplomatic History*, pp. 232-234.

[24] *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Vol. 36 (New Delhi: JN Memorial Fund), 110.

[25] For a trenchant critique see Philip Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace: UN Peacekeepers from the Global South* (London: Hurst, 2013), pp. 188-195.

[26] T. Ramakrishna Reddy, *India's Policy in the United Nations* (Rutherford: Dickinson University Press, 1968), pp. 91-94.

Assembly, might deploy it against its great-power rivals. India was also worried that such a force might be used against small countries. Given India's troubles in Jammu & Kashmir, there was also the apprehension that a UN permanent force might be targeted against India. From a tactical perspective, Delhi saw that ad hoc peacekeeping arrangements would give India a greater voice than a permanent force.[27] In the post-Nehru years, both the demand and supply of India's troop contribution seemed to significantly decline. The 1970s and 1980s saw a steady reduction of peacekeeping activities. On its part, India itself was preoccupied with the aftermath of three wars, with China (1962) and Pakistan (1965 and 1971). It was only towards the end of the Cold War that India's peacekeeping operations would acquire a new salience.

Post-Cold War Challenges

The end of the Cold War increased the push and pull factors for India's participation in international peace operations. After the end of the Cold War, there has been a significant increase in the UN and other regional multilateral peace operations. The absence of great power rivalry and the reduction of inter-state conflicts were accompanied by dramatic expansion of intra-state conflicts that were seen as the sources of new threats to international peace and security. Since the late-1980s, there has been a dramatic surge in the number of peacekeeping operations under the auspices of the UN. Between 1988 and 2013, UN authorised 55 peacekeeping operations around the world in comparison to 13 in the earlier years. Not surprisingly, the UN would turn to India and South Asia for providing the military manpower. India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal provided the bulk of the peacekeepers after the Cold War.[28]

The expanded role for India in international peacekeeping presented at once opportunities and threats to Delhi. On the positive side, India believed that its substantive contribution to international peacekeeping would enhance its credentials as an emerging power and claims for a seat at the global high table. The surge in international peacekeeping coincided with the diplomatic efforts in the UN to expand

---

[27] Ibid., p. 144.
[28] Alex J. Bellamy and Paul D. Williams, Eds., *Providing Peacekeepers: The Politics, Challenges, and Future of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations* (Oxford University Press, 2013).

the permanent membership of the UNSC as part of comprehensive reform. Getting a permanent seat at the UNSC became an important political objective for India, and Delhi spent much diplomatic capital on it at the bilateral and multilateral levels. In its international campaign, its contributions to the UN Peacekeeping became a central argument.[29]

India's peacekeeping role also underlined Delhi's significant military potential and provided a basis for greater strategic cooperation with major powers, especially with the US. After India and the US formalised their defence cooperation in 1995, peacekeeping became a major theme of bilateral engagement in the defence arena. The greater American interest in multilateralism, under the Clinton Administration, appeared to provide a potential area of convergence. This was further elevated during the presidency of George W Bush, when the two sides embarked upon a more ambitious agenda for defence cooperation. The India-US Framework Agreement on Defence Cooperation, signed in June 2005, explicitly referred to greater cooperation in peacekeeping and multi-national operations.[30] The absence of a reference to the UN in the document, however, created a political controversy amidst questions about India's potential participation in peace operations that did not have the mandate of the UN. Amidst the unilateralism of the Bush administration, there was much hue and cry in India about Delhi becoming a junior partner for the US.

While Delhi finessed the controversy, the question of India joining the US in coalition operations remained controversial.[31] Even before the Defence Framework was signed in June 2005, India had begun to consider the deployment of its forces outside the UN framework and in coalition missions. In 2002, during the US Operation "Enduring Freedom", Indian Navy escorted high-value US military vessels that were transiting

---

[29] See "No reform of UN will be complete without reforms of UNSC: President Pranab Mukherjee", *The Economic Times*, 6 December 2012, for the statement by President Pranab Mukherjee at the 13th conference of chief justices of the world organised by City Montessori School, Lucknow, "By any objective criteria, such as population, territorial size, GDP, economic potential, civilisational legacy, cultural diversity, political system and past and ongoing contributions to the activities of the UN - especially to UN peacekeeping operations - India is eminently suited for permanent membership of the UN Security Council", available at http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2012-12-06/news/35647581_1_permanent-membership-president-pranab-mukherjee-reform-and-expansion

[30] "New Framework for the U.S.-India Defence Relationship", Washington DC, 28 June, 2005, available at <http://library.rumsfeld.com/doclib/sp/3211/2005-06-28%20New%20Framework%20for%20the%20US-India%20Defense%20Relationship.pdf>

[31] For a discussion of the agreement and the controversy surrounding it, see C. Raja Mohan, *Impossible Allies: Nuclear India, United States and the Global Order* (New Delhi: India Research Press, 2006).

through the Malacca Straits. In 2003, India actively considered the deployment of a division of its army to Iraq. Although Delhi eventually declined, the debate broke through many of the traditional shibboleths on use of force abroad. Indian military has also been deployed outside the UN framework for humanitarian missions, for example in the relief work for the Tsunami victims in the Indian Ocean at the end of 2004. India actively coordinated its relief activity with the US, Japan and Australia. After the initial bold moves with the US, Delhi under the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government appeared to develop cold feet in considering any joint peace and stability operations with the US outside the UN framework.

Even as it underlined the importance of the UNSC in lending legitimacy for peace operations, India had begun to encounter a new set of problems. India's renewed interest in peacekeeping also coincided with a significant change in the terms and conditions for international peace operations. The focus of the operations shifted to intra-state conflicts and the emphasis increasingly turned to peace building and peace enforcement. The new muscular approach was justified in the name of new threats to international peace and security, the case for humanitarian intervention and the responsibility to protect populations against their own regimes.[32] The new post-Cold War agenda for peace raised many concerns in the non-Western world, including India, about territorial sovereignty of the developing world, dangers of international intervention in the internal conflicts, and the temptation to use humanitarian norms in the pursuit of crass national interests.[33]

Besides the developing world, many in the West began to question the efficacy of intervention in the internal affairs of nations and pointed to the mixed record of UN peace operations in promoting peace and stability.[34] Others viewed the return of peacekeeping as nothing less than a restoration of imperialism, in the name of liberalism and global order.[35] The high point of the post-Cold War Western

---

[32] For a useful historical account, see Alex J. Bellamy, Paul Williams and Stuart Griffin, *Understanding Peacekeeping*, Second Edition (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2010).

[33] For a recent succinct review of the issues, see Sharon Wiharta, Neil Melvin and Xenia Zvezov, *The New Geopolitics of Peace Operations* (Stockholm: SIPRI, 2012).

[34] Michael W. Doyle and Nicolas Sambanis, *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

[35] Philip Cunliffe, "Still the Spectre at the Feast: Comparisons between Peacekeeping and Imperialism in Peacekeeping Studies Today", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 19, No.4, 2012, pp. 426-442.

enthusiasm for use of force, with or without the consent of the states concerned, to achieve political and humanitarian objectives may be behind us in the light of the experience in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya. Declining domestic public support and the difficulty of sustaining high levels of defence expenditures, amid the prolonged financial crisis, have inevitably cast a shadow over Western readiness to bear the burden of interventionist operations. US President Barack Obama, throughout his first term and in the election campaign of 2012, has insisted on the importance of nation-building at home. Increasing political resistance in the UNSC to such Western operations from Russia and China has compounded the problem.

India, which was going through a difficult domestic period of instability and crises in such frontier areas as Kashmir, Punjab and the North East, was deeply worried about the attempt to denigrate territorial sovereignty in the name of liberal internationalism. Having faced hostile Western approaches in the past to India's territoriality, especially on the question of Jammu & Kashmir, India has had a genuine interest in preventing international intervention in its own domestic affairs and guarding against complicating its necessarily-prolonged effort at nation-building. Realists in Delhi, however, would argue that a UN intervention in Kashmir is unlikely to be defined by doctrine or precedent but by the nature of India's relations with the great powers and its geopolitical weight in the international system.

In the UN debates, India emphasised that peacekeeping should always be with the consent of the state concerned. India has also sought a clear distinction between peacekeeping operations which it favoured and the new interest in coercive peacekeeping. India, however, has not shied away from a debate on reforming the peacekeeping operations and in defining the role of the new Peace-Building Commission established in 2006 by the UN.[36] In fact during its tenure in Security

---

[36] The United Nations Peacebuilding Commission was established with the idea of assisting countries to avoid the dangers of relapsing into civil war. The mandate of the UN PBC is: "(a) to bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery; (b) to focus attention on the reconstruction and institution-building efforts necessary for recovery from conflict and to support the development of integrated strategies in order to lay the foundation for sustainable development; and (c) to provide recommendations and information to improve the coordination of all relevant actors within and outside the United Nations, to develop best practices, to help to ensure predictable financing for early recovery activities and to extend the period of attention given by the international community

Council (2011-12), India took the initiative to launch a wider debate in the UN on peacekeeping. Underlining its traditional emphasis on state sovereignty, India argued that "national ownership is the key to success in peace building. The international community has the duty to make available appropriate capacities to national authorities". Emphasising India's democratic credentials, its representatives at the UN argued that "countries that have undergone state-building and democratic transitions hold special relevance to our peace building efforts".[37] Pointing out that "ambitious agendas are not being backed with the financial, operational and logistical resources", India's Permanent Representative to the UN Hardeep Singh Puri argued that the "lack of resources tells on the operational effectiveness of peacekeeping and casts a shadow on the credibility of the Council's mandates".[38] India has also insisted that the troop-contributing countries like India should have a greater role in defining the mandates for the various peacekeeping operations and should not be treated as adjuncts brought in merely to implement the mandate.

The question of finances is a special concern for India. The UN owes scores of millions of dollars to troop-contributing countries. India alone is owed nearly US$ 80 million at the end of 2013.[39] Continued financial uncertainty has not until recently limited India's enthusiasm for peacekeeping operations. Meanwhile, there has been criticism of India and the South Asian countries that their main interest in international peacekeeping has been the financial and diplomatic rewards. "For India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, for example, peacekeeping is an inexpensive way to maintain large armies and boost the pay of select troops, while also building diplomatic inroads in poorer countries that might be rich in resources that South Asia lacks."[40] India, which once paid the costs of peacekeeping in Gaza and Congo, finds these charges galling. From the Indian perspective, "whatever financial gain an Indian soldier might receive, it accrues to a negligible number. Today, these conditions do

---

to post-conflict recovery". For further details see UN Security Council Resolution S/RES/1645 (2005), available at <http://www.globalpolicy.org/images/pdfs/1220resolution.pdf>

[37] Statement by Manjeev Singh Puri, Deputy Permanent Representative, on Post-Conflict Peacebuilding at the General Assembly on 19 March 2012.

[38] Statement by Ambassador Hardeep Singh Puri at the Open Debate on UN Peacekeeping Operations at the United Nations Security Council, 26 August, 2011.

[39] Press Trust of India, "UN owes $80 million to India for peacekeeping operations", *Hindu Businessline*, 11 October 2013.

[40] David Axe, "Why South Asia Loves Peacekeeping", *The Diplomat*, 10 December 2010. Available at <http://thediplomat.com/2010/12/why-south-asia-loves-peacekeeping/?allpages=yes>

not constitute a major incentive for the Indian armed forces and are not an important reason for participation in UN peacekeeping".[41] It has also been argued that India's emphasis on community-oriented peacekeeping and its military doctrine of restraint in the use of force have contributed to successes in increasingly-difficult operating environment that the peacekeepers confront today. Yet, India's peacekeeping has occasionally invited negative reaction.

Despite the occasional negative reactions, the reputation of the Indian armed forces as effective peacekeepers has significantly expanded since the end of the Cold War. "India's participation in UN peacekeeping operations is also significant for its response to demands relating to the conduct of new peacekeeping operations, which have complex and multi-functional mandates. India has carried out broad and non-military duties and tasks such as election supervision and monitoring (Cambodia, Angola and Mozambique), policing (Sierra Leone, Angola and Congo), resettlement of displaced populations (Haiti, Bosnia-Herzegovina), de-mining (Lebanon and Cambodia) and civil administration and nation-building (Cambodia and Angola)".[42]

Some analysts are calling on India to take on a larger and more active leadership role to shape the changed role of international peacekeeping. "Instead of constantly criticising the UN for not formulating appropriate peacekeeping mandates in line with changing ground realities, India, as a peacekeeper, should think of ways of engaging with the UN at higher levels, directly or indirectly. This will certainly mean conceiving of and pushing for innovative approaches to the overall management of UN peacekeeping".[43] But amidst the demands for such leadership from external sources, Delhi must now cope with the greater questioning at home of the relevance and value of participating in international peacekeeping operations. What India confronts is not the problem of popular support at home, for the executive retains considerable leverage on the decision to deploy troops for peacekeeping, but criticisms from within the strategic community. Addressing these questions has become a challenge for the Indian security establishment.

Peacekeeping and National Interests

[41] Dipankar Banerjee, "India", in Bellamy and Williams, eds., *Providing Peacekeepers*, op. cit, n. 28.
[42] Kabilan Krishnasamy, "A Case for India's 'Leadership' in United Nations Peacekeeping", International Studies, Vol. 47, Nos.2-4, 2010, pp.233-234.
[43] Ibid., pp. 242-243.

India's peacekeeping has traditionally been debated in terms of its commitment to international peace and security, the ideals of non-alignment, the promotion of an area of peace, and India's self-image as a responsible power and its claim for a larger role in the international arena. In the post-Cold War period the commitment to international peacekeeping got associated with India's campaign for a permanent seat in the UNSC. Many have begun to question the relationship between contribution to peacekeeping and the prospect of a permanent seat in the UNSC.[44] While the goal has become increasingly elusive, India's substantive participation in international peacekeeping no longer gives Delhi a special cache in the global arena. Unlike in the Nehru years, when India seemed the lone middle power willing to bear the burden of international peacekeeping, today it keeps company with other major troop-contributing nations from South Asia. India is increasingly seen as providing cheap military labour in pursuit of imperial objectives set by the West.[45] On its part, Delhi has argued about the logic and nature of new peacekeeping operations and the need for more effective management at a variety of levels. All this diplomatic activity at the UN, however, has not translated into a significant say in how global peacekeeping is organised after the Cold War.

Some have questioned the geographic scope and the diplomatic utility of India's peacekeeping operations. "If India needs to flex its muscles, pretensions to which it is credited with, or our diplomacy wants to strut and do its stuff, it should be done in the immediate neighbourhood where its writ is likely to run, where it will be of some benefit to at least a portion of its citizenry. Not halfway around the world in some remote corner of Africa".[46] Some other military officials have questioned the kind of special priority that Delhi seemed to attach to international peacekeeping and wanted a more balanced consideration of domestic defence priorities and global diplomatic aspirations.[47] In the wake of the allegations against Indian troops in Congo during 2008, there were strong calls for a comprehensive review of India's policy on peacekeeping.

---

[44] Varun Vira, "India and UN Peacekeeping: Declining Interest with Grave Implications", *Small Wars Journal*, July 13, 2002.

[45] Philip Cunliffe, *Legions of Peace: UN Peacekeepers from the Global South* (London: Hurst and Company, 2013), pp. 121-165

[46] Lt Col AK Sharma quoted in Varun Vira, op. cit., n.44.

[47] H.K. Srivatsava, "Indian Defence and Peacekeeping: Are the two competitive or supplementary?" *Indian Defence Review*, Vol. 9, No. 4, October-December 1994, pp.16-21.

Nitin Pai and Sushant Singh, for example, argued that "India's economic and geopolitical profile has charged far ahead of its peacekeeping policy. It is timely for a transformed India to review its policy on foreign troop deployments in the light of its national interests." It has been insisted that "India should immediately suspend all further UN deployments. This should be followed by a graduated withdrawal of all Indian troops operating under the UN flag. There might be a case for a small, token presence, in carefully chosen theatres." Pai concluded that "It is time for India to stop seeing foreign troop deployments as 'risking lives in the service of an ideal.' Rather, they should be seen as being tightly coupled with vital foreign policy objectives, like for instance, securing India's construction crews in Afghanistan. As India's economic interests expand globally, it is likely that the need for such deployments will increase".[48] These trenchant arguments were contested by others who underline the importance of ideals, the contribution of peacekeeping to India's soft power, and the importance of differentiating itself from other great powers.[49] Supporters of peacekeeping say, the decisions to participate in a particular mission always take into account the question of national interest, affordability and the domestic requirements. They rebut the argument that national interests are not factored into the peacekeeping policy by pointing to the complex decision making that goes in responding to the requests from the UN for Indian contributions.[50]

The problem, however, might lie in the fact that India does not have a "strategic" understanding of peacekeeping.[51] In the 1950s, Nehru saw peacekeeping as a means to project Indian influence on the global stage taking into account the particular context of the Cold War rivalry between the US and the Soviet Union. The resurgence of India's peace operations since the 1990s has not been based on an overall strategic conception of India's interests. On the foreign policy side, it was seen as a useful device to promote India's interests at the UN. On the military side, peacekeeping was never a major priority for the Indian armed forces amidst the multiple challenges of internal security and territorial defence. There is no evidence despite its expansive participation in the peacekeeping over the decades, that the leadership of the Indian

---

[48] Nitin Pai and Sushant K Singh, "Bring the troops back", *Indian Express*, 10 July, 2008.
[49] Anit Mukherjee, "Keep the troops there", *Indian Express*, 12 July, 2008.
[50] Dipankar Banerjee, op. cit., n. 38.
[51] Richard Gowan and Shushant Singh, "India and UN Peacekeeping: The Weight of History and the Lack of a Strategy", in Waheguru Pal Singh Sidhu, Pratap Bhanu Mehta and Bruce Jones, Eds., Shaping the Emerging World: India and the Multilateral Order (Washington, DC: Brookings, 2013),

armed forces has recognised the value of codifying this experience, learning lessons from it and leveraging it for India's broader defence needs. Although some military analysts have highlighted the professional value of peacekeeping for the Indian armed forces, there has been no attempt to learn the lessons and create effective capabilities for such missions abroad. The Ministry of Defence has been a reluctant leader and shaper of India's strategic policy and has not made any effort to create a coherent set of guidelines and manage the complex inter-agency process involved. The political leadership, which was more focused on the diplomatic value of peacekeeping, has not sought to articulate a strategic rationale for India's international peacekeeping efforts. In contrast, the Chinese political leadership has proclaimed that international peacekeeping is an important element of PLA's new historic missions. The PLA, in turn, has embarked on a purposeful mission to develop peacekeeping capabilities, now seen as an integral part of its growing role in securing its interests beyond its shores.[52] India's approach, in contrast, has been driven by the inertia of an inherited tradition and short-term tactical considerations.

Nevertheless a broad debate has begun in India about peacekeeping amidst a broader global discussion on the future of peacekeeping.[53] A number of imperatives for change are indeed likely to modify India's approach to peacekeeping. One, peacekeeping is now seen as less of an ideal but in the context of the changing nature of India's security interests. As an emerging trading nation — more than 40 per cent of India's current GDP is linked to imports and exports — India is dependent on import of natural resources and export markets for sustaining high economic growth rates and improving the living standards of its teeming millions. Not surprisingly, India's political leadership is now reaffirming the notion prevalent during the British Raj that India's interests extend from the Suez to the South China Sea. The idea of expeditionary operations, which had long been taboo in independent India's defence discourse, is now getting a closer look by the strategic community. Although not fully

---

[52] See Roy D. Kamphausen, "China's military operations other than war: the military legacy of Hu Jintao", National Bureau of Asian Research, April 2013; see also Marc Lanteigne and Miwa Hirono, Eds., *China's Evolving Approach to Peacekeeping* (Routledge, 2013).

[53] For a sense of the unfolding debate in India and South Asia, see Xenia Avezov, "The New Geopolitics of Peace Operations: A Dialogue with Emerging Powers" *SIPRI Workshop Report*, Kathmandu and New Delhi, April 2012.

developed, the notion that India is a net security provider is beginning to gain some traction.[54]

Amidst the changing external context of international peacekeeping operations and the evolution of the domestic debate, India is likely to eventually recast its approach that was defined in the 1950s and modified somewhat in the years after the Cold War. The pressure for change will not come from a review of its peacekeeping tradition or its positions in multilateral forums. The sources of transformation, instead, are likely to be the new imperatives of India's national security, the changing nature of its great-power relations, the logic of maintaining a stable balance of power in the Indo-Pacific region, its growing military capabilities, the renewed awareness of India's role as regional security provider and an increasing weight in international system. The nature of its participation in international peace operations can only be one element of the inevitable change in India's strategic conception of its place in the region and the world.

Annexure One
INDIAN CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING
1950-2014

FC – Force Commander

MO – Military Observer

CIVPOL = Civilian Police

SRSG – Special Representative to the Secretary-General

USG – Under-Secretary General

"Support elements" can be medical, dental assistance; HQ staff officers; engineer, provost, signals, postal sections; other field support elements.

Current personnel numbers for ongoing operations India is participating in are accurate as of March 2014.

---

[54] See for example, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, *Net Security Provider: India's Out-of-Area Contingency Operations* (New Delhi: Magnum, 2012); See also Abhijit Singh, "The Indian Navy's New 'Expeditionary' Outlook", *ORF Occasional Paper No. 37* (New Delhi: Observer Research Foundation, October 2012).

Place (Year)	Mission Name	Conflict – Mandate	Contribution	Remarks
Korea (1950-53)	UN Command	**Korean War** Assist South Korea to repel North Korea and restore peace and security	Ambulance Field Unit Total: 346 troops	2,324 surgeries performed; 20,000 inpatients and 195,000 outpatients treated.
(1953-54)	Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission (**NNRC**)	Take custody of the prisoners who wanted to remain with their captors and provide explanations to each	Lt Gen Thimayya was Chairman of the NNRC Custodian Force India (**CFI**) under Major General S P P Thorat Total: 6,130 troops + support elements	India proposed the formation of the NNRC. The CFI dealt with 22,951 POWs in 90 days. 2 Maha Vir Chakra medals awarded
Indo-China (1954-70)	International Commission for Supervision and Control (**ICSC**) India, the chairman of each ICSC	**French Indo-China War** Supervise implementation of cease-fire; ensure and oversee demilitarisation; monitor cross-border movement	Total: 7,267 troops (Vietnam) + support elements Medical detachment in Laos (1964-68)	India provided most of the civilian personnel as well as the security forces. It represented the Non-Aligned participant in the Commissions.
Egypt (1956-67)	UN Emergency Force I (**UNEF I**)	**Suez Canal Conflict** To supervise withdrawal of troops from the conflict region (and act as a buffer between Israeli and Egyptian troops)	Total: 13,185 troops + support elements FCs: Major General P S Gyani (1959-1964) Major General I J	Armed military contingents authorised for the first time. India contributed the largest number of troops, sending one infantry battalion every year.

			Rikhye (1966-1967)	27 fatalities
Lebanon (1958)	UN Observer Group in Lebanon (**UNOGIL**)	**Lebanon crisis of 1958** SC Res 128 (1958) [S/4023] Ensuring no illegal infiltration across Lebanese borders – observation only	20 MOs, 71 military officers	Rajeshwar Dayal was a member of the Observation Group. Dr A. Lall was a member of the Advisory Committee
Congo (1960-64)	Operations des Nations Unies au Congo/United Nations Operation in the Congo (**ONUC**)	**Congo crisis after it became independent from Belgium** Established by SC Res 143 (1960) Use of force authorised by SC Res 161 (1961) and 169 (1961) Prevent foreign intervention in the conflict and stop Katanganese secession	Total: 12,222 troops + support elements 6 Canberra IAF bomber aircraft Rajeshwar Dayal was SRSG (1960-1961) I J Rikhye was Military Advisor to the SG	India lobbied hard for expansion of mandate to include use of force. IAF played a pivotal role (airlift, transport, relief missions) Dayal had to resign due to negative media attention and Congolese pressure at the UN. The troops, too, faced some ill-treatment and bad press. 39 deaths Captain G.S. Salaria awarded Paramvir Chakra posthumously
West Irian (1962-63)	UN Temporary Executive	**Transfer of sovereignty of West**	2 MOs Major	India did not send any troops but was very

	Authority (**UNTEA**) or UN Security Force in West New Guinea (**UNSF**)	**Irian** Supervise ceasefire during transition of the territory from Netherlands to Indonesia	General I J Rikhye as Chief Military Observer	active in defending Indonesia's right to West Irian.
Yemen (1963-64)	United Nations Yemen Observation Mission (**UNYOM**)	**Yemen Civil War** Established by SC Res 179 (1963) Supervise disengagement of Saudi Arabia and Egypt from the conflict	2 MOs Major General I J Rikhye as Military Adviser to UNSG Lt Gen P S Gyani as Chief of Mission (Sept-Nov 1963) Col S C Sabharwal as Chief of Staff (1963-1964)	While a small mission with only 20 or so observers, India played a significant role through the leadership it provided to the mission.
Cyprus (1964 -)	UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (**UNFICYP**)	Cyprus dispute Originally defined by SC Res 186 (1964) Current authorisation by SC Res 2135 (2014) Maintain buffer between Greek and Turkish Cypriots	Air Force Unit with medical supplies. Has recently started sending CIVPOL and individual police (8 police deployed currently) FCs: Lt Gen Gyani (Mar-Jun 1964) General Thimayya (1964-65 – died on duty) Major General	India did not send troops. It sent civilian personnel including political, economic, legal advisers.

			Prem Chand (1969-1976)	
Iran/Iraq (1988-91)	UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (**UNIIMOG**)	**Iran-Iraq War** SC Res 619 (1988), continued by SC Res 671 (1990) Verify, confirm and supervise ceasefire and withdrawal of armed forces	8 MOs Brigadier General V M Patil as Assistant Chief Military Observer (Iraq)	
Central America (1989-92)	UN Observer Group in Central America (**ONUCA**)	**Nicaraguan Civil War** Established by SC Res 644 (1989), mandate enlarged by SC Res 650 (1990) and 653 (1990) Monitor ceasefire and demobilisation of Nicaraguan irregular forces, prevent arming of these forces	MOs Major General Lalit Mohan Tewari as Chief of Observer Group in Costa Rica	
Namibia (1989-90)	UN Transition Assistance Group (**UNTAG**)	**Namibian Independence War** SC Res 632 (1989) Support SRSG in preparing for elections	MOs, 88 police monitors, electoral supervisors, 138 CIVPOL FC: General Prem Chand (1989-1990)	1 fatality

Angola (1988-91)	First UN Angola Verification Mission (**UNAVEM I**)	**Angolan Civil War** Established by SC Res 626 (1988) Verify the phased withdrawal of Cuban forces and supervise cease fire agreement	Over 1,000 troops, MOs + support elements Col Y K Saksena as Deputy Chief MO	2 fatalities
(1991-95)	Second UN Angola Verification Mission (**UNAVEM II**)	SC Res 696 (1991) Monitoring neutrality of the police, providing technical assistance for elections, verifying 1992 elections	25 MOs Col Y K Saksena as Deputy Chief MO Col K S Jamwal as Chief of Staff at Force HQ (1991-1993)	
(1995-97)	Third UN Angola Verification Mission (**UNAVEM III**)	Established by SC Res 976 (1995) Monitor ceasefire and disarmament	2 infantry battalions, 20 MOs, CIVPOL + support elements Brig Y K Saksena as Deputy FC	
(1997-99)	UN Observer Mission (**MONUA**)	MONUA established (by SC Res 1118 of 1997) when UNAVEM III ended to consolidate the peace process and build trustful environment.	Indian Mechanised Task Force (INDMTF)	
Iraq/Kuwait (1991-2003)	UN Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission	**Gulf War** SC Res 689 (1991) Monitor demilitarised	14 MOs FC :	1 fatality

	(**UNIKOM**)	zone along Iraq-Kuwait border	Brigadier General Upinder Singh Klair (Aug-Oct 2003)	
El Salvador (1991-95)	UN Observer Mission in El Salvador (**ONUSAL**)	**El Salvador Civil War** SC Res 693 (1991) Enforce ceasefire, aid in nation-building (police, judicial reform etc.)	7 MOs	
Cambodia (1992-93)	UN Transition Authority in Cambodia (**UNTAC**)	**Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia** SC Res 745 (1992) Oversee implementation of the Paris Accord; provide humanitarian assistance and repatriation of refugees; supervise free elections; undertake administrative duties before elections	Total: 1,373 troops + CIVPOL + support elements	The first mission in which the UN provided temporary administration 8 fatalities 1 FC's citation awarded
(1993-94)	UN Military Liaison Team (**UNMLT**)	Maintain continued liaison with the new government	2 MOs	
Former Yugoslavia	UN Protection Force	**Wars in Yugoslavia** SC Res 743 (1992)	FC: Lt Gen Satish	

			Nambiar (1992-1993)	
(1992- 1995)	(**UNPROFOR**)	Initially to ensure demilitarisation of specific areas in Croatia. Later extended to B-H, in monitoring safe-zones and no-fly zones.		
Mozambique (1992-94)	UN Operation in Mozambique (**ONUMOZ**)	**Mozambique Civil War** SC Res 797 (1992) Monitor ceasefire and electoral process; provide technical security assistance	Total: 1,083 support and civilian personnel + support elements Chiefs of Staff at Force HQ: Colonel S D Awasthi (1992-1994) Colonel H S Lidder (Jun-Dec 1994)	2 fatalities
Somalia (1992-93)	Unified Task Force (**UNITAF**)	**Somali Civil War** SC Res 794 (1992) Create a secure environment for delivery of humanitarian operations	Naval Task Force (3 ships + support elements) Total: 5,000 troops	American-led UN-sanctioned venture Indian Naval Task Force sent for humanitarian relief effort Indian contingent given "Friends of Somalia" moniker.

(1993-94)	Second UN Operation in Somalia (**UNOSOM II**)	SC Res 814 (1993) Disarm, reconcile and finish task of UNITAF of ensuring peace, stability, law and order.	4 INS battleships	First mission after Congo where ground unit heavily supported by IAF contingent. 15 fatalities 1 Force Commander's citation awarded
Liberia (1993-97)	UN Observer Mission in Liberia (**UNOMIL**)	**First Liberian Civil War** SC Res 866 (1993) Monitor ceasefire, help implement peace agreement and supervise elections	20 MOs	Mission established in support of ECOWAS efforts in implementing peace agreement and overseeing eventual elections.
(1997-2003)	UN Peacebuilding Support Office in Liberia (**UNOL**)	Help consolidate peace and democracy		
Rwanda (1994-96)	UN Assistance Mission in Rwanda (**UNAMIR**)	**Rwandan Civil War** SC Res 872 (1993) Help implement Arusha Peace Agreement and monitor ceasefire	Total: 956 troops + 18 MOs + support elements Brigadier Shiv Kumar as Acting FC (1995-1996)	Given responsibility for the most sensitive sector in Kigali

Haiti (1994-1996)	UN Mission in Haiti (**UNMIH**)	**1991 military coup in Haiti** Established by SC Res 867 (1993) Help implement agreement between military and civilian government; stabilise country after coup	Rapid Reaction Force – 120 members; 120 CIVPOL	
(1996-2000)	Several successive missions to Haiti (UN Support Mission; Transition Mission; Civilian Police Mission)	Modernise police and army; continue nation-building; stabilise the country	CIVPOL	
Lebanon (1978-)	UN Interim Force in Lebanon (**UNIFIL**)	**Israeli invasion of Lebanon; 2006 Israel-Lebanon conflict** Established by SC Res 425 and 426 (1978) Enhanced by SC Res 1701 (2006) Monitor cessation of hostilities	11 infantry battalions; currently a contingent troop + support elements (897 contingent troop deployed currently) Major General Lalit Mohan Tewari as FC (2001-2004)	4 fatalities

Sierra Leone (1998-99)	UN Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (**UNOMSIL**)	**Sierra Leone Civil War** SC Res 1181 (1998) Monitor security and military situation in Sierra Leone	2,613 troops; attack helicopter unit; 14 MOs; 18 CIVPOL + support elements Brigadier Subhas C Joshi as Chief MO	
(1999-2000)	UN Mission in Sierra Leone (**UNAMSIL**)	SC Res 1270 (1999) Help implement peace agreement; stabilise and disarm country	3,059 troops (UNAMSIL) Major General Vijay Kumar Jetley as FC and Chief MO (1999-2000)	India was the second-biggest contributor to mission. It withdrew early in 2000, due to problems with the Nigerians. 5 fatalities
Congo (1999-)	UN Organisation Stabilisation Mission in DRC (**MONUSCO**)	**Second Congo War** Established by SC Res 1279 (1999) Renamed etc by SC Res 1925 (2010) Monitor peace process; stabilise and consolidate peace	Troops, IAF contingent, Formed Police Units, MOs, Experts on Mission, CIVPOL + support elements (4,037 total deployed currently) FC: Major General Bikram Singh (2007-08) Lt Gen Chander Prakash Wadhwa (2010-13)	Previously known as UN Mission in the DRC (MONUC). India is the single largest contributor of troops UN medals awarded to 500 Indian peacekeepers in 2007 for exemplary service United Nations Peacekeeping Medal awarded to the 135 Indian Formed Police Unit (FPU) 2 in 2013

			Sudesh Kumar as Police Commissioner (2007-09)	23 fatalities (total)
Ivory Coast (2004-)	UN Operation in Cote d'Ivoire (**UNOCI**)	Cote d'Ivoire Civil War Established by SC Res 1528 (2004) Maintain internal security	MOs, CIVPOL, experts on mission (8 experts on mission deployed currently)	
Burundi (2004-06)	UN Operation in Burundi (**ONUB**)	**Burundi Civil War** SC Res 1545 (2004) Support and help implement peace agreement	12 MOs	
Haiti (2004-)	UN Stabilisation Mission in Haiti (**MINUSTAH**)	**2004 Haiti Conflict** Originally set up by SC Res 1542 (2004) Stabilise country	Formed Police Units, Individual Police, CIVPOL (429 police deployed currently)	140 UNPOL from India were awarded the UN Medal in 2012 Medical personnel support a medical outreach programme for displaced persons 1 fatality
Sudan (2005-11)	UN Mission in Sudan (**UNMIS**)	**Second Sudanese Civil War** SC Res 1590 (2005) Support implementation of Comprehensive Peace Agreement	Troops; IAF contingent (6 Mi-17 helicopters); MOs; CIVPOL + support elements Lt Gen Jasbir Singh Lidder as FC (2006-08)	4 fatalities

			Rajesh Dewan as Police Commissioner (2009-11)	
Ethiopia-Eritrea (2000-08)	UN Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (**UNMEE**)	**Eritrean-Ethiopian War** SC Res 1320 (2000) Monitor cessation of hostilities	1 infantry battalion every year; 47 MOs + support elements Major General Rajender Singh as FC (2004-06)	4 fatalities
Golan Heights (1974-)	UN Disengagement Observer Force (**UNDOF**)	**Disengagement of Israel and Syria in the Golan Heights** SC Res 350 (1974) Maintain ceasefire between the two; supervise disengagement agreement	Contingent troop personnel (194 deployed currently) Major General Iqbal Singh Singha as FC and Head of Mission	
East Timor (2006-12)	UN Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (**UNMIT**)	**2006 Timor Leste Crisis** SC Res 1704 (2006) Support government in strengthening country	Police, staff personnel Atul Khare as SRSG and Head of Mission (2006-09)	
Liberia (2003-)	UN Mission in Liberia (**UNMIL**)	**Second Liberian Civil War** SC Res 1509 (2003) Support implementation of ceasefire agreement	Formed Police Units; Female FPU (252 total deployed currently) Gautam Sawang as Police	4 fatalities

		and peace process	Commissioner (till 2011/2)	
Abyei (2011-)	UN Interim Security Force for Abyei (**UNISFA)**	South Kordofan Conflict SC Res 1990 (2011) To demilitarise region and monitor peace	troops; experts on mission	
South Sudan (2011-)	UN Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (**UNMISS**)	**Second Sudanese Civil War** SC Res 1996 (2011) Consolidate peace and security; help establish conditions for development	Police, experts on mission, contingent troop (2,093 total deployed currently)	8 fatalities
Afghanistan (2002-)	UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (**UNAMA**)	**Afghanistan conflict** SC Res 1401 (2002) Assist the government and people in establishing peace and development in the country	Police (1 currently deployed)	

As of 31 March 2014, India had contributed 7,923 troops (1,001 police, 51 experts on mission, and 6,871 troops) towards UN peacekeeping operations. It was third, after Pakistan (8,257) and Bangladesh (7,950)

. . . . .