The United Nations and Intelligence

BY
Bram Champagne

A THESIS PRESENTED IN PARTIAL COMPLETION OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF
The Certificate-of-Training in United Nations Peace Support Operations

Peace Operations Training Institute®

The United Nations and Intelligence

A Thesis

by

Bram Champagne

Office of the United Nations Special Co-ordinator for the Middle East Peace Process

Presented in partial completion of the requirements of

The Certificate-of-Training in United Nations Peace Support Operations

Submitted: **Bram Champagne** 12/09/06
Signature of Student Date

Forwarded Recommending Approval: _____ _____
Signature of Thesis Advisor Date

Approved: _____ _____
Signature of Thesis Coordinator Date

Table of Contents:

The United Nations and Intelligence

Case Study: Intelligence during Peacekeeping

Introduction

The notion of 'intelligence' within the United Nations raises many questions: what is the relationship between the world's leading International Organisation and Intelligence? Does the United Nations use Intelligence? Could it make better use of intelligence to accomplish its enormous and challenging tasks? Why is there no intelligence agency within the U.N.? What can be done to make better use of intelligence?

Before we can answer any of these questions we will first have a closer look at the concept of 'Intelligence'. Chapter 1 deals with the difference between espionage and intelligence; the 'intelligence cycle', the various forms of intelligence and the various actors in the world of intelligence.

In the second and main part we discuss the tasks of the U.N. and its relation towards intelligence. We discuss why the United Nations prefers to equate the terms 'intelligence' and 'information' and usually replaces the former with the latter, and why despite numerous recommendations for the institutionalization of an independent UN intelligence unit, no documentation indicates that the UN has formally established such an intelligence organisation.

Peacekeeping is the most visible and also most complex task of the United Nations. Its relationship with intelligence is studied in the final chapter. We will have a closer look at some of the major peacekeeping operations throughout the history of the United Nations and the role 'intelligence' played in their successes or failures.

1. The concept 'Intelligence'

1.1. Definition

Intelligence can be described as 'the collection and analysis of information'; the building blocks for the information are individual data; the difference between data and information is that the latter also refers to the aim the user has for the information.[1]
In our present information society information in its broadest meaning is quickly becoming the most valuable resource. The old adage "knowledge is power" is now true more then ever before in history.
There is a clear distinction between espionage and intelligence. Espionage is secretly and illegally gaining knowledge about the adversary for the sake of self benefit; while intelligence is a much wider concept including all possible ways of collecting information.[2]

1.2. The Intelligence cycle

Intelligence can be described as a process consisting of five steps: planning, collecting, processing, analysing and distribution of information. Together these five steps are called the 'intelligence cycle'.
Planning can be considered as the management phase of the whole process. From the acknowledgement for the need of information to the distribution of the finished intelligence; it is the beginning and the end point of the cycle.
The collection consists of the gathering of 'raw' information; which can come from open or closed sources. Open sources are defined as 'all information sources which are legally and ethically accessible for the general public'.[3] At present an estimate of 70 to 90 percent of all information is open source information.
Closed sources are those not accessible for the public. Due to of the enormous advances and availability in technology, the distinction between both sources is getting blurred. Satellite images for example, used to be a closed source, only available to the military and intelligence agencies of advanced states, but are now available for anyone through specialised internet sites.

---

[1] SCHAAP, C. *'Bedrijfsspionage en informatiemakelaardij : criminaliteit van de toekomst ?*', Het Tijdschrift voor de Politie, nr.4, april 1994, 6.
[2] COOLS, M., '*Kwetsbare kennis : criminele aspecten van de kennistechnologie'*, lezing opening academiejaar Politie Opleidingscentrum antwerpen, 25 oktober 1996.
[3] CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, ' Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency perspective', *in Encyclopedia of security management : techniques and technology*, FAY, J.J.(ed.), Boston, Butter-worth-Heinemann, 1993, 402-404.

In the third step of the cycle, the processing, 'raw' information is transformed into a form more apt for producing the finished intelligence; it could be for example that the gathered data requires decryption or translation.
During the analysis phase the information is transformed into finished intelligence through integration, evaluation and analysis of all the available gathered information.
The final step is the distribution; this is the handing over of the finished intelligence to the consumer who ordered the information. The consumer can then use this intelligence for taking decisions, often creating new needs for information which then closes the intelligence cycle.[4]

1.3. Different forms of Intelligence

Human intelligence (HUMINT) is the gathering of information through people and was the most important form of intelligence until the beginning of the 20th century. During the last decennia of the 20th century the importance of HUMINT declined in favour of TECHINT or technical intelligence, which is the collection of information through all possible technical means. It can be divided into signals intelligence (SIGINT), electronic intelligence (ELINT), communications intelligence (COMINT), radar intelligence (RADINT) and imagery intelligence (IMINT).
SIGINT is the collection and decryption of encoded material and became very common during the First World War.[5] ELINT is the interception of all possible forms of electronic traffic while COMINT focuses on the eavesdropping of (radio) communication lines. RADINT consists of information coming from radar installations. IMINT uses all imagery gathered with satellites or planes which can use infra-red, thermal or other sensor devices for producing imagery. [6]
TECHINT can deliver an enormous amount of data; especially the intelligence services of the United States have put a lot of effort and confidence in SIGINT and IMINT. The National Security Agency (NSA) for example created ECHELON, a program for intercepting worldwide phone, fax and email traffic and filtering these data with computers using keywords. However after 9/11 United States intelligence agencies realised that focussing mainly on TECHINT is not always successful and thus more time and effort are invested in human intelligence again.

[4] CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, I.c., 403.
[5] LAQUER, W., *A world of secrets: the uses and limits of intelligence,* New York, Basic Books, 1985, 30.
[6] WESTERFIELD, H.B., *Inside CIA's private world*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1995, IX.

1.4. Intelligence in the public sector

The sort of information, the purpose and the way of collecting differs according to the different players on the intelligence field. A first important distinction to make is between those players belonging to the public field like the different national intelligence agencies and special police services, and those from the private sector, like the big private security companies and information brokers.

In the public field we find the intelligence agencies of the national states, they can work for the military or the civil administration. Many police services also have intelligence units focussed mainly on terrorism and organised crime.
Further differentiation can be made according to geographical operations theatre. Offensive intelligence agencies engage in active espionage and work exclusively abroad like the Central Intelligence Agency in the U.S. and the Secret Intelligence Service in the U.K.
Defensive services, such as the Belgian Sûrete de l'Etat, operate only on the national territory of a state and engage in counter-espionage.

On the international level organisations traditionally never really engaged in intelligence because it was always viewed as intruding into state sovereignty, and usually they worked with information received from their member states. This vision is slowly changing because of their ever increasing responsibilities and tasks, which often brings along a real need for independent intelligence.
Because of the negative connotation associated with the term 'intelligence' international organisations try hard to avoid this term. The Joint Information Centre created a few years ago within the European Council is a good example.
It has to centralise European Intelligence regarding threats against the E.U. and deliver supporting information for the E.U. foreign policy, but due to its small size it is still in a developing stage.

NATO relies mainly on the information coming from the military intelligence agencies from its member states. Since the Balkan war in the 90's, NATO is engaging more and more in 'peacekeeping' missions. During these missions it creates ad hoc intelligence agencies constituted out of military personnel from its members to provide intelligence for force protection and to inform the force commander.
Since counter-terrorism is a major task of NATO, it has established an intelligence section and a anti-terrorism section, for which it relies heavily on countries cooperating and sharing their intelligence.

1.5. Intelligence in the private sector

Private persons using intelligence is not a new phenomenon, the first known example dates back to the 14th century when 2 Italian bankers, De Bardi and Peruzzi used an extensive network of spies for collecting intelligence before extending major loans.[7]

The private intelligence sector has known a huge increase in actors involving in some sort of intelligence work in recent years. Many of the large international security firms like Control Risks or Kroll have diversified their activities and now often offer a wide range of intelligence to their clients.
They can deliver business or competitive intelligence and global security intelligence for high risk environments. Business intelligence is the gathering of information that can legally and ethically be used to improve the continuity and profit of a company. "*The fundamental purpose of competitive intelligence is to reduce the inherent risk of deciding a key business issue by providing to the decision makers an accurate understanding of the issue with respect to the competition."* [8]
When illegal techniques are used to gather the information, this is considered corporate or industrial espionage.

[7] ALEM, J.P., *L'espionage: histoire methods*, Paris, Lauvauzalle, 1987, 239.
[8] ZIMMER, G.H., 'Intelligence, competitive intelligence in business', in *Encyclopedia of security management: techniques and technology*, FAY, J.J., (ed.), Boston, Butterworth-Heinemann, 1993, 401.

2.The United Nations and intelligence.

"Intelligence means knowledge," it refers to that select portion of information that is necessary for leaders at all levels of command to make decisions.[9]

2.1. Need and use of Intelligence in the United Nations.

Article 1 of the Charter describes the overall objective of the United Nations as: *"to maintain international peace and security and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace"*
Over the years the United Nations has developed a wide range of instruments for this purpose such as: preventive actions, peacemaking, peacekeeping, peace building, disarmament, sanctions and peace enforcement.[10]

- Preventive action aims at preventing disputes from developing between parties and can be carried out as preventive diplomacy, deployment of troops or a combination of both.
- Peacemaking is a diplomatic action to bring hostile parties to negotiate a settlement.
- Peacekeeping is a United Nations presence in the field with the consent of the parties.
- Peace building refers to the measures and structures which promote peace.
- Peace-enforcement includes the use of armed force to maintain international peace and security.[11]

Each of these different 'conflict resolution' instruments needs intelligence to be carried out effectively and successfully. Intelligence support can identify areas at risk, key actors, their perceptions, the effectiveness of ongoing efforts, more effective use of force to get a ceasefire and minimize the loss of life and property; and a more effective monitoring of contested areas and verification of treaty terms.[12]
Intelligence enhances both the overall strategic and the local tactical aspects of 'peacekeeping'.

---

[9] SHERMAN, K.. Strategic Intelligence for British World Policy (1999), p.3.

[10] HARLEMAN, C., *An introduction to the U.N. system, UNITAR POCI, 2003, New York, 38.*
[11] *Ibid.*, 39.
[12] WILLIAMS, C., *Intelligence support to U.N. peacekeeping operations*, National defence University, Fort McNair, Washington, 1993, 3.

A well informed Secretariat and Security Council will be much more capable to overcome propaganda and half truths to build consensus in getting all nations to fully support or comply with Security Council decisions.[13]

Observation, analysis and timely reporting, all elements of intelligence work, are the 'peacekeepers' primary mission.[14] This must be followed by the comprehension of the situation; intelligence reports shed light in understanding events, enabling observers to be more efficient. Intelligence collection and processing is one of the basis functions of a peacekeeping operation.[15]

Intelligence is also vital for 'force protection', when governments know that there is good intelligence support available for their forces, they might be less hesitant to provide troops.

2.2. The Intelligence system at the United Nations.

An intelligence system is designed to deliver information at three levels: strategic, operational and tactical.

- Strategic intelligence can be defined as "*gathering, analyzing, distributing and utilizing information and know-how to further its own ends relative to other states, political groups, military powers, movements or individuals*".[16]
  The Secretary-General, the Security Council and the General Assembly require strategic intelligence to provide the necessary information on which to base decisions concerning the conduct and development of policy. Such information includes: the origins of the conflict or the geo-strategic goals of the international community.

- Operational level intelligence is required by planners for peacekeeping forces at the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, Force Commanders and UN relief agencies to plan the most effective deployment of the UN resources to the field and to be aware of the threat posed by parties to the conflict. This includes information about the intentions and capabilities of the warring parties and the character of the military activities (conventional, guerilla, ethnic cleansing). Also the United Nations special tribunals are in need of solid intelligence.

- Finally, UN contingent commanders need tactical level intelligence on the local situation to be aware of shifts in different local factions and in order

[13] *Ibid.*, 7.
[14] Ayers, C., *Peacekeeping tactics, techniques and procedures*, Langley Airforce Base Virginia, 1989, 31.
[15] *Ibid.*, 55.
[16] WIEBES, C., *Ibid.,* 13.

to carry out their mandated tasks. This type of information is locally focused and includes ethnic and religious division, strength and location of belligerents, demarcation lines, mine fields, checkpoints and tactical centers of gravity.

2.3 Information sources and their limitations.

Information is continually flowing into UN Headquarters from agencies such as the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and the Department of Public Affairs, peacekeeping missions, member states themselves, as well as from readily available open sources.
The *UN Situation Center* (SitCen) in New York is the main organ which gathers and processes information from the field continuously and round-the-clock. The SitCen in New York is part of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and also has a small analyzing unit, called *Information and Research Unit*[17]. Besides its limited sizes its major problem is that it is mainly dependent on intelligence coming from national intelligence agencies; which leaves the possibility of manipulation of intelligence wide open. The only independent information it gets is from UN monitors and observers on the ground, but they sometimes blame SitCen of sucking up lots of information without creating much output.

The problems created by this dependency on Nations supplying intelligence to the United Nations are epitomized by the debacle over Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. When Secretary of State Colin Powell presented what he said was U.S. evidence that Iraq had such weapons, no one in the room had the capacity to evaluate his claims.[18]

Another illustrative example comes from Carla Del Ponte, Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, in her address to the Security Council in December 2005 stated that the Office o the Prosecutor had to start up a in-house fugitive tracking capability because of a lack of intelligence sharing. *"The circulation of information among the interested parties, domestic and international, is inadequate. Intelligence gathering efforts are carried out at the national level, and the products of intelligence are jealously guarded by the various national authorities for themselves. Our tracking activities are meant to remain of a mainly coordinating nature, because my Office cannot build up the technical and human resources needed to carry out sophisticated intelligence operations. When significant resources are required, we have to turn to the relevant States or to NATO or EUFOR. Unfortunately they have been unwilling to provide the ICTY with useful information on fugitives or to coordinate efforts…mechanisms need to be set up or revived that offer the possibility for*

[17] JACOBS, I, *UNSCOM, A United Nations Intelligence Organisation*, Canadian Forces College, 1999, 3.
[18] CHESTERMAN, S., *This time too the UN has no Intelligence*, International Herald Tribune, April 22, 2006.

meaningful planning and exchanges of information between those involved in intelligence-gathering activities".[19]

We can only assume that the other special courts, who have even less resources than the ICTY, and the International Criminal Court face the same problems regarding the need for intelligence sharing.

Since there is currently no organization or department within the United Nations System with regard to intelligence, the Secretary General must rely on informal and ad hoc information sharing by member states. This information is heavily filtered; states share only that information that serves their agenda
This means that currently the United Nations can not benefit from the advantages of good intelligence and therefore is less effective in fulfilling its goals as it should be.

2.4. The need for a dedicated Intelligence Unit.

2.4.1. Arguments pro

Commander Charles Williams from the U.S. Navy describes following desirable functions and capabilities needed by the United Nations:

- gather and process all open source information,
- get information from all the organizations worldwide within the U.N. system,
- provide limited access and security for sensitive information provided by member states,
- function as base station to receive independent satellite data.
- Provide 24 hour support to the Secretary-General, Security Council and all deployed U.N. forces.[20]

Another strong advocate of improved intelligence within the United Nations is Colonel Jan-Inge Svensson from the Swedish Armed Forces Intelligence and Security Center. He stresses that the in response to the realization that intelligence is just as important for peacekeeping as for traditional military operations, serious plans must be made to improve intelligence capacities for peacekeeping, for future conflicts will be at a sub-state level, and peacekeepers need clear and accurate pictures of what is happening. Mr. Svensson recommends that the UN itself needs to set up an intelligence structure; it should no longer be satisfied with total dependence on assets and analysts contributed by willing member states.

[19] DEL PONTE, C., *Carla Del Ponte addresses the Security Council*, The Hague, 15 December 2005, 1-2.
[20] *Ibid*., 15.

The UN may not like being involved with 'spying', but it has an obligation to protect its forces while on mission.[21]

A United Nations intelligence component should be multi-disciplinary, a world where law enforcement, military, changing technology, linguists, finance and commercial interests are intertwined needs intelligence teams that are just as diverse and well-rounded.[22]
It would be a central location for all information to be received, analysed, evaluated, and disseminated. This centralization would make more information available to all mission participants. It would be a place where secret intelligence contributed by member states would be combined with commercial satellite imagery, open source information, and operational level and tactical intelligence.

2.4.2. Arguments contra

Looking through the United Nations website or official documents one will search in vain for a reference to a U.N. intelligence unit or intelligence agents working for the U.N. That is because term 'intelligence' is not used within the organization because of political reasons; it has too many negative connotations. Therefore 'intelligence' is usually replaced by the more neutral term 'information' or 'military information' during peacekeeping missions.[23]

There are indications that this attitude is changing, but the United Nation's preference for the term 'information' rather than intelligence, indicative of the sensitiveness and the notion that intelligence is an unethical means for pursuing a moral cause is pervasive.[24] It is the secret intelligence, information gathered covertly, which accounts for less than five percent of the total information obtainable, that causes the controversy. Yet secret intelligence is indispensable in filling critical knowledge gaps and verifying open source information and is accepted as such by states in a national context. In forewarning of threats, it may prevent their occurrence or minimize the need to use force. It is often the only effective means of countering the activities of opponents who themselves operate clandestinely.[25]

The process of collection, assessment and dissemination of secret intelligence is non-transparent and is therefore seen as the very antithesis of the non-threatening and impartial image which traditionally has been deemed critical to the success of peace keeping operations.

---

[21] DUMULON,A.; HEIDE, R. and PHILLIPS, J., *Peacekeeping Intelligence: New players, extended boundaries,* Conference report, 2003, 6.
[22] DUMULON,A.; HEIDE, R. and PHILLIPS, J., *Ibid., 17.*
[23] VILLENEUVE, D., *Intelligence and the UN: lessons from Bosnia - a Canadian experience*. Military Intelligence Professional Bulletin, 2006, 2.
[24] GENDRON A., *Ethical issues: the use of intelligence in peace support operations*. Centre for Security and Defence Studies, Carleton University, 2004, 1.
[25] *Ibid.,* 2.

Transparency was seen as the means by which to ensure the fair and objective treatment of all sides. But paradoxically, secret intelligence can serve the idea of impartiality where it informs decision-makers about the actual situation on the ground in the face of disinformation, prejudice, preconceived judgments and sympathies. [26]

One of the main causes why the UN can not gather intelligence effectively is because of the Status Agreement with the host country, which states that the mission must adhere to the principles of legitimacy, consent, transparency, impartiality and neutrality.
This means that intelligence gathering on other member states, even during peacekeeping missions, does not belong in the open and transparent culture within the UN. Especially the humanitarian wing within the UN-system, like UNHCR and UNICEF, are strong defenders of this vision. The attitudes of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Department of Political Affairs, which were traditionally also strongly against intelligence within the UN, are slowly changing.[27]

Another problem is the difference of defining the concept of intelligence by the member states. And the reluctance of many states to hand over information to the UN, caused mainly by frequent 'leaks' within the organization because there is no system in place to work with classified material. And in the past it turned out that some, even high level, UN employees were still working for their national intelligence agency. Which touches one of the main problems that would rise if the UN would create an independent intelligence agency; how can it make sure that the people working for it or completely independent and don't continue working for their own national agencies?

But the main reason is that many countries are afraid that an effective intelligence unit within the UN could harm their national interests at some point. In 1992 the European Community, Russia, Australia, Canada and New Zealand made a proposition to create an independent 'intelligence-gathering facility' within the UN for 'early warning' purposes and preventive diplomacy. The proposition "*touched off a furious response from the United States, which appears to be resolutely opposed to any moves that would enhance the UN's ability to gather and analyze sensitive information in an independent fashion*". [28]

The primary impediment to the establishment of a credible UN intelligence gathering system, aside from the cost, is rooted in the transparency of the organization itself. As all member states have access to information generated by the UN, classified information gathered by an individual state and used by the UN may reveal capabilities and techniques of the gathering state. In addition, many member states view covert intelligence gathering against them as a violation of their sovereignty. Should the UN engage in such activities, it would be paradoxical that the organization that has been the vehicle for defining and expanding individual state sovereignty would then be accused of violating those rights.

---

[26] *Ibid.2.*
[27] WIEBES, C., *Ibid.*, 26.
[28] CURTIS, M., *The great deception, Anglo-American power and world order*, London, 1998, 200-201.

The former British Permanent Representative with the UN, Sir David Hannay, mentioned three reasons why there will not be such an agency: first of all member states are not prepared to pay for it, secondly it would pose a to big of a threat to national security and finally the DPKO would not know what to do with all the intelligence because it does not have enough personnel to deal with it.[29]

[29] HANNAY, D., 'Intelligence and International Agencies', in Shukman (ed.), *Agents for change. Intelligence services in the 21ste century*, London, 2000, *179*.

3. Intelligence during peacekeeping missions.

Although the paradigm of Cold War peacekeeping was the interposition of impartial forces with the consent of the belligerents where the requirement for intelligence on the belligerents was minimal, the UN mission in the Congo (ONUC, 1961-65) was a premonition of the intelligence needs of UN forces in the post-Cold War era.
Major-General Carl von Horn of Sweden, ONUC's first commander, believed that the UN needed an "information gathering and processing agency", as the force was deployed into a situation that was escalating into a series of civil wars. Secretary-General U Thant soberly assessed the situation faced by his force commander: "We are fully aware of your long standing limitations in gathering information. The limitations are inherent in the very nature of United Nations and therefore of any operation conducted by it."[30] As the UN became a target to all sides in the conflict, U Thant authorized the use of force to subdue the secessionist province of Katanga and several roving gangs of mercenaries.
In response to the intelligence requirement for this operation, a Military Information Branch (MIB) was created. Its mission was to conduct, gather and analyze SIGINT, IMINT and HUMINT. Initial MIB operation used SIGINT to listen in on Katangese radio traffic. As the conflict deepened, MIB eventually acquired the services of two Swedish photo-reconnaissance aircraft, which clarified the threat posed by the Kataganese Air Force. The failure of MIB"s HUMINT capability was exposed in the ambushing of an Irish patrol, with serious losses, by Baluba tribesmen. ONUC continually was the focus of acrimonious debate about the role that the UN should play in internal conflicts, while the lessons learned by MIB staff were quickly forgotten.[31]
The cornucopia of intra-state conflicts, similar to the Congo, which the UN has dealt with has spurred a re-evaluation of its system of collecting and analyzing information.

Another striking example from Cambodia shows that force commanders had no central organization in the UN from which they could request something as simple as reasonably detailed maps of the country. In the United Nations mission to Cambodia in 1992, one high ranking peacekeeper acerbically remarked that" they deployed us without maps . . . if you go into an area, it would be nice to know where you are . . . . I tried for two months to secure maps and finally, 1 had to go back down to Phnom Perth and man-handle a staff official and literally threaten his life so that I could get money to buy them on the black market."[32]

---

[30] WALLER, A. and BELL, D., "*Intelligence and Peacekeeping: The UN Operation n the Congo, 1960-64,*" International Peacekeeping,(Vol. 2, No. 1: Spring 1999), p. 11.

[31] *Ibid*.
[32] LEWIS, W. "*Military Implications of UN Peacekeeping"*, (Washington: NDU Press, 2003), p. 69-110

With the emerging of more complicated 'peacekeeping' missions like Bosnia or Rwanda the problem of poor intelligence gathering within the UN became even more acute.
The Deputy Force commander of UNPROFOR in Bosnia, Major-General Barry Ashton stated in his End of Tour Report:

" *Operations were frequently impaired by the lack of credible and dedicated intelligence means. While NATO information was often made available, the caveats placed on it made it awkward to use in a transparent international organization. As has been pointed out for other UN missions, operating in a complex and higher risk peacekeeping environment without adequate means of information limits the ability of UN forces to carry out their mandated tasks, impairs operational capabilities, and places UN personnel at greater risk."*[33]

The Force Commander for the United Nations Mission in Rwanda, Lt.-General Dallaire, already encountered these problems while preparing the mission deployment in New York: *"I had no means of intelligence on Rwanda. Not one country was willing to provide the UN or even me personally with accurate and up-to-date information".*[34] *We always seemed to be reacting to, rather then anticipating, what was going to happen. The reason for that was that the Rwandan ambassador to the UN had a seat on the Security Council and was not only privy to the inner workings of the mission but to the Security Council's attitude towards the mission…the extremists had a direct pipeline to the kind of strategic intelligence that allowed them to shadow my every move."*[35]

UNPROFOR-Generals Briquemont and MacKenzie also complained about the problems of availability of intelligence during their time with UNPROFOR. And the Swedish Force Commander General Lars Eric Walhgren already advised the UN in New York in 1993 to *"rethink the entire approach to information versus intelligence gathering".*

As a result of UNPROFOR's inadequate intelligence about Srebrenica, the Dutch changed their attitude towards intelligence. They realized that not only was intelligence needed for future peace support operations, but as a force provider, the Netherlands was responsible for protecting its forces. Intelligence capability is now part of the deployed forces package. The Dutch learned the lesson the hard way, and now they now first hand how peacekeeping missions need full intelligence support.[36]

[33] WIEBES, C., *Intelligence en de oorlog in Bosnië, de rol van de inlichtingen- en veiligheidsdiensten*, Nederlands Instituut voor oorlogsdocumentatie, Boom, 2002, 11.
[34] DALLAIRE, R., *Shake hands with the devil*, Arrow Books, London, 2003, 90.
[35] *Ibid.*, 194-195.
[36] DUMULON,A.; HEIDE, R. and PHILLIPS, J., *Ibid., 7.*

In his book 'The Cloak and the Blue Beret' Walter Dorn draws the conclusion: " *Many failures in the history of UN field operations might have been avoided had the UN taken a more forthright approach to intelligence and possessed a stronger mandate to gather information and improve its information gathering system".*[37]

The UNSCOM mission, which had to look for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, was in many ways an exception, also in the use of intelligence. It had its own SIGINT unit and encrypted communication lines; and received a lot of intelligence from member states. At one point UN officials had to limit access for the weapon inspectors to CIA and allied intelligence agencies reports, because Iraq accused them of spying for the US.[38]

The use of intelligence may be less critical to the success of some intervention strategies than others, but there is a general consensus that where military forces are deployed, the availability of intelligence may be critical to the effectiveness of the mission.[39] But besides two exceptions, ONUC and UNSCOM, all field missions had to depend on intelligence from the member states (often the United States), which was of very diverse but usually insufficient quantity and quality.

Other lessons learned from peacekeeping include some old truths about intelligence. Language skills, cultural empathy, the importance of encryption, signals intelligence, civil-military cooperation must be strengthened and a willingness to use and cultivate HUMINT proved essential. Constant rotating of personnel makes it difficult to maintain a trained and well-functioning intelligence staff and the equipment of different member states is often not compatible.

[37] DORN, W., The cloak and the Blue Beret, limitations on intelligence in UN peacekeeping, *International journal of intelligence and counterintelligence*, Vol. 12, 1998, 4.
[38] DIAMOND, J and NICHOLS, B., UN restricts use of intelligence reports, *USA TODAY*, 26/11/2002.
[39] GENDRON, A., *Ibid. 7.*

Conclusion.

Intelligence for peacekeeping missions clearly needs to be made a priority. It is essential for force projection, deployment and warning of threats against peacekeepers. The international community needs to overcome the negative connotation of intelligence. It is not about secrecy; those gathering intelligence are trying to learn what is happening, by using all sources available.

A growing recognition of the importance of intelligence needs to lead to individual nations increasing their intelligence capabilities, to more sharing amongst peacekeeping partners and to an intelligence component within the UN.

A more effective use of intelligence would lay a foundation for a more effective use of the United Nations itself, making it harder for states participating within the forum to ignore emerging crises or embrace unworkable policies. Over time, it may also encourage greater cooperation between states to address those threats that no one state can address alone.

Ultimately, though, an enhanced UN intelligence gathering capability can only come about as a result of greater political resolve and more financial and material support from its member states.

Bibliography:

ALEM, J.P., *L'espionage: histoire methods*, Paris, Lauvauzalle, 1987, 465.

AYERS, C., *Peacekeeping tactics, techniques and procedures*, Langley Airforce Base Virginia, 1989, 31.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, ' Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency perspective', *in Encyclopedia of security management : techniques and technology*, FAY, J.J.(ed.), Boston, Butter-worth-Heinemann, 1993, 402-404.

CHESTERMAN, S., *This time too the UN has no Intelligence*, International Herald Tribune, April 22, 2006.

COOLS, M., '*Kwetsbare kennis : criminele aspecten van de kennistechnologie'*, lezing opening academiejaar Politie Opleidingscentrum antwerpen, 25 oktober 1996, 139p.

CURTIS, M., *The great deception, Anglo-American power and world order*, London, 1998, 200-201.

DALLAIRE, R., *Shake hands with the devil*, Arrow Books, London, 2003, 562 p.

DEL PONTE, C., *Carla Del Ponte addresses the Security Council*, The Hague, 15 December 2005, 5p.

DIAMOND, J and NICHOLS, B., UN restricts use of intelligence reports, *USA TODAY*, 26/11/2002

DORN, W., The cloak and the Blue Beret, limitations on intelligence in UN peacekeeping, *International journal of intelligence and counterintelligence*, Vol. 12, 1998, 414 p.

DUMULON, A.; HEIDE, R. and PHILLIPS, J., *Peacekeeping Intelligence: New players, extended boundaries,* Conference report, 2003, 48p.

GENDRON A., *Ethical issues: the use of intelligence in peace support operations.* Centre for Security and Defence Studies, Carleton University, 2004, 15p.

HANNAY, D., 'Intelligence and International Agencies', in Shukman (ed.)*, Agents for change. Intelligence services in the 21ste century*, London, 2000, *179.*

HARLEMAN, C., *An introduction to the U.N. system, UNITAR POCI, 2003, New York, 171 p.*

JACOBS, I, *UNSCOM, A United Nations Intelligence Organisation*, Canadian Forces College, 1999, 20p.

LAQUER, W., *A world of secrets: the uses and limits of intelligence,* New York, Basic Books, 1985, 404p.

LEWIS, W.. "*Military Implications of UN Peacekeeping"*, (Washington: NDU Press, 2003), 69-110.

SHERMAN, K., Strategic Intelligence for British World Policy (1999), p.3.

SCHAAP, C. *'Bedrijfsspionage en informatiemakelaardij : criminaliteit van de toekomst ?*', Het Tijdschrift voor de Politie, nr.4, april 1994, 6-12.

SHULSKY, A., Silent Warfare: Understanding the World of Intelligence (1999), 6 p.

VILLENEUVE, D., *Intelligence and the UN: lessons from Bosnia - a Canadian experience*. Military Intelligence Professional Bulletin, 2006, 4p.

WALLER, A. and BELL, D., "*Intelligence and Peacekeeping: The UN Operation n the Congo, 1960-64,*" International Peacekeeping,(Vol. 2, No. 1: Spring 1999), 11 p.

WESTERFIELD, H.B., *Inside CIA's private world*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1995, 489p.

WIEBES, C., *Intelligence en de oorlog in Bosnië, de rol van de inlichtingen- en veiligheidsdiensten*, Nederlands Instituut voor oorlogsdocumentatie, Boom, 2002, 489 p.

WILLIAMS, C., *Intelligence support to U.N. peacekeeping operations*, National Defence University, Fort McNair, Washington, 1993, 25 p.

ZIMMER, G.H., 'Intelligence, competitive intelligence in business', in *Encyclopedia of security management: techniques and technology*, FAY, J.J., (ed.), Boston, Butterworth-Heinemann, 1993, 401-402.