

There is a related point. Even if defined satisfactorily at the beginning of an operation, the mandate may be subject to interpretation or gradual erosion. Freedom of movement, for example, is particularly important for the carrying out of any mission which involves observation of frontiers or the supervision of a return to normal conditions. Generally, it will be in the interest of the Parties that such movement be as unrestricted as possible. But there will also be occasions when this is not so. It is now an accepted condition of peacekeeping that the host government consent to the operations and procedures followed by the U.N. Nor in principle must the U.N. interfere in the internal affairs of the host state. But it must be able to observe, to verify and where necessary to interpose. It will be the more difficult to carry out this task if there is not firm, consistent pressure on the Parties to co-operate. Who is to exercise this pressure? It is unfair to expect the Secretary-General to do the job alone. The Security Council must give him the backing he needs. If it cannot do so, then contributors may have no choice but to re-examine their decision to participate in the operation.

A third important conclusion we would draw from our experience is that peacekeeping is a beginning, not an end. Perhaps the day will come when the U.N. is able to provide for forces and to maintain bases around the world on a semi-permanent basis. But that day has not yet arrived. In the meantime contributions by governments of contingents of their forces for U.N. peacekeeping purposes will be based on the assumption that the Parties to the dispute will get on with the job of settling their differences or re-establishing order. The U.N. cannot and must not be responsible for one Party clearly gaining the advantage