

a mediator, to negotiate the terms of a conflict resolution. In this sense, they are fundamentally humanitarian in origin, not political. Neither are they conceptualized in the same way in which traditional ceasefires are conceived: The organizing feature may be primarily time (five days of peace), space (corridors of tranquillity), or both (corridors of tranquillity lasting for a fixed period of time).

There is no formal mechanism, either at the UN or any other regional organization, for setting into motion and carrying out the process that results in a humanitarian ceasefire. The impetus for the ceasefire will usually come from the party for whom the humanitarian need is pertinent; whether that is a humanitarian organization, some other non-governmental organization (NGO) or the parties to the dispute themselves.

If humanitarian ceasefires and traditional ceasefires are negotiated with quite different objectives in mind, it may be that they still serve the same master. That master is conflict resolution. In the following sections of this paper we shall analyze and compare the traditional UN approach to conflict resolution exemplified by the resort to peacekeeping forces, and the contribution that might be made to the peace process by all that is intrinsic to the negotiation of a humanitarian ceasefire, a non-traditional path to conflict resolution.