

overwhelming military forces, nor the political clout to obtain cooperation from reluctant parties. Furthermore, in these circumstances, these countries do not have the strong geo-political or economic interests in the particular region that would encourage resolute policy determination and higher-risk military operations. The lead country therefore becomes susceptible to the influence of those more powerful nations who do have strong parochial interests.

Some of the major powers and those with colonial histories in the region would have had more difficulty in forming a multinational coalition, had they been so inclined. This is particularly true in the case of France, whose presence in theatre was in fact flatly rejected by some of the host parties. Similarly, the Government of Zaire, and potential partners in the MNF, would have suspected that a US-led force might support the cause of the Tutsi rebels.

Recommendation 2: Where the presence of major, ex-colonial powers is unwelcome, countries with no obvious parochial interests can be more acceptable in the formation and leadership of such missions (despite their operational limitations).

Observation 3: Almost any use of the MNF had political implications. The various political interests of parties on the ground and in the MNF made management of the mission difficult.

Unlike in "traditional" peacekeeping missions, this operation envisioned the insertion of armed forces into an area where the parties were still engaged in combat. In such circumstances, all use of military force has political implications. The parties on the ground, and some in the MNF, understood that the presence of the Force would affect the military and, therefore, political balance on the ground. The varying, and often competing positions of the parties on the ground and in the coalition was one of the primary obstacles to the effective use of the MNF.

The MNF was formed around the consensus that an impending humanitarian emergency required a "humanitarian" response involving the military. In fact, the label "humanitarian" became a "fig leaf"; countries coalesced around the need to address the immediate humanitarian concerns, without being willing to take the difficult political decisions to agree to a well-defined