

established to patrol the Sinai in accordance with the Camp David Accords and remains in operation today.

Another peacekeeping force, the Multinational Force (MNF) in Beirut, was deployed in August 1982 to supervise the withdrawal of Syrian and Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) forces from Beirut. The contingent consisted of troops from France, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States. It became a focal point of controversy in October 1983 when two suicide attacks by Moslem extremists resulted in the death of 69 French paratroopers and 241 US marines. Both the American and French troops became increasingly involved in actively supporting the Christian Phalange faction and thereby vitiated their "peacekeeping" role. In effect, they became another faction in the ongoing civil war, incurring the animosity of factions opposed to the Lebanese government. The Force was withdrawn by the summer of 1984.

FINANCING OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

From the inception of UN peacekeeping missions, controversy over the method of financing such operations has plagued the Organization. The dispute over financing reached critical proportions in 1964, and threatened to cripple these operations. The roots of the financial crisis lay in disagreement between the states over the right of the General Assembly to call for international peacekeeping forces, to apportion the expenses of these missions, and the obligations of states to pay the apportionments. Surrounding the financial crisis was the more serious political and constitutional dispute over powers and responsibilities under the Charter.

Significant cleavages between Member States emerged during the UNEF and Congo operation. The Soviets refused to contribute to the financing of UN Peacekeeping. The French agreed to the establishment of UNEF and paid its assessments. However, France abstained when the Security Council voted to send UN forces into the Congo, subsequently opposed apportionment of the costs of the General Assembly, and has refused to pay the assessments. Both the United States and the United Kingdom endorsed the stand taken by the Security Council in financing the UNEF and sent their contributions in accordance with the assessments made by the General Assembly.

In an effort to cope with the financial difficulties, the General Assembly took two steps. First, the Assembly authorized the Security Council to issue, as a stop-gap measure, \$200 million worth of UN bonds. Secondly, it sought an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) with respect to whether or not the financial expenditures of UN peacekeeping missions constituted "expenses of the Organisation" within the meaning of Article 17(2) of the Charter. The advisory opinion of the ICJ supported by the majority of judges stated that "investigation and observation operations undertaken by the organization to prevent possible aggression should be financed as part of the regular budget of the UN".

Notwithstanding the acceptance of the Court's

opinion by the majority of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union has continued to insist that these interpretations are "incorrect and incompatible with the Charter".

By the end of 1964 the Organization had unpaid commitments amounting to \$129.7 million and was short \$145.3 million in unpaid assessments. In 1965 the Secretary-General reported that 16 countries, including France and the Soviet Union, were in arrears "in excess of the amount of their assessed contributions for the preceding two full years". This raised the question of their right to vote in the General Assembly under Article 19. Article 19 stipulates that a member state which is in excess of 2 years in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the UN shall have no vote in the General Assembly. Thus, the political and constitutional issue of whether Article 19 pertained to arrears on peacekeeping assessments or only on those on the regular budget was raised in conjunction with the financial issue.

United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Financial Costs (in US\$)

UNMOGIP	\$ 31,995,819	From inception of mission to 31 Dec. 1979.
UNTSO	\$130,851,866	From inception of mission to 31 Dec. 1979.
UNEF I	\$220,124,012	From inception to end of mission. The financial cost of UNEF I was considerably reduced by the absorption of varying amounts of the expenses involved by the countries providing contingents.
UNOGIL	\$ 3,697,742	From inception to end of mission.
ONUC	\$400,130,793	From inception to end of mission.
UNTEA	The governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands paid full costs in equal amounts.	
UNYOM	\$ 1,840,450	From inception to end of mission.
	\$ 800,000 (each)	Contributions from Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic.
UNFICYP	\$398.5 (million)	From inception of mission to 1 June 1982. UNFICYP is financed entirely by means of voluntary contributions and by troop contributing countries — Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, New Zealand, Sweden, and the United Kingdom — which pay for direct salaries and related costs and for some supplies and a variety of other direct costs.
UNIPOM	(1) \$ 1,713,280	From inception to end of mission.
	(2) \$ 33,500	
UNEF II	\$446,487,000	From inception to end of mission.
UNDOF	\$121,355,321	From inception of mission to 31 May 1982.
UNIFIL	\$449,889,727	From inception of mission to 18 June 1982.

Source: Wiseman, H. (ed.), *Peacekeeping: Appraisals and Proposals*, 1983.