

PEACEKEEPING AT SEA? A CASE STUDY OF THE MARITIME TASK FORCE IN LEBANON¹

Luiz Gustavo Aversa Franco²

ABSTRACT

Since the end of the Cold War, naval forces have become more and more important to peacekeeping and conflict management efforts, a novelty whose best example is the Maritime Task Force (MTF) established within the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). The objective of this work is to present the potentialities of the employment of naval forces in peace operations to fulfil their mandates through the case study of UNIFIL-MTF, emphasizing the role played by Brazil and how it boosts the country's projection in international peace and security. Using the operational concepts of "maritime interdiction" and "peacekeeping", this paper presents an overview of the utility of naval forces in peace operations in general, a brief background of the 2006 conflict in Lebanon, the performance of UNIFIL-MTF and the importance of the Task Force to the Brazilian participation in peace operations. The main contribution of this research is to fill a gap in the existing literature on the issue, which has very few updated titles dedicated to this subject.

Key-words: UNIFIL-MTF; peacekeeping; maritime interdiction; Brazil.

¹The author thanks Prof. Ana Flávia Granja e Barros and Prof. Alcides Costa Vaz for their valuable contributions, exempting them of any responsibility.

²PhD Candidate at the University of Brasília's Graduate Studies Program in International Relations (PPGRI-UnB), Brasília, DF, Brazil and member of the International Security Studies and Research Group (GEPSI). The present work was carried with support of the CNPq, National Council for Scientific and Technological Development – Brazil. E-mail: luizgafranco@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Since the late 1940s, the United Nations (UN) has employed military forces voluntarily granted by its member-states to assist in conflict management and resolution efforts in what has been known as peacekeeping or peace operations. Such operations have been carried out mostly by ground troops, with maritime forces playing a small and partial role. However, with the end of the Cold War and the changing nature of armed conflicts around the world (i.e., the decrease of classic international/interstate conflicts and the simultaneous increase of internal/intrastate conflicts), this scenario has changed and naval forces have become more and more important to peacekeeping and conflict management. This novelty is best illustrated by the establishment of the Maritime Task Force (MTF) as an integrating part of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). Initially, this was a largely European force, commanded and composed by European armed forces. However, since 2010, the Europeans have reduced their forces, with emergent countries filling the gap, among them Brazil, who has the command of the Task Force in 2011.

The first (and so far only) example of naval forces being placed under the UN flag as an integral part of a peacekeeping operation, the MTF has been established in the aftermath of the 2006 Israel-Hizbollah war as part of a redesign of UNIFIL, deployed since 1978. The Task Force's main purpose is to enforce the arms embargo imposed by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) against unofficial armed groups in Lebanon, and it does so by conducting maritime interdiction operations on the Lebanese coast. Unlike other cases when naval power was employed to conduct such operations in support of a peacekeeping mission, the units that comprise the MTF are an integral part of the UN force (and not an independent force acting in parallel), representing a "groundbreaking innovation for the UN system" (MATTELAER, 2013).

Peace operations are historically a highly important issue for students of International Relations, International Security and Peace Studies. However, even with the considerable attention given to the employment of multinational naval forces in peace operations during the last decades, the knowledge about these forces' potential in such operations is not yet widespread. Real life cases are few and recent, which makes

the general understanding of this issue considerably underdeveloped. This leads to the following **research problem**: how does the employment of naval forces contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security within the peace operations framework? In an attempt to satisfactorily answer it, the following **research hypothesis** will be tested: the employment of naval forces as components of peace operations can be useful to a large extent in the fulfilment of their mandate as exemplified by the case of UNIFIL-MTF.

In this sense, the general objective of this work is to present the potentialities of the employment of multinational naval forces in peace operations to fulfil their mandates through the case study of UNIFIL-MTF, emphasizing the role played by Brazil and how it boosts the country's projection in international peace and security. In order to do so, the present work is divided in seven sections, including this Introduction. The second section presents the operational concepts that lay the analytical foundations for this study: maritime interdiction and peacekeeping. The third section provides an overview of the role played by naval forces in peacekeeping operations in general. The fourth section briefly presents the background of the 2006 conflict in Lebanon and how UNIFIL has been redesigned to tackle the situation and its main developments. The fifth section will analyze the role of the MTF as part of UNIFIL, its contribution to the fulfilment of the mission's mandate and its development from inception to the present day. The sixth section addresses the importance of the MTF to Brazil's participation in peace operations, underlining the Brazilian perspective on the issue. Finally, the Conclusion will present the study's main findings and final argument.

The main contribution of this paper is to fill a gap in the existing literature on the issue, which has very few updated titles dedicated to this subject. In fact, it will be perceptible along the next sections that very little attention has been given to the role played by UNIFIL-MTF in conflict management in Lebanon, especially in the last years. In addition, there is almost no examples of published works that address the Brazilian contribution to the mission and its perspectives on the subject. Therefore, it is hoped that the analysis presented here contributes to the advance of other researches on naval peacekeeping and the role played by Brazil in this scenario.

OPERATIONAL CONCEPTS: MARITIME INTERDICTION AND PEACEKEEPING

In order to properly analyze the role of naval forces in peacekeeping operations in general and the role of the UNIFIL-MTF in particular, it is necessary to present and clarify the main aspects of two operational concepts that are fundamental to this study: maritime interdiction and peacekeeping.

According to Fernando dos Santos (2013, p. 499), the concept of maritime interdiction “in its most generic conceptualization, encompasses the capacity to interfere in the use of the sea by third parties”, and involves “any measure, imposed by a Naval Power, that limits maritime transport or navigation, even partially or temporarily”. Also referred to as Maritime Interdiction Operation (MIO), this concept is operationally defined by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION) as encompassing:

seaborne enforcement measures to intercept the movement of certain types of designated items into or out of a nation or specific area (...) normally restricted to the interception and, if necessary, boarding of vessels to verify, redirect or impound their cargoes in support of the enforcement of economic or military sanctions (NATO, 2005, p. 1).

Before advancing further, it is important to differentiate maritime interdiction from blockade operations. On the one hand, MIOs share similarities with these last ones “by employing the same classic strategic conception” while, on the other, being distinct of them “as regards to the possibilities of employment and to tactical-operational procedures”. In this sense, the main difference between MIOs and blockade operations is that the former are not usually unilaterally undertaken by an individual state, being normally related to an authorization from an international organization (IO) that is seen as legitimate, even by the interdiction’s target state.³ It follows from this understanding that a fundamental trait of MIOs is the “non-state character of the application of military force”,

³In legal terms, the basis for such action is found in the United Nation Charter’s Article 24,

which grants powers to the UNSC to maintain international peace and security.

which must be “determined by a competent body recognized by the international community as the holder of such power and appreciate the respect for state sovereignty by limiting the application of force to the minimum necessary” (SANTOS, 2013, p. 508-509).

It must also be noted that MIOs are not only limited to the application of sanctions and that they do not necessarily imply the denial of the use of the sea by a state. In other words, MIOs are not a necessarily coercive measure, with its use being either imposed or requested (the case of UNIFIL-MTF, as it will be seen, is the latter type). Regardless of the category in which it fits, however, MIOs have a few fundamental traits: the contribution to international peace and security as its goal; the selective restriction of the use of the sea; the “contained and moderate stance” of the use of force; a “non-state, collective and agreed character”; its limitation to the maritime environment; the naval means, material goods or people and extraction of sea resources activities as targets of interdiction; and the ability to impose military force without undermining state sovereignty (SANTOS., p. 511). This kind of operation has two objectives, being the determination “if a vessel is in compliance with or in violation of the stated reason for interdiction” its primary one and the gathering of intelligence regarding the “vessel’s itinerary and future intentions” and “[m]ilitary and shipping activity in and around an embargoed nation’s ports” (NATO, 2005, p. 1-2).

In general, units engaged in MIOs have the authority to perform tasks such as: interrogation of vessels “for reasons other than safe navigation”; dispatching “armed boarding parties to visit vessels bound to, through, or out of a defined area”; examination of a ship’s paper and cargo; searching for “evidence of prohibited items”; diversion of vessels that fail to comply with the guidelines established by the sanctioning body; and the seizing of vessels and their cargo in case of refusal to divert. When it comes to the enforcement of embargoes and/or sanctions, the effectiveness of a MIO “is related to compliance with the sanctions or embargo, reduction in the flow of prohibited items, and/or prevention of escalating hostilities”. In this sense, the responsible authority must address the following points during the establishment of a MIO: the level of force authorized in the conduction of the operation; the specification of prohibited items; the geographic limitations; and the disposition or not to divert and/or seize vessels (NATO., p. 1-1 – 1-2).

There has been a considerable number of MIOs conducted since the establishment of the UN System, with documented occurrences including the Beira Patrol (1966-1975), the maritime interdictions in

the Middle-East (1990-2003) and in the Adriatic Sea (1992-1996), the embargo imposed on Haiti (1993-1994), NATO's Operation Unified Protector on Libya (2011) and, finally, the one conducted by UNIFIL-MTF (2006 -). All these operations were approved by the UNSC on the grounds of a Chapter VII resolution,⁴ which presented a specified list of prohibited items and limited the military activities to the maritime area (SANTOS, 2013). The UN is unique among the authorities capable of launching such operations because it is "recognized as a legitimate representative of the community of states in global scale (...) and a tool for the application of a specific naval power capable of respecting states' sovereignty". Its range of operations include conflict prevention, establishment of exclusion zones, maritime interdiction and peace operations (SANTOS., p. 512).

In parallel with the idea of maritime interdiction, the other operational concept for the development of this study is peacekeeping. The UN defines peacekeeping as "one among a range of activities undertaken by the United Nations and other international actors to maintain international peace and security throughout the world", and as "a technique designed to preserve the peace, however fragile, where fighting has been halted, and to assist in implementing agreements achieved by the peacemakers" (UNITED NATIONS, 2008b, p. 17-18).⁵

Developed in the 1940s-1950s as a conflict management tool to fill the gaps left by the post-war collective security regime, peacekeeping operations have become one of the main activities conducted by the UN in the area of peace and security. The main purpose of these operations is, in principle, "to support the implementation of a cease-fire or peace agreement" and, although not being fully-fledged military warfighting operations, peacekeeping missions "may also use force at the tactical level, with the authorization of the Security Council, to defend themselves

⁴Chapter VII of the UN Charter is dedicated to "action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression" and provides the UNSC authority to establish coercive measure in crisis management.

⁵Peacekeeping is, actually, one specific type of the broader concept of peace operations, which encompasses other activities such as peace enforcement and post-conflict peace-building and may be conducted by the UN, regional organizations and *ad hoc* multinational coalitions. For the purposes of this research, however, only peacekeeping operations conducted under the UN flag will be addressed.

and their mandate, particularly in situations where the State is unable to provide security and maintain public order” (UNITED NATIONS., p. 19). Its three basic principles are: (I) the consent of the parties; (II) impartiality; and (III) the non-use of force except in self-defense and defense of the mandate (UNITED NATIONS., p. 31). Since 1948, the UN has deployed almost 70 peacekeeping operations around the globe and, nowadays, it has 16 missions on the field with more than 120 thousand personal (including troops, military observers, police and civilian personnel) involved.⁶

Until the late 1980s, peacekeeping missions were almost exclusively deployed to contain interstate conflicts, patrolling borders among warring states and overseeing the fulfillment of cease-fires and peace agreements. Since the end of the Cold War, however, due to the large increase of internal conflicts and civil wars, peacekeeping operations were adapted to properly handle contemporary conflict situations. This new configuration is called “multi-dimensional” peacekeeping, and its core functions are: the creation of “a secure and stable environment while strengthening the State’s ability to provide security, with full respect for the rule of law and human rights”; the facilitation of the “political process by promoting dialogue and reconciliation and supporting the establishment of legitimate and effective institutions of governance”; and the provision of “a framework for ensuring that all United Nations and other international actors pursue their activities at the country-level in a coherent and coordinated manner”. In fact, these operations often help to “fill the security and public order vacuum that often exists in post-conflict settings”, having “a critical role in securing the peace process, and ensuring that humanitarian and development partners are able to work in a safe environment” (UNITED NATIONS., p. 23-24).

With the proper understanding of how peacekeeping missions are useful as conflict management efforts by the international community and how MIOs may be used to support such efforts in the maritime environment, it is necessary to analyze the general aspects of the role played by naval forces in peacekeeping operations. This is the purpose of the following section.

⁶ United Nations Peacekeeping. Available at: <<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/>>. Access on 19 May 2016.

OVERVIEW OF THE ROLE OF NAVAL FORCES IN PEACEKEEPING

There is an increasing importance of the role played by naval forces in peace operations, with some analysts arguing that “naval peacekeeping support operations are proliferating” (SIEGEL, 2009, p. 101). Conceptually speaking, there are two ways of understanding the role of naval forces in peace operations (often referred to as “naval peacekeeping”): “naval peacekeeping as a derivation of peacekeeping concepts on land and naval peacekeeping as an autonomous concept adjusted to the peculiarities of the maritime context”. Empirical evidence suggest that the first category is the one more observable, with very few cases of the second category being registered – and only very recently, such as the counter-piracy operations off the coast of Somalia since 2008 (OLIVEIRA, 2012, p. 49). Due to its larger empirical support and greater applicability to the case studied, the first understanding is the one adopted here.

In more general terms, naval forces in peace operations have a “broad range of (...) tasks”, encompassing possibilities that vary from the most “benign” (such as “use of Navy vessels to transport relief supplies or a UN contingent”) to the most belligerent (like bombardment) across the conflict spectrum, with some tasks (such as sealift) being applicable throughout its entirety.⁷ Unlike ground troops, “involvement in peace operations does not present navies with missions that are at odds with training for traditional blue-water operations” because, for naval forces, “peacekeeping is not significantly different from regular operations”. In fact, for such forces, the main difference between its traditional warfighting roles and peace operations lies in the location of the operations and its interaction with other forces, i.e., “where those operations take place and the joint nature of the exercises”. There are three main types of UN naval operations: “authorizations” (“when the United Nations authorizes nations to conduct an operation”), “designation” (“when the United Nations designates a lead nation to conduct and command a mandated operation”) and “integration” (“when naval assets are directly integrated into an UN-controlled, ground-based operation”). Such operations have been conducted to transport UN personnel or equipment, riverine monitoring

⁷ A detailed examination of the roles of naval forces in peace operations across the conflict spectrum has been presented by Adam Siegel (2009, p. 99).

and/or sanctions enforcement, monitoring and conduct military operations in support of a UN resolution by member-states. Naval forces have also been employed to support a UN peace operation in an independent manner (SIEGEL, 2009, p. 98-100).

In this sense, naval forces have six distinct tasks in UN peace operations, three regarded as “fundamental” and the other three as “ancillary” (MCLAUGHLIN, 2009, p. 49-54). The first fundamental task is force delivery, which can happen in three different ways: the physical delivery of “land and air forces to distant territory”; the delivery of strikes in support of a UN operation;⁸ and the delivery of “latent force, or presence, in support of a message or warning on behalf of the UN or international community”. The second fundamental task is to “patrol and monitor”, which can be carried out by “monitoring compliance with UN resolutions and peace agreements”, “monitoring and enforcing UN sanctions and embargoes” or “policing compliance with other specific arrangements that are considered integral to a particular mission”. The third and last fundamental task undertaken by naval forces in UN peace operations is logistical support, once the majority of “supplies, equipment and replacement forces provided on a continuing basis during UN peace operations are delivered from the sea”. The first ancillary task of naval forces is to serve as the initial (often primary) command and control platform for the provision of communication facilities in support of UN operations. The second ancillary task is to support the evacuation of non-combatants from a conflict zone. Finally, the third and last ancillary task is the provision of “neutral ground” for negotiations and discussions between parties to a conflict, and between these parties and the international community”.

When it comes to maritime interdiction more specifically, there are two main roles played by naval forces in peace operations: economic/diplomatic “peaceful coercion” and the use of force “for international peace and security purposes”. The first, characterized as a “passive” role, is more commonly related to the enforcement of sanctions and involves the deployment of naval forces as the “obvious observer, whose duty is to monitor and report on compliance and non-compliance rather than to act as an enforcer”. Its legal/conceptual basis is the UN Charter’s

⁸ This can be carried out through means such as “naval gunfire support, detection and targeting intelligence, and aircraft and missile strike” and must be explicitly authorized in the mission’s mandate and explained in its rules of engagement.

Chapter VI, related to the “*pacific settlement of disputes*”. The second role is characterized as “*active*” and loosely resembles classic blockade operations, with the “*use of force for the preservation of international peace and security*” involving the “*use of naval forces to actively implement and enforce compliance*” based on the UN Charter’s Chapter VII and the Law of Naval Warfare – LoNW (MCLAUGHLIN, 2009, p. 125-128).

The employment of naval forces in peace operations has a number of unique advantages and associated challenges which are worthy of examination. One of the main advantages is that naval forces, when operating under national command (i.e., not part of the UN operation), can serve as “*reserves*” for the mission, standing “*ready to intervene with full combat capability to protect or otherwise support*” troops in the ground “*without the UN itself having to assert a combative posture*”. Another important advantage of naval forces in peace operations is their interoperability, i.e., “[t]he ability of naval units to switch from one task to another” (SIEGEL, 2009, p. 101, 104). In this sense, such forces are able to provide added value to a peace operation due to its ability to range “*from the perennial synergy between naval power and diplomacy (...) through constabulary functions (...) to military roles*”. Naval forces can also be of great use to peace operations due to its multi-dimensional flexibility, which can be divided in flexibility of movement, flexibility of presence and flexibility of employment. In terms of movement, naval forces enjoy virtually unrestricted freedom of movement through the ocean and are much lesser prone to the legal, political and practical boundaries that restrict the movement of ground troops. When it comes to presence, naval assets’ greater freedom of movement and easier access to a conflict zone through the sea facilitates the ability of the UN to emphasize or de-emphasize its presence in the scenario through the prompt use of such assets. In addition, naval forces enjoy considerable flexibility of employment, since they can rapidly switch between various levels of force posture due to their interoperability. This “*organic, ‘multi-purpose configuration’*” of military naval vessels “*is what lends naval force its greatest utility for UN peace operations*” (MCLAUGHLIN, 2009, p. 38, 48).

Naval forces' interoperability, however, can be perceived as a liability too. Unlike ground forces, it is more difficult to adapt a warship from full combat capability to more passive stances usually desired for peacekeeping units. Aside from the inherent nature of these different assets (ground troops and maritime forces), the number of potential contributing states of naval forces is considerably smaller than those contributing ground forces, which lowers the number of assets potentially available for a UN peace operations (SIEGEL, 2009; MCLAUGHLIN, 2009). Other disadvantages of naval forces acting in peace operations are its costs and integrated command issues. Maritime forces are inherently expansive to operate, which makes the integration of large naval contingents under the aegis of a UN peace operation with its considerably limited budget not very feasible. These forces also require a considerable degree of compatibility to achieve interoperability and to act effectively, which makes it easier for them to operate under the same national or allied command than the standard multinational integrated command structure of a peace operation (SIEGEL, 2009). The aforementioned flexibility that naval forces provide for peace operations generates a counterpart: the need for increased awareness by the drafters of the mandate of the "character and uses of naval forces" (MCLAUGHLIN, 2009, p. 54). In this sense, peace operations that contemplate a more active role for naval forces must have clearer guidelines for the use of such assets, running the risk of rendering these assets irrelevant.

Beyond the operational advantages and disadvantages associated to naval forces in peace operations scenarios, there are also a few legal and legitimacy issues derived from the presence of such assets that need to be tackled. In its most generic terms, the use of the seas is governed by two sets of rules. The 1982 Law of the Sea Convention (LOSC) – also known as Montego Bay Convention – is the principal legal document that governs the peaceful uses of the seas and oceans. However, when it comes to their belligerent uses, the main referent is the LoNW, which is frequently understood as a subcomponent of the International Law of Armed Conflict/International Humanitarian Law. In the specific context of peace operations, another highly important set of norms and rules is the regime established by the UN Charter, more specifically its Chapter VII. In this sense, there are important

tensions between the provisions established by Chapter VII and those of the LOSC, which generates complications for naval forces in UN peace operations.⁹ However, this is an issue that remains “relatively untouched”, which makes the understanding of the relationship between these two important sources of international law “far from clear”.¹⁰ Still, questions regarding “UN Chapter VII operations, use of force, the LOSC, and their relationship” will continue to be significant, due to the “escalating tempo and intrusiveness of UN peace operations at sea” (MCLAUGHLIN, 2009, p. 13, 24).

Regardless of the confusions and tensions between the LOSC, LoNW and the UN Charter, the provisions of the last one are quite telling about the legal and legitimacy aspects of the role of naval forces in UN peace operations. In fact, Chapter VII, specifically articles 40-42, have important implications for such operations, although remaining “ambiguous”, especially ‘in the case of interdiction operations’ (MCLAUGHLIN, 2009, p. 129). At first, Article 40 gives the UNSC powers to adopt “provisional measures” to prevent an ongoing crisis from escalating, which may include the deployment of naval forces for monitoring and observing. Secondly, Article 41 regards which “measures not involving the use of armed force (...) to be employed to give effect to its decisions”, including “complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of (...) sea (...) means of communication”. Finally, Article 42 establishes that, if the UNSC “consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces to maintain or restore international peace and security”, which “may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations”.¹¹

⁹In sum, while the rights and duties established by the LOSC create “no go zones” in coastal states jurisdictional waters, the provisions of the UN Charter Chapter VII allow the trespassing of such spaces if mandated by the UNSC. It is exactly that there is no legal mechanisms that determine when the provisions of one norm cede to the other that make the relationship between the two confusing and problematic.

¹⁰According to Rob McLaughlin (2009, p. 17), “[w]hilst scholarship and practice has scratched the surface of the separate relationships between LoNW and the UN Charter, and the LoNW and the LOSC, there is scarce analysis of the third element of this triangle – the interaction between UN Charter Chapter VII and the LOSC”, a relationship that is “seminal for UN naval peace operations”.

¹¹UN Charter (full text). Available at: <<http://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/un-charter-full-text/index.html>>. Access on: 31 May 2016.

While Article 41 is seen as a “mandatory sanctions regime” that “must be complied with by all states and parties whether UN members or not”, Article 42 provides a “clear and unequivocal” authorization to “use force during an interdiction operation”. This textual distinction, however, is “is far from clear” in practice (MCLAUGHLIN, 2009, p. 130, 132). Indeed, Rob McLaughlin argues that the relationship between the measures provided by these two articles should not be viewed as a “clear-cut distinction”, but rather as a “continuum”. This continuum varies from the minimum of “enforcement”, which demands “the authority to approach, board, demand documents, search, and if required, divert and arrest”, to the extreme situation when “if a vessel refuses to comply, this authority ultimately extends to firing across that vessel’s bows or, as a last resort, disabling it with direct fire” (MCLAUGHLIN, 2009, p. 133). In this context, the territorial sea acquires special meaning for being “the most significant sphere of maritime activity” in cases where peace operations are authorized to use force. It is the “oceanspace most closely linked to any land territory that is subject to a UN mandate” and most of the typical tasks undertaken by naval forces on such space are “closely linked with, and often vital to, the success of UN peace operations ashore” (MCLAUGHLIN, 2009, p. 33).

The analysis of past practice has revealed that the UN has a potential authority to mandate MIOs in the territorial sea (even without consent) to enforce sanctions regimes. Some of the most illustrative cases include interdiction operations conducted during the First Gulf War and the Yugoslav Wars, occasions in which interdiction can be seen as “as an aspect of the UNSC’s authority to use force in Territorial Seas during peace operations”. On the one hand, the interdiction operation conducted during the First Gulf War is viewed as “the modern precedent for such operations”, with its authorization provided by UNSC resolution 665 being the “fundamental conceptual precedent for modern UN naval interdiction operations” and its operational conduct representing “the modern recapitulation of practice in such operations”, a precedent that “has dominated and been repeated in UN naval interdiction operations since 1990”. On the other, the operations conducted during the Yugoslav Wars have been seen as “the most complex and provoking example of such operations” due to “the fact that this crisis clearly and overtly raised, in particular, the issue of UN interdiction operations in the Territorial Sea” (MCLAUGHLIN, 2009, p. 135, 137-138, 140, 152).

Once the general role of naval forces in UN peace operation is clarified, the analysis can proceed with the examination of the role played by UNIFIL-MTF. However, before moving to this, it is important to understand the general dynamics of the conflict in Lebanon, how it has led the UN to intervene and how it has evolved since its early days to the present. The next section will provide this background, with the following section dedicated to the analysis of UNIFIL-MTF specifically.

BRIEF BACKGROUND OF THE CONFLICT AND UN PEACEKEEPING IN LEBANON

The conflicts in Lebanon involving Israel as well as the presence of international troops under the UN flag on the region have been present for decades, with the conflict's final resolution and the total withdrawal of peacekeepers not predicted anytime soon. In general, it is another protracted conflict that has demanded considerable attention and direct involvement of the international community and that will probably last as long as its root causes – the border disputes and the situation of the Palestinian refugees (MATTELAER, 2013) – are not addressed. Still, both the conflict itself and its management by the international community have evolved, especially in the last decade, in a way that it demands closer examination.

The main factors that resulted in the confrontations between Israel and Lebanon are the Lebanese civil war of 1975 and the Palestinian presence in that country, which included both refugees fleeing from the Israelis first conflict with its Arab neighbors in 1948 as well as the establishing of strongholds of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) in southern Lebanon in the 1970s (MATTELAER, 2013). In March 1978, PLO armed elements based in Lebanon carried out attacks in Israel, leading to the first Israeli invasion of Lebanon, in which the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) occupied the entire Southern part of the country (MAKDIS *et al.*, 2009). After protests from the Lebanese government, the UNSC approved resolutions 425 and 426 demanding an immediate cessation of all Israeli military activity and the complete withdrawal of its forces from the Lebanese territory. It was in this context that the Council established UNIFIL, with three main purposes: “confirming the withdrawal of Israeli forces; restoring international peace and security; and assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area”.¹² Initially approved for a period of six months and a four thousand-strong force, latter resolutions extended the missions mandate and increased its contingent.

¹² UNIFIL Background. Available at: <<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unifil/background.shtml>>. Access on 02 June 2016.

Throughout the following years, “little progress was made” (EDSTRÖM, GYLLENSPORRE, 2013, p. 71), and new confrontations in 1982 lead to a new Israeli military campaign against Lebanon. The fighting lasted for three years and, during that period, UNIFIL remained behind Israeli lines and restricted its role to “providing protection and humanitarian assistance to the local population to the extent possible”.¹³ In 1985, Israel conducted a partial withdrawal of its forces, maintaining control of the Southern part of the country. On that same year, another important player would come into the scene: the Islamic resistance movement called Hizbollah (MAKDIS *et al.*, 2009), the “Party of God”.

On the year 2000, Israel unilaterally withdrew its forces from Lebanon. However, “there was no comprehensive peace deal between Israel and Lebanon”, and “the Lebanese government refused to deploy its armed forces to fill the vacuum the Israeli forces left behind in the south”, allowing Hizbollah to “grow into a state within the state of Lebanon” and to build-up its territorial defenses. In the meanwhile, UNIFIL’s contingent was decreased and it “was gradually transformed into an observer mission” (MATTELAER, 2013, p. 82). This “illusion of peace”, in which Hizbollah “continued to stockpile weapons and reinforce its po-sitions in southern Lebanon, amidst fears that Israel would launch further incursions” (MAKDIS *et al.*, 2009, p. 21), set up the stage for new confrontations.

On 12 July 2006, Hizbollah carried out a “dramatic raid” against an Israeli army patrol (killing three soldiers, wounding two and making two others captive), attacking Israel’s third largest city (Haifa) on the following day. These events provoked a “sharp military response” from Israel (MATTELAER, 2013, p. 82), which resulted in a new occupation of Lebanon, including the imposition of a “total land, sea and air blockade” of the country (MAKDIS *et al.*, 2009, p. 21). After 34 days of fighting with “no decisive result” (MATTELAER, 2013, p. 83), the UNSC approved resolution 1701 in order to put an end to the conflict (INTERNATIONAL CRISIS GROUP, 2006). The resolution called for a “full cessation of hostilities”, including “the immediate cessation by Hizbollah of all attacks and the immediate cessation by Israel of all offensive military operations”, as well as the support of both Israel and Lebanon to “a permanent ceasefire and a long-term solution” to the conflict. Other important provisions of the resolution included the determination that “the situation in Lebanon constitutes a threat to international peace and security” (which may be considered an indirect and implicit reference of Chapter VII),

¹³ Idem

the establishment “between the Blue Line and the Litani river of an area free of any armed personnel, assets and weapons other than those of the Government of Lebanon and of UNIFIL”, as well as “the disarmament of all armed groups in Lebanon, so that (...) there will be no weapons or authority in Lebanon other than that of the Lebanese State” and the prohibition of any “sales or supply of arms and related materiel to Lebanon except as authorized by its Government”. In addition, the Security Council called upon “the Government of Lebanon to secure its borders and other entry points to prevent the entry in Lebanon without its consent of arms or related materiel”, requesting UNIFIL to “to assist the Government of Lebanon at its request” (UNITED NATIONS, 2006b, p. 2-4). In this sense, the mission was significantly enhanced to a 15 thousand-strong force with an expanded mandate, which included an authorization to:

take all necessary action in areas of deployment of its forces and as it deems within its capabilities, to ensure that its area of operations is not utilized for hostile activities of any kind, to resist attempts by forceful means to prevent it from discharging its duties under the mandate of the Security Council (*Ibid.*, p. 3-4).

This contingent increasing and mandate expansion made some analysts refer to the new phase of the mission as “UNIFIL II” (MAKDIS *et al.*, 2009; MARTA, 2009).

Although successfully accepted by all parties of the conflict, resolution 1701 received some criticism from various observers, with some “uncontroversial parts”, however, “whose implementation marked steady, even surprising progress” (ICG, 2006, p. 1-2). Some of them were the aforementioned strengthening of UNIFIL and the imposition of an arms embargo (MARTA, 2009).

Regarding the strengthened UNIFIL, its effectiveness has been “hotly debated” (ABDENUR, 2016, p. 395), with the extent to which the mission’s “robustness’ has succeed in transforming UNIFIL II into a more effective peacekeeping unit” remaining “controversial” (MAKDIS *et al.*, 2009, p. 7). In fact, the expansion of the mandate allowing the operation to use force would have made, for some, the operation to “trode [the] fine line between peacekeeping and peace enforcement, a policy that ultimately

backfired" (MAKDIS *et al.*, 2009, p. 10). Although it is recognized that "UNIFIL contributesto containing the outbreak of renewed hostilities", it is also affirmed that it "does not address the underlying conflict dynamics, which are political in nature and go far beyond UNIFIL's mandate". In fact, such analysts argue that "the enhanced UNIFIL can never be strategically decisive" because "it contains conflict on an interim basis, but does not make peace" (MATTELAER, 2013, p. 99, 114).

Following the establishment of the arms embargo (designed to prevent the rearming of Hizbollah), Israel announced, in September 2006, that it would begin to lift the blockade imposed on Lebanon earlier. In the Mediterranean, a temporary European naval force composed of seven vessels under Italian command replaced Israeli forces. In 15 October 2006, in response to a request from the Lebanese government, the UN established the MTF as part of UNIFIL. An "important innovation in the enhanced UNIFIL" and "the very first time a UN operation included naval assets" (MATTELAER, 2013, p. 89-90), the MTF was designed to "patrol international waters off Lebanon's coast as a way of assisting the government, which", at that time, had "no significant naval capability, in enforcing the arms embargo" (ICG, 2006, p. 11).

THE ROLE PLAYED BY UNIFIL-MTF

As presented in the previous section, the MTF was established as an integral part of UNIFIL to enforce the arms embargo imposed against non-state actors in Lebanon due to the inability of that country's government to do so by its own means. In this sense, the MTF's importance for the peacekeeping efforts in Lebanon may be resumed in two points: maritime interdiction and capacity building.

As a MIO, UNIFIL-MTF is a one-of-a-kind, since it represented the first time that such operations were conducted by request of the host state and that the naval force was truly part of the UN peace operation (and not an independent force acting in support of it). Another singularity of this mission is that it is "the first maritime interdiction that occurred in accordance with the government *de facto* and *de jure* and in favor of the focal state's exercise of sovereignty". Since its action is dependent on the Lebanese government's request, UNIFIL-MTF demonstrate that an MIO does not necessarily imply the denial of a state's use of the sea, even though it restricts its use for purposes such as trafficking and smuggling of prohibited items. In fact, the MTF is "employed to support the jurisdiction of" Lebanon (SANTOS, 2013, p. 506, 509).

The main tasks of the MTF are “to establish a naval presence and surveillance over the Area of Maritime Operations, with priority to the Lebanese territorial waters” and “to conduct Maritime Interdiction Operations (...), including identification and, within the Lebanese territorial waters, stopping/diverting or referring suspect Merchant Vessels for inspection by Lebanese authorities”. Its long-term objective is “to hand over security responsibilities to the” Lebanese Armed Forces-Navy (LAF-Navy) “in a gradual manner”, which includes direct assistance and training (SANDALI, 2010, p. 7). It is important to note that “the Lebanese Navy carries out all inspections, thus permitting the MTF to maintain a high degree of neutrality, and by extension, a credibility respected by all parties” (MAKDIS *et al.*, 2009, p. 28).

The MTF units operate within the Area of Maritime Operations (AMO), an area of approximately 5 thousand square nautical miles that “runs along the entire coastline of Lebanon and stretching westward up to 43 nautical miles into the Mediterranean Sea”.¹⁴ Within this area, the MTF conducts “continuous surveillance of merchant traffic, particularly along the approach corridors to the three main harbours of Lebanon: Beirut, Tripoli and Sidon.” (SANDALI, 2010, p. 7).

The first activities undertaken by the Task Force were “rescue and humanitarian action (...) and subsequently patrolling activities (...), both within a national framework first and later a multinational one” (MARTA, 2009, p. 4). One of the difficulties faced by the MTF in its initial stages was the “lack of pre-established UN maritime operation procedures”, making necessary that “that such procedures had to be created in close collaboration with the (...) LAF, as well as with the Israeli and Syrian Navies” (MAKDIS, *et al.*, 2009, p. 28).

From October 2007 to 26 February 2016,¹⁵ the MTF has carried out a “dual mandate”, which included two main activities. The first was to conduct MIOs “along the Lebanese coast to prevent the entry into Lebanon of unauthorized arms and related materiel”. The second was the “[c]ooperation between the Task Force and the Lebanese navy”, including a “joint training programme” (UNITED NATIONS, 2008a, p. 7). Throughout this period, the Task Force has maintained its presence and readiness to act in the AMO while, simultaneously, providing training for the Lebanese authorities to assume their responsibilities.

¹⁴ The first 12 nautical miles from the Lebanese coastline constitute the country’s territorial sea. Beyond this point are international waters.

¹⁵ Date of the latest report of the UN Secretary-General on the implementation of the Security Council resolution 1701 by the time of writing

From November 2008 to November 2013, “[j]oint training exercises, aimed at enhancing the operational capacity of UNIFIL and the Lebanese Armed Forces” were undertaken (UNITED NATIONS, 2009b, p. 5). Since June 2009, the joint exercises included “personnel with the Coastal Radar Organization and the Lebanese naval chain of command” and added a “particular focus on response to unexpected events” (UNITED NATIONS, 2009a, p. 6). In some occasions, the joint exercises included “an amphibious and an artillery exercise” involving “land and maritime forces” (UNITED NATIONS, 2010, p. 4). Other important training activities included MIO exercises,¹⁶ workshops, cadet training sessions and training exercises on land and at sea.¹⁷

In one of his reports regarding the implementation of UNSC resolution 1701, the UN Secretary-General asserted that “the improved capabilities of the Lebanese navy will gradually enable it to assume some responsibilities and tasks presently performed by the Maritime Task Force” and that “continued material and technical support will remain critical over the medium to long term” (UNITED NATIONS, 2008a, p. 7). In a similar way, a further report of the same kind affirmed that “[t]he lack of adequate naval units presents a major challenge to the Lebanese navy in assuming increased responsibilities on a sustainable basis” (UNITED NATIONS, 2009a, p. 8). Therefore, the “international support for training the Lebanese armed forces” is “crucial.” (EDSTRÖM, GYLLENSPORRE, 2013, p. 80).

Since March 2009, the LAF-Navy has “assumed responsibility inside the [Lebanese] territorial waters for hailing vessels approaching the main Lebanese ports, while the Maritime Task Force has assumed a monitoring role” (UNITED NATIONS, 2009c, p. 7). On three occasions between November 2009 and February 2010, the MTF was requested to “assist in search and rescue operations” (UNITED NATIONS, 2010, p. 6).

Between November 2011 and 28 June 2012, due to “requests by Lebanese naval authorities”, the MTF “intensified its surveillance activities in certain parts of the area of maritime operations to prevent suspected smuggling activities” (UNITED NATIONS, 2012a, p. 5; 2012b, p. 6). In two during the February-June 2012 period, “the Lebanese authorities reported

¹⁶ Conducted five times (lasting five days each) from February to June 2012 and three times (lasting two days each) from June to November 2012. Similar exercises were also conducted in nine occasions during the 1 March – 28 June 2013 period.

¹⁷ There are registers of “one workshop and 11 cadet training session, as well as 31 at-sea training activities on-board the Maritime Task Force vessels, for Lebanese junior officers” (UNITED NATIONS, 2012c, p. 7) conducted during the June-November 2012 period; “13 workshops on land and 20 at-sea training exercises” (UNITED NATIONS, 2013a, p. 6) conducted during the 30 October 2012 – 28 February 2013 period; and “42 training exercises on land and 151 at sea” (UNITED NATIONS, 2013b, p. 6) conducted during the 1 March – 28 June 2013 period.

to UNIFIL that they had found unauthorized cargo consisting of weapons and military equipment, which were being smuggled into Lebanon from the sea in violation of resolution 1701" (UNITED NATIONS, 2012b, p. 6). Investigations by the Lebanese authorities concluded that, in both instances, the apprehended weapons were destined to rebel groups in neighboring Syria. These were considered the "the most significant attempts to breach the arms embargo reported by the Lebanese authorities since the adoption of resolution 1701" (UNITED NATIONS, 2012b).

Earlier analysis had already stressed that, although a "considerable MTF presence should be maintained within the UNIFIL framework to act as a deterrent or buffer force between the conflicting parties (...), MTF needs fewer large ships, and more small vessels, which would be faster and thus facilitate maritime manoeuvres." In due time, "these rapid patrol boats would and should be operated by the Lebanese Navy, endowed with the sovereign capacity to stop, inspect and detain suspect ships" (MAKDIS *et al.*, 2009, p. 29). In this sense, in late 2014, to streamline the MTF's requirements "while maintaining its operational capability", the UN's Department for Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), in coordination with the mission's staff, "carried out a desktop ship-to-task analysis and recommended reconfiguring the Maritime Task Force in phases by gradually substituting frigates with corvettes" (UNITED NATIONS, 2014, p. 12).

As early as 2006, the first report of the UN Secretary-General on the implementation of UNSC resolution 1701 argued that the establishment of a "maritime unit for patrolling the coastline" was one of the "most urgent" needs "to reinforce UNIFIL" (UNITED NATIONS, 2006a, p. 5). A further report of the same kind (UNITED NATIONS, 2007, p. 12) emphasized that such an "innovative measure", driven by the "circumstances in which the newly expanded UNIFIL was established", introduced important assets that "have been critical to the successful implementation of UNIFIL's mandate". Years later, one of the MTF's former commanders argued that its efforts "have contributed to the implementation of UN Security Council resolution 1701, proved as a strong deterrence against illegal activity in the area and have helped generally enhance the security of maritime shipping, with significant benefits to the economy,

trade, welfare and overall stability of Lebanon” (SANDALI, 2010, p. 7).

As the Lebanese authorities’ capacities to assume security responsibilities in their jurisdiction has improved, the size and scope of UNIFIL-MTF has been scaled down to less and smaller vessels. This points to an at least partial success of the Task Force in assisting local authorities in capacity building, while, simultaneously, maintaining a vigilant presence. By the time of writing, the MTF had hailed approximately 63 thousand ships and referred about six thousand vessels for further inspection by the Lebanese Navy and Customs officials.

PARTICIPATION IN UNIFIL-MTF AND THE BRAZILIAN PERSPECTIVE ON NAVAL PEACEKEEPING

From its inception until 2011, European States were responsible for the leadership of the MTF, as well as most of its composition (MAKDIS et al., 2009). When these countries reduced or withdrew their contingents, the gap was filled mostly by Asian countries, such as Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal and Sri Lanka (EDSTRÖM; GYLLENSPORRE, 2013). However, none of them was able to assume the Task Force’s command, which made the UN and the parties involved to look for a substitute. On 24 February 2011, the command of MTF was transferred to Brazil.¹⁸ It has been argued that this country was chosen for the task due to its “solid relations with both Lebanon and Israel” as well as its “accumulated experience (...) in UN peacekeeping” after seven years commanding the military component of the UN operation in Haiti (ABDENUR, 2016, p. 405).

The case of UNIFIL-MTF presents a “dilemma of continuity” for Brazil’s contribution to UN peacekeeping operations, entailing “a series of opportunities, as well as new risks”. The country has a historic aspiration to “play a more direct role in international security”, having contributed to UN peacekeeping since its inception in the late 1940s and mid-1950s. To date, Brazil has contributed with troops, police and civilian personnel to 25 UN peacekeeping missions around the world, having around 1,300 personnel deployed by August 2016.¹⁹ Consequently, expectations for the country’s involvement with matters of international security have increased in later years.

¹⁸ Maritime Task Force. Available at: <<http://unifil.unmissions.org/Default.aspx?tabid=11584&language=en-US>>. Access on: 06 June 2016.

¹⁹ Including five police, 24 military observers and 1,274 troops (data provided by the DPKO).

This, coupled with criticisms that “Brazil is a ‘security free-rider’, ‘benefitting more from the international security system than it actually contributes’” led to its decision to assume the command of UNIFIL-MTF (ABDENUR, 2016, p. 390, 397, 401).

Although entailing “a variety of risks, including political and security ones” and representing a “different set of challenges, at additional expense and in a distant region of the planet”, the Brazilian decision to assume this responsibility may be explained by three main reasons. The first is the country’s desire for greater projection in international security; secondly, the strengthening of its bilateral ties with Lebanon; and, lastly, “naval capacity-building” (ABDENUR, 2016, p. 402-403).

Regarding the objective of improving Brazil’s projection in international security, which includes greater involvement in the Middle East, the decision to assume the command of UNIFIL-MTF would arguably “help to demonstrate Brazil’s commitment to international security” and make sure that it would “remain relevant to Middle Eastern security for a number of years” (ABDENUR, 2016, p. 403-404). According to the country’s former Minister of Defense, Celso Amorim (2012, p. 13), this decision “underlines the diversity of our contribution to the cause of peace and security”. Aside from its well-known desire for greater involvement in international security, Brazil has interests of its own in the Middle East, which are constantly affected by the recurring conflicts in the region. In this sense, the pursuit of deeper ties with Middle Eastern governments was “an important element of consideration”, making the Middle East “an increasingly important way for Brazil to expand its global reach, in security and beyond” (ABDENUR, 2016, p. 405).

When it comes to the objective of strengthening Brazil’s bilateral relations with Lebanon, the Brazilian decision was seen as an opportunity to deepen the ties with the Middle Eastern country. In fact, by the time Brazil was invited to assume command of the MTF, both its government and the UN emphasized the “demographic, cultural and economic ties between Brazil and Lebanon” (ABDENUR, 2016).²⁰

Finally, with respect to the objective of naval capacity-building, the Brazilian participation in UNIFIL-MTF “is particularly relevant (...) due to the opportunities for enhanced cooperation with multiple navies from around the world”.

²⁰ There are approximately 10,000 Brazilians living in Lebanon, especially in Beirut and in the Bekaa Valley (ABDENUR, 2016, p. 406), as well as a large population of Lebanese immigrants and descendants living Brazil, including the country’s president, Michel Temer.

Even though having previous experience with cooperation initiatives with other naval forces (including naval exercises), joining and commanding a UN peacekeeping operation represented “a vastly different level of experience acquisition” for the Brazilian Navy. The case of UNIFIL, specifically, was seen as “a very different set of experiences” than the ones lived in Haiti, offering “officers and sailors alike to acquire first-hand experience, along with Marines” (*Ibid.*, p. 407-408). It is also important to note that, in assuming the command of the Task Force, Brazil became the first non-NATO country to lead a UN peacekeeping naval force – or even a multinational – fleet ever (*Ibid.*).

By the time of writing, the Brazilian contingent in Lebanon was 279-strong.²¹ Aside from the Brazilian Flag Ship (the frigate *Independência*), the Task Force is also composed of vessels from Bangladesh (two ships), Germany, Greece, Indonesia and Turkey (one ship each).²²

A general evaluation of the Brazilian participation in UNIFIL-MTF shows that not only “naval peacekeeping is aligned with the country’s maritime strategy”, but also that “it is widely considered to be a relatively efficient way of maintaining Brazil on the global peacekeeping stage and of boosting its image and role as a contributor to humanitarian efforts” (ABDENUR, 2016, p. 409). In fact, the Brazilian Navy has the “participation of the Naval Force under the aegis of international bodies in collective defense arrangements and in peace missions and humanitarian aid” as part of its objectives for its increasing international relationship and action (WIEMER, 2012, p. 193). This indicates that naval peacekeeping represents a “promising area” for the country to expand its contributions to UN peacekeeping. These contributions are not limited to the “deployment of personnel, vessels and equipment”, but also help to “shape the normative debates about how naval components may be more effectively incorporated into multilateral peace missions”. Furthermore, these are not only related to the “role that naval forces play in preventing the inflow of arms contraband into conflict-prone areas”, but also to the “capacity of naval forces to prevent blockades that undermine local economic activity and development” as well (ABDENUR, 2016, p. 411).

²¹ 256 military personnel aboard the frigate *Independência*, 13 as part of the MTF’s Joint Staff, three as part of UNIFIL’s Joint Staff and seven inserted at the Spanish Brigade (data provided by the Brazilian Ministry of Defense).

²² Maritime Task Force. Available at: <<http://unifil.unmissions.org/Default.aspx?tabid=11584&language=en-US>>. Access in: 06 June 2016.

CONCLUSION

Naval forces have been playing an important role in peace operations for decades. Especially after the end of the Cold War and the changing nature of conflicts, the employment of naval assets to prevent the (re)arming of warring parties and the further fueling of hostilities has been vital for the maintenance of international peace and security as well as conflict management and resolution. Since this pattern of conflict is not likely to change in any foreseeable future, it is right to expect that navies throughout the world will continue to be highly valuable assets in such efforts.

The role played by navies in such conflict scenarios may vary on a case-by-case basis and will certainly be determined by the conflict's intensity and the intervening parties' willingness to use force. With an inherent ability to shift from a more passive support stance to a more proactive full-scale fighting stance in a very short time period, maritime forces may be invaluable to international actors in cases of a rapidly rising hostilities and escalation of conflicts. The correct and timely deployment of naval forces by the international community in such scenarios may be the very difference between considerable success and a huge failure to prevent, manage and solve a conflict.

The case of UNIFIL-MTF is a clear example of this, showing that naval forces can be greatly useful in peace operations' contexts by tackling both short and long term goals of the mission's mandate – the enforcement of an arms embargo and capacity-building respectively. It is perceptible from both official sources and outside analysts that the MTF has provided a very important contribution to the peacekeeping efforts in Lebanon. The absence of any further confrontation in that country since the 2006 Israel-Hizbollah war proves that such efforts have been successful (at least partially). If the current trend remains, it can be expected a further gradual decrease of the Task Force's size and strength alongside the Lebanese authorities greater and improved capacity to act, which would ultimately render the naval force's presence no longer necessary. In time, this unique example may become a model for the use of maritime forces as an integrating part of UN peace operations in which such forces fulfill a dual role of conducting MIOs in accordance with UNSC resolutions while assisting local authorities with capacity building to reassume their responsibilities.

In this sense, it is vital that any country willing and able to play a significant role in international peace and security through peace operations maintain a strong and ready to act naval force prepared to assume such responsibilities and contribute to such efforts. As it has been the case during the last decades, those states with a naval power that can be called to action in a timely fashion are the ones with the greater ability to influence an armed conflict's development and outcome. Whether if such forces are employed independently or in an integrated manner under the auspices of an IO like the UN, it will probably be the states that can make their naval forces more easily available that will have greater influence in matters of international peace and security.

MANUTENÇÃO DA PAZ NO MAR? UM ESTUDO DE CASO DA FORÇA TAREFA MARÍTIMA NO LÍBANO

RESUMO

Desde o fim da Guerra Fria, forças navais têm se tornado cada vez mais importantes para os esforços de manutenção da paz e gerenciamento de conflitos, cujo melhor exemplo é a Força Tarefa Marítima (FTM) estabelecida dentro da Força Interina das Nações Unidas no Líbano (UNIFIL). O objetivo deste trabalho é apresentar as potencialidades do emprego de forças navais em operações de paz para cumprir seus mandatos por meio do estudo de caso da FTM-UNIFIL, enfatizando o papel desempenhado pelo Brasil e como isso impulsiona a projeção do país na paz e na segurança internacionais. Usando os conceitos operacionais de “interdição marítima” e “manutenção da paz”, este artigo apresenta uma visão geral da utilidade das forças navais em operações de paz em geral, um breve pano de fundo do conflito de 2006 no Líbano, a atuação da FTM-UNIFIL e a importância da Força Tarefa para a participação brasileira em operações de paz. A principal contribuição desta pesquisa é preencher uma lacuna na literatura existente sobre o tema, que possui poucos títulos atualizados dedicados ao assunto.

Palavras-chave: FTM-UNIFIL; interdição marítima; manutenção da paz; Brasil.

REFERENCES

- ABDENUR, Adriana Erthal. Rising powers in stormy seas: Brazil and the UNIFIL maritime task force. *International Peacekeeping*, v. 23, n. 3, p. 389-415, 2016.
- AMORIM, Celso. A política de defesa de um país pacífico. *Revista da Escola de Guerra Naval*, v. 18, n. 1, p. 7-17, 2012.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Defesa. [Site]. c 2014. Disponível em: <www.defesa.gov.br>. Acesso em: 2 maio 2016.
- EDSTRÖM, Håkan; GYLLENSPORRE, Dennis. *Political Aspirations and Perils of Security: unpacking the military strategy of the United Nations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- ICG – International Crisis Group. Israel/Hizbollah/Lebanon: avoiding renewed conflict. *Middle East Report*, n. 59, 1 November 2006.
- MAKDIS, Karim; GÖKSEL, Timur; KAUCK, Hans Bastian; REIGELUTH, Stuart. UNIFIL II: emerging and evolving European engagement in Lebanon and Middle East. *Euromesco Paper*, n. 76, Jan. 2009.
- MARTA, Lucia. The UNIFIL II mission in Lebanon: Italy's contribution. *Security & Defence – ARI*, n. 125, 2009.
- MATTELAER, Alexander. *The Politico-Military Dynamics of European Crisis Response Operations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- MCLAUGHLIN, Rob. *United Nations Naval Peace Operations in the Territorial Sea*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2009.
- NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (NATO). Allied maritime interdiction operations. Brussels: NATO Standardization Agency. April, 2005.
- OLIVEIRA, Gilberto Carvalho de. Naval peacekeeping and piracy: time for a critical turn in the debate. *International Peacekeeping*, v. 19, n. 1, p. 48-61, 2012.

SANDALI, Paolo. Maritime task force's role in UNIFIL. *AlJanoub*, n. 06, p. 6, Jan. 2010.

SANTOS, Fernando Roberto dos. Uma força naval para a paz e a segurança internacional. *Revista da Escola de Guerra Naval*, v. 19, n. 2, p. 497-522, 2013.

SIEGEL, Adam B. An examination of maritime peace support operations. In: WIRTZ, James J; LARSEN, Jeffrey A. *Naval peacekeeping and humanitarian operations: stability from the sea*. New York: Rotugledge, 2009. p. 97-109.

UNITED NATIONS. *Eighteenth report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006)*. New York: United Nations Security Council, 28 Feb. 2012a.

UNITED NATIONS. *Eleventh report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006)*. New York: United Nations Security Council, 2 Nov. 2009a.

UNITED NATIONS. *Ninth report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006)*. New York: United Nations Security Council, 3 Mar. 2009b.

UNITED NATIONS. *Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006): for the period 11 to 17 August 2006*. New York: United Nations Security Council, 18 Aug. 2006a.

UNITED NATIONS. *Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1701 (2006)*. New York: United Nations Security Council, 30 Oct. 2007.

UNITED NATIONS. *Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006)*. New York: United Nations Security Council, 28 Feb. 2008a.

UNITED NATIONS. *Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006)*. New York: United Nations Security Council, 28 June 2012b.

UNITED NATIONS. *Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006): reporting period from 29 June to 30 October 2012*. New York: United Nations Security Council, 14 Nov. 2012c.

UNITED NATIONS. *Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006)*: reporting period from 30 October 2012 to 28 February 2013. New York: United Nations Security Council, 27 Feb. 2013a.

UNITED NATIONS. *Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006)*: reporting period from 1 March to 28 June 2013. New York: United Nations Security Council, 26 June 2013b.

UNITED NATIONS. *Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006)*: reporting period from 27 June to 5 November 2012. New York: United Nations Security Council, 5 Nov. 2014.

UNITED NATIONS. *Security Council Resolution: S/RES/1701*. United Nations Security Council, New York, 11 Aug. 2006b.

UNITED NATIONS. *Tenth report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006)*. New York: United Nations Security Council, 29 June 2009c.

UNITED NATIONS. *Twelfth report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006)*. New York: United Nations Security Council, 26 Feb. 2010.

UNITED NATIONS. *United States Peacekeeping Operations: principles and guidelines*. New York: Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Department of Field Support, 2008b.

UNITED NATIONS. [Site]. c 2016. Disponível em: <<http://www.un.org>>. Acesso em: 2 maio 2016.

UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON (UNIFIL). [Site]. c 2016. Disponível em: <<http://unifil.unmissions.org>>. Acesso em: 2 maio 2016.

WIEMER, Fernando Eduardo Studart. Aula inaugural dos cursos de Altos Estudos Militares da Escola de Guerra Naval no ano de 2013: a concepção político-estratégica e a atuação internacional da Marinha do Brasil. *Revista da Escola de Guerra Naval*, v. 18, n. 2, p. 2012.

Recebido em: 07/03/2016

Aceito em: 09/12/2016

