

# The Russian Federation's involvement in peace missions after the dissolution of the USSR

MICHAŁ ROMAŃCZUK  
DR

Uniwersytet Szczeciński, Instytut Politologii i Europeistyki  
e-mail: [michal.romanczuk\(at\)interia.pl](mailto:michal.romanczuk(at)interia.pl)

**Keywords** peacekeeping forces, military conflict, Russian Federation, post-Soviet area, Balkans

**Abstract** The global character of the United Nations is a result of the provisions contained in art. 34 of the United Nations Charter, which gives the UN Security Council the right to consider any situation that could threaten international security. After the collapse of the USSR, in the 1990s, the armed forces of the Russian Federation participated in the UN framework in the Balkans (including in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Kosovo), as well as in operations in the post-Soviet area, carried out in within the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). The Russian Federation after the collapse of the USSR was particularly involved in military operations in the post-Soviet area, which sometimes raised many ethical and legal reservations. The aim of engaging the Russian peacekeeping forces in the post-Soviet area is to strive to maintain a dominant position in this area. Often their actions go beyond the legal framework and favor one of the parties to the conflict.

## Zaangażowanie Federacji Rosyjskiej w misje pokojowe po rozpadzie ZSRR

**Słowa kluczowe** siły pokojowe, konflikty zbrojne, Federacja Rosyjska, obszar postradziecki, Bałkany

**Abstrakt** Globalny charakter ONZ jest rezultatem zapisów zawartych w art. 34 Karty Narodów Zjednoczonych, który przyznaje Radzie Bezpieczeństwa ONZ prawo rozpatrywania każdej sytuacji mogącej zagrażać bezpieczeństwu międzynarodowemu. W latach 90. XX w. siły zbrojne Federacji Rosyjskiej brały udział w ramach ONZ w misjach na Bałkanach (m.in. w Bośni i Hercegowinie, Chorwacji i Kosowie), a także w operacjach na obszarze postradzieckim, prowadzonych w ramach Wspólnoty Niepodległych Państw (WNP). Federacja Rosyjska po rozpadzie ZSRR szczególnie angażowała się w operacje militarne na obszarze postradzieckim, co niekiedy budziło wiele zastrzeżeń natury etycznej i prawnej. Celem zaangażowania rosyjskich sił pokojowych na tym obszarze jest dążenie do utrzymania tam dominacji. Często ich działania wykraczają poza ramy prawne i sprzyjają jednej ze stron konfliktu.

## Introduction

The experiences of World War II have made the international community aware of the need to create a universal international organization with a global reach. As a consequence, the United Nations (UN) was established. Its main tasks are included in the Charter of the United Nations (Charter). They include the preservation of international peace and security in the world, as stipulated in article 1 of the Charter (United Nations, 2017b). The global character of the UN is the result of the provisions contained in article 34 of the Charter, which gives the UN Security Council the right to examine any situation that could threaten international security. In addition, this council, in accordance with art. 42 of the Charter of the United Nations, has the power to decide on the use of force *to restore international peace and security*. UN peacekeepers took part in solving almost all conflicts and wars after 1945. There is no other organization in the world that would work for peace and security in such a broad and universal scope as the UN. The instruments to carry out these tasks are, above all, the possibility of conducting negotiations, mediation and even, as already mentioned, the use of force. The most frequently used tool in the implementation of these tasks are peace operations, which, however, are not explicitly mentioned in the UN Charter, which raises many legal objections.

The UN's first observation mission, which was organized to preserve peace, was the UNTSO mission in 1948. Since then, the character, implementation and tasks of peacekeeping operations have evolved significantly. Whenever the UN Security Council agrees to establish a peacekeeping mission, there arise questions about its competences, legal status, tasks and effectiveness. At the beginning, peacekeeping missions were only observation missions – especially the first two (UNTSO mission created to monitor the Arab-Israeli cessation of hostilities agreement, and UNMOGIP, the United Nations Military Observers Group in India and Pakistan). Currently, UN peacekeeping missions are no longer observation missions, and their mandate is extended to activities such as humanitarian assistance, protection of civilians, support the process of building political structures and organize elections, disarm the feuding parties, assisting in territorial disputes, maintaining public order, etc. Since the establishing, UN has conducted over 60 peace operations around the world (Ciechanowski, 2013, p. 102–104).

The abovementioned dynamics of changes arise the problems concerning the unambiguous definition of the term “peace operation”. This issue is hampered by the fact that the United Nations Charter does not contain an article about peace operations. This creates legal reservations about the sanctioning of this type of mission. There are also many terms and expressions relating to peacekeeping operations, such as *peacekeeping*, *peacemaking*, *peace enforcement* and *peacebuilding*. Undoubtedly, the abovementioned activities are primarily aimed at resolving conflicts (local, regional or international) (Cianciara, 2014, p. 14). According to *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guideline* – act issued in 2008 by the UN – *peacekeeping* is one of the ways to act for peace and security in the world (United Nations, 2008).

Currently, peacekeeping operations are one of the priority actions for the United Nations. This state of affairs illustrates the budget allocated to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, which exceeds the budgets of all other UN departments. In 2016, funds for this purpose costed

approximately USD 8.27 billion. The staff commitment is also record-breaking. In 2016, 105,228 people participated in peace-keeping missions (89,829 peacekeepers, 13,602 policemen and 1,797 observers), it is the largest amount since 1991 (Операции ООН..., 2017).

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) was one of the founding members of the United Nations. USSR also obtained the status of a permanent member of the UN Security Council. The political strategy of the Kremlin leaders was to avoid the involvement of Soviet soldiers in peace-keeping missions. The east-west confrontation was the motive of this avoidance. In the 1970s, thanks to *détente*, a period of peaceful coexistence and dialogue between the great powers in international relations, the Soviet Union undertook cooperation and began to financially support peace operations and send its observers. An example of these activities was, among others, participation of Soviet soldiers in the UNEF II mission (Second Emergency UN Peacekeeping Force established to oversee the ceasefire between the armies of Egypt and Israel), established to monitor the ceasefire in the Suez Canal area. It was the first UN mission in which the Soviet army symbolically took part. This was possible thanks to the agreement from 1973 between the then foreign ministers of the USSR – A. Gromyko and the USA – H. Kissinger.

After the collapse of the USSR, in the 1990s, the armed forces of the Russian Federation took part in missions in the Balkans through the UN, as well as in operations in the post-Soviet area, conducted within the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). From the first peaceful operation, in which the armed forces of the Russian Federation took part in 1992, have passed 25 years. This is enough time to fully illustrate the activities and approach of the Russian Federation to this type of missions, and to analyze Russia's influence on maintaining peace in the world.

## Legal aspects of Russian troops participation in peacekeeping missions

The competence to send Russian soldiers to peacekeeping missions lies primarily with the president, who according to The Constitution of the Russian Federation adopted by national referendum on 12<sup>th</sup> December 1993, is the supreme head of the armed forces (art. 87 § 1) (Конституция, 1993). However, the question of the possible use of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation outside of Russia is within the competence of the upper chamber of the Russian Federation – the Federation Council (art. 102, § 1d) (Конституция, 1993). The legal framework for the participation of Russian military and civilian personnel in peacekeeping operations is specified in Federal Law of the Russian Federation No. 93-FZ of June 23, 1995: *On procedures for the implementation of civilian and military personnel in activities related to maintaining or restoring international peace and security*. Article 16 of this act states that: *The Government of the Russian Federation annually submits to the Council of the Federation and the State Duma a report on the participation of the Russian Federation in the mission of maintaining or rebuilding international peace and security* (О порядке предоставления Российской Федерацией..., 1995).

Also in the Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation relates to the participation of Russian soldiers in peacekeeping missions, including the art. 23 on the missions of the United Nations, art. 29 on sending of Russian soldiers as part of the peacekeeping missions of the Collective

Security Treaty Organization and art. 30 and art. 31 specifying the procedure for sending Russian soldiers abroad (Kremlin.ru, 2014).

Rhetoric led by the current government of the Russian Federation indicates that Russia wants to become a key state, which will increase its efforts to maintain world peace. However, the low financial contribution to the UN budget for this purpose, as well as the activities of this country as a permanent member of the UN Security Council (including vetoing resolutions related to South Sudan, Libya and Syria) do not illustrate this rhetoric. Since Vladimir Putin took power at the beginning of the 21st century, the Russian Federation has tightened its stance on the creation of peacekeeping forces within the UN. The Russian authorities criticize the way in which peace-keeping missions are being managed, stressing that they represent the interests of the West (Abilova, 2016).

The reform of the armed forces of the Russian Federation, beginning in 2008 and lasting to this day, has the task of rebuilding the military power of Russia from the Soviet era. Currently, the Russian Federation is involved in few peacekeeping operations within the UN and sends to them only specialized units, and sometimes only military experts. They are deployed in many places to show the involvement of Russian forces in the field of security with the smallest involvement of their forces and resources. In addition, the Russian Federation did not sign a declaration at the World Summit on Peace in 2015, in which more than 40 countries committed themselves to new activities and to strengthening efforts to maintain peace within the UN (United Nations, 2008). The authorities of the Russian Federation also did not take part in the report of the independent team adoption for London peace operations in September 2016, arguing that they disagree with its content, which according to Russian representatives was to violate the sovereignty of the UN member states (Abilova, 2016).

## Peacekeeping missions of the Russian Federation as part of the UN

After the collapse of the USSR in December 1991, the Russian Federation became the legal successor of the Soviet Union, and what was associated with it, became a permanent member of the UN Security Council. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the creation of a new socio-political system in Russia at the time, initiated a new period in relations with the UN. As a result, the number of Russian observers who took part in peacekeeping missions increased, the objective of which was increasing the prestige of Russia on the international arena. Even before the formal collapse of the USSR in 1991, the Russian military under the UN acted as observers on the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border and monitored the demilitarized zone after the first Gulf War. Then, Russian soldiers were sent to Western Sahara in September 1991. Later, the Russian Federation in 1992 sent its personnel to peace missions to the former Yugoslavia, Cambodia and Mozambique, and in January 1994 to Rwanda and the United Nations observation mission in Georgia. In turn, in February 1995, Russia sent a contingent of 160 soldiers and seven Mi-8 helicopters to Angola. In March 1997 Russian observers were sent to Guatemala, in May 1998 to Sierra Leone, in July 1999 to Timor-Leste, and in November 1999 to the Democratic Republic of Congo. In 2010, at

the peak of Russia's engagement, the Russian peacekeeping force serving the world included 367 people (United Nations Peacekeeping, 2017).

It dropped drastically in 2015 – up to 71 people. Re-growth can be noted in recent times – In January 2017 there was 95 people (including 38 police officers, 52 soldiers and 5 experts) (United Nations Peacekeeping, 2017). Thus, there is a reduction in the Russian Federation's commitment to UN peacekeeping missions. In addition, in 2003 the Russian authorities decided on the total withdrawal of their forces from the UN mission in the countries of the former Yugoslavia.

In 2017, as part of the UN peacekeeping forces, the Russian Federation took part in ten from sixteen operations aimed at maintaining peace and security. Which are:

- in Western Sahara – MINURSO (United Nations Mission for a Referendum in Western Sahara) 14 people;
- in Haiti – MINUSTAH (United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti) 9 people;
- in the Democratic Republic of the Congo – MONUSCO (United Nations Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo) 29 people;
- in Cyprus – UNFICYP (United Nations Peace Forces in Cyprus) 3 people;
- in Sudan – UNISFA (Temporary Armed Forces of the UN in Abyei) 1 person;
- in Kosovo – UNMIK (Mission of the United Nations Interim Administration in Kosovo) 1 person;
- in Liberia – UNMIL (United Nations Mission in Liberia) 4 people;
- in South Sudan – UNMISS (United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan) 19 people;
- in Côte d'Ivoire – UNOCI (Operation of the United Nations in Côte d'Ivoire) 10 people;
- in the Middle East – UNTSO (United Nations Organization of Truce Supervision) 5 people (United Nations, 2008).

Looking at the number of personnel and peacekeeping missions within the UN, in which representatives of the Russian Federation participated, it should be noted that this involvement is not large, especially considering the potential of the Russian army and its membership in the UN Security Council. Russia's political ambition is to play a significant role in world politics. This may be evidenced by the fact that the authorities in the Kremlin do not perceive the participation of Russian soldiers in international cooperation in the field of security as an important element, which would strengthen their influence and prestige in the world. Currently, the Russian Federation ranks as 31<sup>st</sup> among the countries involved in this type of operations (Nikitin, 2011, p. 46). Russia's lack of participation in efforts to maintain world peace means that Russian soldiers have no chance of gaining experience in such missions, and the country's ability to interact and react to crises in various parts of the world is reduced (Министерство образования и науки..., 2016, p. 48) especially, considering that this is one of the priorities included in the new concept of foreign policy of the Russian Federation, approved by the decree of President Vladimir Putin on November 30, 2017.

Article 31 of this decree indicates that: *Considering the international peace activity as an effective tool for regulating armed conflicts and resolving post-crisis state reconstruction tasks,*

*Russia intends to participate in international peace activities under the aegis of the United Nations and in cooperation with regional and international organizations. It will also actively contribute to strengthening the UN preventive crisis potential* (Kremlin.ru, 2016).

## Peacekeeping missions of the Russian Federation in the area of the former Yugoslavia

In the area of the former Yugoslavia, the largest involvement of military units of the Russian Federation was placed in such countries as: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Kosovo. Russian forces in these operations were placed under the aegis of the UN. The first operation in the countries of the former Yugoslavia, in which the armed forces of the Russian Federation were involved, was the UNPROFOR mission. In this mission, Russian soldiers were deployed to the territory of Croatia (Eastern Slavonia). At that time, the Russian battalion consisted of about 1,000 soldiers, Serbian paramilitary units, the number of which was estimated at about 10,000 people, were also in Russian operational responsibility zone. The task of the Russian battalion as part of a peacekeeping mission was to prevent the commencement of military operations between the Serbian and Croatian divisions (Topolski, 2009, p. 102–103).

As part of the UNPROFOR peace operation, in 1994 Russian troops were deployed in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This was caused by the mediation made by the Russian Federation between NATO and the Serbian army besieging Sarajevo. As a result, Serbia agreed to deploy Russian troops around Sarajevo. This allowed Serbia to comply with the NATO ultimatum on the withdrawal of heavy artillery, and the supervision of these activities by the Russian army made it possible for Serbs “not to lose the face” (Topolski, 2009, p. 103).

The next peace operations, in which Russian troops took part, are missions organized under the aegis of the North Atlantic Alliance – IFOR/SFOR and KFOR. The legal status of the participation of Russian troops in these peacekeeping operations was special. This was due to the fact that the Russian Federation authorities wanted Russian troops to take part in them, but they did not agree that they would be the subject to the command of NATO. The authorities in the Kremlin have proposed that all peacekeepers be included in the joint command of NATO and Russia. This proposal was not accepted by the United States of America. A compromise was found. The Russian Federation agreed to participate in the mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the command of US officers from the 1<sup>st</sup> Armored Division of the United States, provided that Russian soldiers will be subject to the direct orders of a Russian officer who was to act as deputy commander of the IFOR mission. The Russian military in tactical terms were also subject to the commander of the northern sector from the USA. 2,500 soldiers from the airborne brigade of Russian troops took part in this mission. Later, the contingent of the Russian army as part of the SFOR mission in the years 1997–2000, included about 1300–1500 soldiers. In the period 2001–2002, its number was limited to 300–600 people. Eventually, the Russian soldiers ended their participation in the mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina in June 2003 (Topolski, 2009, p. 103–104).

The participation of military units of the Russian Federation in the KFOR mission in Kosovo, “began” on the night of 11 to 12 June 1999. At that time, about 200 Russian soldiers from the troops, which took part in the SFOR mission, as a result of a quick rally, captured the Slatina airport near Pristina without informing the NATO command. The goal of the authorities of the Russian Federation was to create its security sector in Kosovo. After these events, a compromise was reached in July 1999, which decided that the Russian unit would be subordinated only to the Russian commander, at the same time act as a special deputy commander-in-chief of KFOR and be subject to the commander of the NATO armed forces in Europe. In addition, Russian soldiers also had the right to refrain from prosecuting Serbian war criminals. The number of Russian troops in the KFOR peace operation in 1999–2001 included up to 3,600 soldiers. In 2002, it was reduced to 600 people. The withdrawal of Russian troops from Kosovo took place in July 2003, when 320 soldiers were withdrawn. At the same time, the period of military presence of the Russian Federation in the countries of the former Yugoslavia ended (Topolski, 2009, p. 103–104).

### Peace missions of the Russian Federation in the post-Soviet area

The Russian Federation after the collapse of the USSR was particularly involved in military operations in the post-Soviet area, mainly under the auspices of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), which sometimes raised many ethical and legal reservations. Russia considers the post-Soviet area to be its sphere of influence and defines it as “close abroad”, striving for economic, political and military integration with the countries of the former USSR. At the beginning of the 1990s, the Russian authorities sought to recognize the UN’s “special powers” that would enable them to fulfill the role of a guarantor of peace and stability in the region. Russia wanted to strengthen the role of the CIS, in the framework of international cooperation under Chapter VIII of the “Regional Agreement” of the Charter of the United Nations (Bartuzi, Pełczyńska-Nałęcz, Strachota, 2008; Falkowski, 2006). Opposes, the UN wants to strengthen the regional Collective Security Treaty Organization and give it a mandate to conduct peacekeeping operations, especially in the post-Soviet area.

The war between Abkhazia and Georgia in 1992-1993 ended with the signing in Moscow the agreement on *The cessation of hostilities and the separation of forces in Abkhazia* from May 14, 1994, with the intermediation of Russia and the UN (Ciechanowski, 2013, p. 303). The agreement was signed between Georgia and Abkhazia, but the main architect of the agreement was the Russian Federation. The agreement provided for the creation of peacekeeping forces in the area of the conflict, numbering 3,000 soldiers who were subject to the CIS (i.e. de facto Russian), but without the participation of Georgian troops. The agreement was accepted in UN Security Council Resolution no. 858 (United Nations Security Council, 1993) from August 24, 1993. For the purpose of monitoring the implementation of the ceasefire agreement, the United Nations Mission in Georgia (United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia – UNOMIG) was set up by the UN, it has included about 200 people (Esslemont, 2009). The aim of the CIS Peace Forces was to prevent the escalation of the conflict and lead to the withdrawal of Georgian troops from



Abkhazia. The agreement did not indicate the period or rules on which the CIS peacekeeping force will be stationed. Only in 2003, the Russian Federation and Georgia reached an agreement and agreed that the CIS peace troops will be stationed indefinitely, which has also been accepted on the Council of CIS Heads of State summit. It was also agreed that each party of the agreement could at any time demand the end of a peacekeeping mission. This commitment should be completed within a month (Kranz, 2011, p. 65).

Russian troops were also stationed in South Ossetia under the Armistice Agreement from June 25, 1992, which took place on July 14, 1992. The agreement in Dagomys was signed by the presidents of Georgia – Eduard Shevardnadze and the Russian Federation – Boris Yeltsin. The aim of the agreement was to stop the military operations in South Ossetia. According to article 3 of the Dagomys agreement, the rules for the creation of a Joint Peace Forces were established in order to ensure compliance with the signed agreement (Соглашение..., 1996). In the conflict area, peace forces consisting of three “national” battalions and including 700-person Russian battalion were deployed, as well as 469-people Ossetian battalion and a 320-person Georgian battalion (Falkowski, 2006, p. 7–21). These forces were located in the area of the city of Tskhinvali (capital of North Ossetia) and along the border of the autonomous region of South Ossetia. They were, above all, in favor of preventing the escalation of the conflict. In addition, their responsibilities included monitoring of the ceasefire and maintaining peace and security in the conflict zone around Tskhinvali – the informal capital of South Ossetia and the security corridor along the Ossetian-Georgian border. The agreement between Georgia and Russia has not determined what status will the peacekeeping forces have and for what period were they established. It was only agreed on the basis of separate agreements that the number of the contingent and that the commander would be Russian (Kranz, 2011, p. 63–64). With time, the Georgians have reduced their troops and the obligations of the Georgian side were taken by the Russians. The task of these forces was to prevent further fighting.

Supervising the ceasefire, truce and the approximation of the conflicting parties would be the role of the established for this purpose under the auspices of the CSCE / OSCE so called “Joint Control Commission for the settlement of the Georgian-Ossetian conflict”. The committee included representatives of Russia, Georgia, South Ossetia and North Ossetia (autonomous republic within the Russian Federation) (*Sepashvili, Khutsidze, 2006*). The OSCE also participated as an observer in this committee. It should be noted that this was not a strictly peacekeeping mission, but rather one that would enforce the provisions of the peace agreement. The reservations about the impartiality and neutrality of this mission also raised, which was based on Russian, Ossetian and Georgian soldiers participation (Lott, 2012, p. 6–7). Georgia tried to change the composition of the peacekeeping forces stationed in South Ossetia. To this end, in 2006, the Georgian parliament adopted a resolution in which it called for the replacement of the Mixed Peace-Keeping Force with “real” international soldiers. However, unilaterally, without the consent of the Russian authorities, the Georgian resolution had no chance of success. The Mixed Control Commission did not act efficiently and effectively and was not able to secure peace in the conflict region. This agreement lasted until the Russian-Georgian conflict in August 2008. Russian forces are still



stationed in Abkhazia and South Ossetia under bilateral agreements signed with the authorities of these “quasi-states”. In the current political situation, it is very unlikely that Georgia will regain control over its separatist regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia in the near future.

Another state in the post-Soviet area in which the peacekeeping forces of the Russian Federation are stationed is Moldova, and more precisely its separatist part, namely Transnistria. The Moldovan-Transnistrian antagonisms reached its apogee during the civil war that took place in 1991–1992. The conflict was part of a new era of military operations in the post-Soviet area. However, the decisive event in the conflict was the support of the Russian 14<sup>th</sup> Army stationed in Transnistria. On July 21, 1992, M. Snegur and B. Jelcyn concluded: *Agreement on the principles of peaceful settlement of armed conflict in the Transnistrian region of the Moldovan Republic*. Russia and Moldova have pledged to settle the dispute peacefully, recognize the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Moldova and respect the rights of national minorities (Solak, 2010, p. 109–110).

The Russian military presence in Transnistria has a twofold character. On the one hand, there is a peace contingent established on the basis of the Russo-Moldovan agreement, which consists of Russian-Moldovan-Transnistrian troops currently numbering around 400 soldiers (Bryc, 2004, p. 54–55). There is also the Operational Group of Russian Armies (OGRA), established in 1995 on the basis of the formation of the 14<sup>th</sup> Russian Army (until 1<sup>st</sup> of April 1992, the 14<sup>th</sup> Soviet Army). Since the beginning, Russia has supported the separatists from Transnistria in a multi-dimensional sense, constituting a major support for its existence, through direct financial subsidies and loans, as well as through military assistance. Transnistrian enterprises are financed to a large extent from Russian capital, for example due to preferential prices of energy raw materials, improving their profitability and competitiveness. Russia, through the support of Transnistria, conducts its policy, which aims to preserve the bargaining chip in dealing with Moldova.

The conflict in Moldova became a kind of “testing ground” for Russian new concept of preserving its influence in the post-Soviet area of priority. The Russian Federation uses tactics of “controlled chaos” based on unresolved and “frozen” armed conflicts (Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Crimea), thus trying to restore its geopolitical influence in the region, lost due to the collapse of the USSR. An important goal for the Russian Federation, ensuring its security and influence, is to leave its troops in the CIS region (Bryc, 2004, p. 56–64).

One of the most successful peacekeeping missions with Russian troops took place in Tadjikistan in 1992. After Tajikistan gained independence on 9<sup>th</sup> September 1991, the country plunged into a civil war, during which President Emomali Rahmon, from the post-communist nomenclature, representing the interests of the Kulabski and clan, clashed with representatives of clans repatriating the eastern territory of the country, united in the United Opposition Tajikistan (UOT). As a result of these events, the CIS Council of Heads of State on 9<sup>th</sup> October 1992, adopted a declaration of readiness to send a peace mission to resolve the conflict. On October 15, 1992, peacekeeping forces were formed, including 12,000. soldiers, and their main goal was to stabilize the situation in the country. Military units from the Russian Federation, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan were involved in the peace operation and were supported by pro-government

units. Support for peacekeeping troops forced the government to agree to the ceasefire, which was signed on 17 September 1994, and took effect from 20 September of the same year. The agreement stated to hold presidential and parliamentary elections. President Emomali Rakhmon won the presidential election, which was questioned by the opposition. This led to a re-conflict. Finally, after lengthy negotiations, the armed operations were terminated under the pressure of the Russian Federation and Iran on June 27, 1997. The agreement to end the fighting and the protocol on the establishment and operation of the National Reconciliation Commission were signed between the president of Tajikistan – Emomali Rakhmon and the leader of the United Tajik Opposition – Said Abdullo Nuri in Moscow. According to its provisions, the opposition was to receive, among others, 30% of positions in government administration. Russian soldiers as part of the CIS peacekeepers cooperated with the UNMOT mission (United Nations, 2017b), they ensured stabilization of the situation in Tajikistan. The aim of the mission was, among others, guaranteeing security to international representatives, providing humanitarian aid, and assistance in implementing the peace agreement. In addition, the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation together with the Tajik soldiers monitored the Tajik-Afghan border in order to detain terrorists and drug traffickers. The Council of Heads of CIS states planted on June 21, 2000 announced that all the terms of the peace agreement were implemented with the help of the UNMOT mission, and thus the CIS Peace Force was withdrawn from Tajikistan in 2000. The Council of Heads of States of the CIS decided to end the operation in that country (Министерство образования и науки..., 2016, p. 40–41).

Since the independence of Tajikistan, the Russian Federation has played and still plays a significant role in that country. The armed forces of the Russian Federation that supported the government forces contributed to the end of the civil war and are now the guarantor of political stability in Tajikistan. For the Russian Federation stability of Tajikistan is important, especially in the context of the uncertain situation in Afghanistan and the threat of Islamic terrorism in Central Asia. In addition, the Russian authorities strive to subordinate economically and politically the states of the region, which in practice amounts to supporting the authoritarian governments in those countries, which are loyal to the authorities in Moscow.

## Conclusion

Analyzing cooperation between NATO and the Russian Federation after the collapse of the USSR as part of peace missions, it should be recognized that it is symbolic. This is caused by a different vision of international security policy. The only joint missions took place in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo as well as in the ISAF operation in Afghanistan. At that time, the Russian Federation along with the Central Asian states agreed to the creation of a northern transit corridor. The Russian Federation, in opposition to NATO, promotes its regional security organizations – CSTO and the CIS, and strives to create peaceful forces operating within them. However, they cannot be considered impartial, which is in conflict with the basic principles of the UN Charter.

Until the 1970s, the USSR's involvement in peacekeeping missions under the UN was moderate, mainly due to the confrontation with the United States. Only after the break-up of the Soviet Union, the Russian Federation began to develop moderate international cooperation as part of the UN peacekeeping force during the Balkan crisis in 1991–1992. Later, after completing the mission in the Balkans at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the involvement of the Russian Federation in such missions began to decrease.

Russian Federation by engaging in regional conflicts in the post-Soviet area manifesting itself by sending to this region their so-called peace missions, strives to implement its own foreign policy priorities. To this end, it uses instruments such as supporting politically and militarily regimes and states that support the Russian authorities. The aim of engaging the Russian peacekeeping forces in the post-Soviet area is to strive to maintain a dominant position in this area, which illustrates Russia's actions interfering in the internal affairs of the countries located there. They are called peace forces of the CIS, but in fact they mostly consist of Russian soldiers. Often their actions go beyond the legal framework and favor one of the parties to the conflict. In addition, the Russian Federation does not allow the introduction of branches under international auspices, fearing that it will not have control over them. Such actions are not conducive to the stabilization of crisis situations. The Russian Federation has often fueled conflicts between the warring parties in pursuit of their own vested interests, and participation in peace-keeping operations in post-Soviet countries was also seen as a way to gain political influence over this area.

## References

- Abilova, O. (2016). *Peacekeeping Contribution Profile. Russia*. Pobrane z: <http://www.providingforpeacekeeping.org/2016/10/31/peacekeeping-contribution-profile-russia/> (25.07.2017).
- Bartuzi, W., Pełczyńska-Nałęcz, K., Strachota, K. (2008). *Abchazja, Osetia Południowa, Górski Karabach. Rozmrożone konflikty pomiędzy Rosją a Zachodem*. Ośrodek Studiów Wschodnich. Pobrane z: [https://www.osw.waw.pl/sites/default/files/raport\\_kkpd.pdf](https://www.osw.waw.pl/sites/default/files/raport_kkpd.pdf) (25.07.2017).
- Bryc, A. (2004). *Cele polityki zagranicznej Federacji Rosyjskiej*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Cianciara, A. (2014). Operacje pokojowe. W: A. Florczak, A. Lisowska (red.), *Organizacje międzynarodowe w działaniu* (s. 14–24). Wrocław: OTO Agencja Reklamowa.
- Ciechanowski, G. (2013). *Operacje pokojowe ONZ w XX wieku*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Esslemont, T. (2009). *UN monitors to leave Georgia*. Pobrane z: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/8150946.stm> (19.07.2017).
- Falkowski, M. (2006). *Polityka Rosji na Kaukazie Południowym i w Azji Centralnej*. Ośrodek Studiów Wschodnich. Pobrane z: <https://www.osw.waw.pl/pl/publikacje/prace-osw/2006-06-15/polityka-rosji-na-kaukazie-poludniowym-i-w-azji-centralnej> (25.07.2017).
- Конституция (1993). Конституция Российской Федерации. Принята всенародным голосованием 12 декабря 1993 г. Pobrane z: <http://constitution.kremlin.ru/> (12.07.2018).
- Kranz, J. (2011). Zbrojny konflikt rosyjsko-gruziński (2008) w świetle prawa międzynarodowego. W: *Konflikt rosyjsko-gruziński w 2008 roku* (s. 60–84). Gdynia: Akademia Marynarki Wojennej.
- Kremlin.ru (2014). *Военная доктрина Российской Федерации*. Pobrane z: <http://static.kremlin.ru/media/events/files/41d527556bec8deb3530.pdf> (25.07.2017).
- Kremlin.ru (2016). *Указ Президента Российской Федерации от 30.11.2016 г. № 640 Об утверждении Концепции внешней политики Российской Федерации*. Pobrane z: <http://kremlin.ru/acts/bank/41451> (25.07.2017).

- Lott, A., (2012). The Tagliavini Report Revisited. Jus ad Bellum and the Legality of the Russian Intervention in Georgia. *Utrecht Journal of International and European Law*, 28 (74), 4–21. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/ujiel.aw>.
- Министерство образования и науки Российской Федерации Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение высшего профессионального образования (2016). Pobrane z: [http://dspace.susu.ru/xmlui/bitstream/handle/0001.74/11167/2016\\_420\\_burobinasb.pdf?sequence=1](http://dspace.susu.ru/xmlui/bitstream/handle/0001.74/11167/2016_420_burobinasb.pdf?sequence=1) (25.07.2017).
- Nikitin, A. (2011), Russia's Participation in International Peacekeeping. Security Index. *A Russian Journal of International Security*, 3 (14), 43–48. DOI: 10.1080/19934270.2011.588449.
- О порядке предоставления Российской Федерацией военного и гражданского персонала для участия в деятельности по поддержанию или восстановлению международного мира и безопасности. Федеральный закон от 23.06.1995 г. № 93-ФЗ, (1995). Pobrane z: <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/8002> (12.07.2018).
- Операции ООН при поддержанию мира (2017). Цифры и факты. Pobrane z: <http://www.un.org/ru/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/factsheet.shtml> (25.07.2017).
- Sepashvili, G., Khutsidze, N.S. (2006). *Ossetia: Mapping Out Scenarios*. Pobrane z: <http://www.civil.ge/eng/article.php?id=11710> (20.08.2017).
- Соглашение о принципах урегулирования грузинско-осетинского конфликта (1996). Pobrane z: <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/1902246> (24.7.2017).
- Solak, J. (2010). *Konsekwencje zamrożonego konfliktu o Naddniestrze dla bezpieczeństwa europejskiego*. Warszawa: Akademia Obrony Narodowej.
- Topolski, I. (2009). Instrumenty militarne Federacji Rosyjskiej w regionie Europy Południowo-Wschodniej. *Teka Komisji Politologii i Stosunków Międzynarodowych*, 4, 100–109.
- UN News (2009), *Russia vetoes extension of UN mission in Georgia*. Pobrane z: [http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=31151&Cr=georgia&Cr1=#.VONFMCy0k\\_Q](http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=31151&Cr=georgia&Cr1=#.VONFMCy0k_Q) (19.07.2017).
- United Nations (2008). *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Principles and Guidelines*. Pobrane z: [http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/capstone\\_eng.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/capstone_eng.pdf) (25.07.2017). United Nations (2017a). *Charter of the United Nations*. Pobrane z: <http://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/> (25.07.2017).
- United Nations (2017b). *Tajikistan – UNMOT Background*. Pobrane z: <http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/Missions/unmot/UnmotB.htm> (24.07.2017).
- United Nations Peacekeeping (2017). *Troop and police contributors archive (1990-2016)* (2017). Pobrane z: [http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors\\_archive.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors_archive.shtml) (25.07.2017).
- United Nations Security Council (1993). *Resolution 858, adopted on 24 August 1993*. Pobrane z: [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/858\(1993\)](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/858(1993)) (20.08.2017).