The "Left Turn" and the Latin American countries' discourses about the UN Peace Operations around the world

A "Virada à esquerda" e os discursos dos países latino-americanos sobre as Operações de Paz da ONU ao redor do mundo

Thales Leonardo de Carvalho[1]

Abstract
This article argues that the political orientation of the government in office in a country may affect its discourse regarding the United Nations Peace Operations, using content analysis to compare what has been said by officials of leftist and rightist Latin American countries about peacekeeping in the UNSC, since the 1990s.
Keywords: *Left Turn; Peace Operations; International Security.*

Resumo
O artigo visa evidenciar que a orientação política de um governo pode afetar o posicionamento de um país em relação às Operações de Paz das Nações Unidas, através de uma comparação entre o que foi dito por oficiais de governos latino-americanos de esquerda e direita no Conselho de Segurança, desde os anos 1990.
Palavras-chave: *Virada à Esquerda; Operações de Paz; Segurança Internacional.*

1 Ph.D. student in Political Science at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG, Brazil). Master in Political Science (UFMG) and bachelor in International Relations (Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais – PUC Minas, Brazil). Belo Horizonte/ Brazil. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4410-1367. ⓘ

Introduction

There is an increasing number of Peace Operations established by the United Nations (UN) since the end of the Cold War. Since then, scholars have successfully studied these missions. These works often take into account variables related to the international level of analysis. However, it is important to acknowledge that, when considering the behavior of states towards these operations, we are talking about foreign policy, which is affected by international variables while, as well as any public policy, it is also related to domestic politics. Thus, in this work, I intend to look for the impact of a domestic variable on the debate about these operations: I will investigate if the political orientation of Latin American governments led to changes in their discourses regarding Peace Operations since the Left Turn.

In order to do that, I will compare discourses of all right and left-wing Latin American governments which had representatives' speeches in United Nations Security Council (UNSC), before and after the Left Turn (specifically from 1990 to 2017), in meetings related to general debate about Peacekeeping operations. I will use the content analysis to identify the frequency of comparable elements on their discourses. Thus, I start presenting a brief history of the Peace Operations since its beginning, trying to identify changes in their mandates along the time and highlight the role of variables related to the international level. It is important because makes clear what is already said by the literature (KENKEL, 2013; BELLAMY, 2013, among others). Then, I will explain the Latin American Left Turn, searching for elements that could have been incorporated by right and left-wing governments of this subcontinent on their discourses about these operations. Last, I will present the results of the analysis, showing that variables related to the inter-national level impact on these speeches, but political orientation also has effects on it.

A Brief History Of Peace Operations Around The World

The United Nations' Peace Operations are understood here as both, peacekeeping and enforcement[2] missions, established by United Nations Security Council, and have been deployed since the end of World War II (WWII). There are at least five generations of these operations. The first one emerged right after WWII, when the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) and the United Nations Military Observer Group (UNMOGIP) were authorized. Based on Chapter VI[3] of the UN Charter, these missions followed what Bellamy, Williams and Griffin (2010) called "the Holy Trinity" of Peacekeeping: the consent of the host countries, impartiality of its members and non-use of the military strength. These very limited mandates made the first Peace Operations ineffective, since peacekeepers could no act properly and there were no mechanisms to build long-term peace (RICHMOND, 2002).

During the Cold War, disputes between the United States (US) and the Soviet Union (USSR) and their allies – the capitalist and the socialist "worlds" – made it difficult to States to be impartial (or, at least, to be seen as impartial) on these interventions. Thus, during most of the second half of the 20th century, Peace Operations were seldom deployed. When it happened, their mandates were very limited (KENKEL, 2013).

---

2 Peace enforcement measures are authorized when diplomatic and pacific solutions to solve a conflict do not work. Peacekeeping missions are deployed to monitor compliance with cease-fire agreements (UN, 2008).

3 The chapter VI of the UN Charter is about the pacific resolution of controversies between countries, avoiding the use of the military means (UN, 2001)

After the end of the Cold War, the "supply" of Peace Operations increased, since there was not anymore the ideological rivalry. However, the "demand" has also increased. The former Soviet territories needed help to stabilize, dealing with ethnic and separatists conflicts. Non-State actors also became a security issue in other regions of the world. In order to deal with this new context, Peace Operations were deployed not just to monitor peace agreements, but also during conflicts, to help solve them (KENKEL, 2013).

In this new context, the second generation of Peace Operations emerged, incorporating some lessons learned from previous missions: civilians and local polices begun to play a role in order to achieve positive peace[4]. Humanitarian assistance became also important in conflict regions. Some examples of successful experiences of this generation were the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (UNOMOZ) and the United Nations Observer Group in El Salvador (ONUSAL). However, their mandates were still very limited. Thus, they were not capable to deal with higher conflict situations, such as the Rwandan genocide (1994), Bosnia (1995) and Somalia (KENKEL, 2013).

Based on the failures of these three cases, peace enforcement became an issue on Peace Operations, starting the third generation. Based on chapter VII[5] of the UN Charter, the mandates of this generation allowed the use of force, not just in self-defense. There was no longer the need for consent by the host country to establish

these operations, based on the principle of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). Briefly, R2P is a way to interpret norms and implement Peace Operations, considering that the international community has the obligation to intervene in contexts where there are severe human rights violations (BELLAMY, 2013). Some examples of this generation are the intervention of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Kosovo and the United Nations Mission in East Timor (UNAMET).

While the use of force was escalating, due to peace enforcement, positive peace was also becoming one of the main pillars of Peace Operations, with so-called peacebuilding. It was based on the infrastructural and institutional reconstruction of the conflict territories, and combating the root causes of the disputes. It was defended in 2000, on the "Brahimi Report", presented by the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations. The report suggested changes in these missions based on past missions. Peacebuilding was the base of the fourth generation of Peace Operations, which has at the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH), and transitional administrations in Kosovo and East Timor (KENKEL, 2013). In the same year, the UNSC approved Resolution 1325, highlighting the role of women in conflict solutions.

In this fourth generation, Peace Operations were composed of people of various parts of the world. Thus, more than the existing difficulties in conflict situations, there were also cultural divergences between mission components and the local population. In order to mitigate this, the fifth generation of these operations emerged, basing their compositions on inhabitants of the same region of the host country (BELLAMY; WILLIANS, 2005), as in the case of the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM).

---

4 Negative peace is seen when there is no armed conflict, but there are unsolved controversies between actors. Thus, there is still a risk of conflict to occur again. If there are not even controversies between actors, there is positive and lasting peace (GALTUNG, 1969).

5 Chapter VII of the UN Charter establish mechanisms to allow the use of force in conflict resolution, in case that peaceful solutions do not work (UN, 2001).

Finally, since NATO's intervention in Libya, in 2011, the question of impartiality and the intensity of the use of force became, once again, issues of intense discussions. The operation was seen as partial, using more coercive means than necessary to the achieve interest of Western powers – such as the fall of the former president, Muammar Qaddafi. In this context, in the same year, Brazilian diplomats presented the Responsibility While Protecting (RWP) concept. It was based first on the focus on conflict prevention and the use of non-military means to solve conflicts. If there is a need to use military force, its monitoring should be improved, together with its accountability. It would not be a substitute to R2P, just an addendum (STUENKEL, 2016). However, RWP seems not to have advanced and discussions about Peace Operations keep occurring.

The Latin American Left Turn

During the 1990s, Latin American governments tried to implement neoliberal economic policies, influenced by the United States and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), based on the so-called "Washington Consensus"[6]. These governments adopted a more liberal speech than their predecessors, both in domestic and foreign policies. It reflected, for example, on South American integration, based on the increase of regional trade flows during these years. They also used to emphasize the role of the recently established liberal democracy in their countries. However, their economic models failed, allowing leftist (and center-leftist) governments to come to office during the first decade

of the 2000's – the so-called "Left Turn" or "Pink Tide" (LEVITSKY; ROBERTS, 2011).

These leftist governments used to attribute a higher emphasis on social policies at the domestic level, focused on the valorization of the minimum wage and conditional cash transfers programs. Regarding economic policies, these governments kept some neoliberal "prescriptions" – e.g. monetary inflation control and fiscal austerity – but expanded state intervention in the economy. These were the bases of the so-called "new developmentalism", which was implemented by these governments, to a greater or lesser extent (BRESSER-PEREIRA, 2009; BELÉM LOPES; FARIA, 2016). Some of them also attribute an important role to gender equality (WEISEHOMEIER, 2010).

These changes happened on the regional level. During the 1990s, South American integration was based on foreign trade and economic liberalization. However, in the 2000s, this process included other subjects, such as social, infrastructural, security and defense policies, among others. United States leadership over the region became increasingly contested and institutions without the US membership were created. These were the basis of the "Post-Liberal Regionalism". The creation of the Bolivarian Alliance for the People of our America (ALBA) and the South American Nations Union (UNASUR) – which included later the South American Defense Council (CDS) on its structure – are examples of this new regionalism (FUCCILLE; REZENDE, 2014; ABDUL-HAK, 2013).

Thus, in Carvalho (2018), we can see that the Left Turn has also made possible convergences in defense and foreign policies related to security of the Latin American countries where there were leftist governments, or that were UNASUR members. As social policy became one of the main pillars of these leaders, it was also incorporated into security policies, as means to solve security problems, for

---

6 The "Washington Consensus" was disseminated by international financial institutions (such as IMF), conditioning lending to its adoption. It was based in neoliberal elements, such as inflation and debt control, floating exchange rate, trade liberalization and privatization of state companies (WILLIAMSON, 1990).

example. There was also an increase in the role of the region (or, at least, regional cooperation) on peace and security (CARVALHO, 2018). Hence, in the next section, I will demonstrate if the impact of this phenomenon also reached the position of these countries regarding Peace Operations.

Right, Left And Latin American Countries' Positions Concerning Peace Operations

In this work, I intend to analyze if the left/center-left wing governments that came to office in Latin American countries during the 2000s produced changes in their discourses about United Nations Peace Operations. In order to do it, I compared what was said by the left and right-wing governments, before and after the Left Turn on the region[7] – that is, in the 1990s and on the 2000s/2010s.

I analyzed all Latin American speeches delivered on UNSC meetings related to general review of peacekeeping operations, since 1990[8]. There are 65 meeting records[9] available at the United Nations electronic library which meets this criterion. I extracted the discourses made by Latin American representatives in these documents, reaching the amount of 180 speeches. Then I classified them as being made by left/center-left wing and right/center-right[10] wing gov-

ernment officials, totalizing 100 leftists and 80 rightist speeches[11].

In order to investigate these speeches, I used a qualitative approach to content analysis. Drisko and Maschi (2016) highlights the positive elements of this technique. An example is that, instead of using just grammar indicators, we can identify the meaning of a speech. For example, the word "social" can be used in different senses, either to talk about social policies, or to express some concern about the society, among others. Thus, it is important to analyze the meaning of the discourses, considering their context, not just the frequency of the words. Then, I compared the frequency that each code appeared on the speeches of each political orientation (DRISKO; MASCHI, 2016).

The sample intented to analyze what have been told by all Latin American governments that contributed to discussions related to peacekeeping on the main organ related to peace and security in the world (UNSC). Thus, analyzing all cases, I reduce the probability of sample bias. There are left and right-wing governments in the sample, before and after the temporal markers.

It is also important to explain how the codification was done. I established the codes inductively and deductively. According to Drisko and Maschi (2016) it allows us to test previous premises and theories, at the same time that we can include new elements, perceived during the research. Thus, codes were developed trying to test if leftist governments securitize in international arenas what they defend at the domestic level. I also tried to identify the presence (or absence) of RWP issues in their speeches. These are the codes employed in this analysis[12]:

---

7 Countries that had representatives speaking in UNSC since 1990, according to the analyzed meeting records: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Jamaica, Paraguay, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela.

8 I did not analyze meetings where specific peacekeeping operations were discussed; just those ones dedicated to review peacekeeping initiatives in general.

9 Meeting records are documents who describe what was told by each speaker during meetings of the UN institutions.

10 To establish which were right and which were left wing governments I used the classifications made by the Political Science literature (LEVITSKY; ROBERTS, 2011; BELÉM LOPES; FARIA, 2016, among others).

---

11 Haiti was not classified due to the political situation of the country.

12 There are codes related to other codes. For example, the code "social" is included on "New security issues", but not the contrary. Thus, it is important to analyze them separated.

- Social: speeches that mentioned social elements, such as gender issues, as well as inequalities, as causes or ways to help solving conflicts;
- Gender: when there is mention to the role of women in conflict resolution, post-conflict reconstruction, or some concern with crimes related to gender;
- New security issues: speeches that approached non-military security issues, such as the training of polices, the role of diplomacy in conflict prevention and the role of social policies to avoid/solve conflicts;
- Peacebuilding: when there is some emphasis on post-conflict reconstruction;
- Poverty and inequality: when poverty and social inequality are seen as root causes of conflicts, or means for solving conflicts;
- Conflict prevention: when conflict prevention is seen as an important mean to keep international peace;
- Regionalization: speeches that emphasize the cooperation with regional organizations to improve Peace Operations efficiency;
- Clearer rules and monitoring: when the role of establishing a limit to mandates and monitoring Peace Operations is emphasized.

It is also important to acknowledge that there were other important facts happening in the meantime. Some examples are the Brahimi Report (2000), the 9/11 attacks (2001), NATO's intervention in Libya (2011), advances on the gender agenda, among others. In order to observe temporality, as well as if the differences between the speeches of the groups analyzed are really due to their political orientation, I introduced two temporal markers: the year of 2005, to observe changes after a moment in which the Left Turn was consolidated in Latin America; and the year of 2011, searching for impacts of the intervention in Libya. I recognize here that these markers can be arbitrary. However, this is not a problem. These markers show the impact of omitted variables on the speeches. Notwithstanding, I am not searching for the impact of these variables on these discourses, just differences between political orientations. Both groups (left and right) are affected by omitted variables – specifically those related to the international level. Thus, we could say that the differences between left and right provide strong evidence that political orientation matters to Latin American representatives discourses about Peace Operations. The following tables present the results:

Table 1 – Topics mentioned in the speeches before and after 2005

	Post-2005 & Right	Post-2005 & Left	Before 2005 & Right	Before 2005 & Left
Speeches	47	82	31	18
Gender	10 (0,212)	36 (0,439)	1 (0,032)	5 (0,277)
New security	27 (0,574)	64 (0,78)	9 (0,290)	15 (0,833)
Peacebuilding	20 (0,425)	29 (0,353)	6 (0,193)	8 (0,444)
Poverty and inequality	4 (0,085)	21 (0,256)	4 (0,129)	6 (0,333)
Conflict prevention	19 (0,404)	24 (0,292)	2 (0,064)	5 (0,277)
Regionalization	8 (0,17)	24 (0,292)	1 (0,032)	4 (0,222)
Clearer rules and monitoring	4 (0,085)	9 (0,109)	0	3 (0,166)
Social	17 (0,361)	52 (0,634)	7 (0,225)	11 (0,611)

Source: Own elaboration, using Atlas.ti

Table 2 – Topics mentioned in the speeches before and after the operation in Libya

	Post-Libya & Right	Post-Libya & Left	Before Libya & Right	Before Libya & Left
Speeches	28	62	50	38
Gender	7 (0,25)	33 (0,532)	4 (0,08)	8 (0,21)
New security	16 (0,571)	50 (0,806)	20 (0,4)	29 (0,763)
Peacebuilding	13 (0,464)	20 (0,322)	13 (0,26)	17 (0,447)
Poverty and inequality	4 (0,142)	13 (0,209)	4 (0,08)	14 (0,368)
Conflict prevention	13 (0,464)	20 (0,322)	8 (0,16)	9 (0,236)
Regionalization	3 (0,107)	23 (0,370)	6 (0,12)	5 (0,131)
Clearer rules and monitoring	1 (0,035)	7 (0,112)	3 (0,06)	5 (0,131)
Social	11 (0,392)	40 (0,645)	13 (0,26)	23 (0,605)

Source: Own elaboration, using Atlas.ti

As we could see, mentions to gender, conflict prevention, and social issues increased along the time for both political orientations. This may be an impact of omitted variables, such as the gender agenda – that became increasingly important – as well as lessons learned from previous experiences, as already discussed in the first section of this paper. Variables related to the international level can produce effects over Latin American representatives' speeches about these issues. It is not new, as I said it in the beginning of this work, but is important to recognize that this analysis confirms this hypothesis.

However, the data shows that political orientation may have effects over these discourses. Leftist governments mention non-military security issues more than rightist ones. They emphasize more social issues (including gender and poverty). Thus, we can see that domestic discourses are also present on the international level. It is important to say, because security issues are not broadly discussed in these countries. In most cases, researchers say that these issues are decided by reduced groups and almost not influenced by government changes (KACOWICZ; MARES, 2016). Since the intervention in Libya, leftist governments also attribute an important role to regional actors' participation in these operations, in order to help solving conflicts.

Notwithstanding, peacebuilding and conflict prevention are more mentioned by right-wing actors, although they focus mostly on institutional consolidation in conflict regions, while the left-wing ones share the view that social development would be the way to (re)build peace. As discussed in the last part of this work, it was already expected. Right-wing governments are more associated with liberal issues, such as open markets, democracies, and consolidation of state institutions, in order to progress. Leftist representatives historically focus on reducing inequalities. Thus, data shows that it is also present in their respective speeches about Peace Operations.

The last conclusion here is that the principle of RWP, which has a greater focus on clearer rules, limited mandates and closer monitoring of interventions seem not to have been highly incorporated to Latin American speeches, as we could see. Thus, the Brazilian initiative lacked support even from its neighbors and did not prosper.

Conclusion

The analysis confirms what is already said by the literature related to Peace Operations: international politics are crucial to understanding changes on these missions. The international society perceived that it was important to include peacebuilding measures, assistance, and some social issues on Peace Operations to improve their effectivity. However, the

data shows that the political orientation of the government in office may affect its discourses regarding these operations. Leftist governments seem to securitize more gender issues, as well as poverty and social inequalities. They often see social issues as the root causes of conflicts, and as a solution to conflicts. They also have a greater tendency to go beyond military affairs and think regional actors are important to solve conflicts. Meanwhile, rightist governments focus on avoid and solve conflicts by implementing democracies and strengthening institutions. It would produce progress and make the national environment more peaceful. Thus, it goes towards what is said by Carvalho (2018) that leftist governments in Latin America brought changes in foreign policies related to security.

Last, it is important to recognize that leftist governments seem to emphasize social issues in security matters even before the Left Turn. However, it has increased after the phenomenon. This work is not capable to say if the boost is a result of the Pink Tide or international variables. Thus, we rest with the conclusion that political orientation matters: Latin American left has incorporated social issues to Peace Operations agenda more than the right, either before or after the Left Turn, while rightist governments are more concerned with democracy and institutional issues.

References

ABDUL-HAK, Ana Patrícia. **O Conselho de Defesa Sul-Americano (CDS):** objetivos e interesses do Brasil. Brasília: Fundação Alexandre de Gusmão, 2013. 280p.

BELÉM LOPES, Dawisson; FARIA, Carlos Aurélio. When foreign policy meets social demands in Latin America. **Contexto Internacional,** Rio de Janeiro, v. 38, n. 1, p. 11-53, 2016.

BELLAMY, Alex. The Responsibility to Protect: added value or hot air? **Cooperation and Conflict,** v. 48, n. 3, p. 333-357, 2013.

BELLAMY, Alex; WILLIAMS, Paul. Who's keeping the peace? Regionalization and contemporary Peace Operations. **International Security,** v. 29, n. 4, p. 157-195, 2005.

BELLAMY, Alex; WILLIAMS, Paul; GRIFFIN, Stuart. **Understanding peacekeeping.** Cambridge: Polity, 2010. 447p.

BRESSER-PEREIRA, Luiz Carlos. From old to new developmentalism in Latin America. **Textos para discussão #193,** 2009. 39p. Disponível em: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/6485488.pdf>. Acesso em: 18 nov. 2018.

CARVALHO, Thales Leonardo. **A "Virada à Esquerda" e as políticas de defesa e políticas externas relacionadas à segurança na América Latina**: um estudo comparativo de 16 mandatos presidenciais. 2018. 121f. Dissertation (Master degree in Political Science) - Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte. 2018.

DRISKO, James; MASCHI, Tina. **Content Analysis.** Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. 208p.

FUCCILLE, Alexandre; REZENDE, Lucas. Complexo regional de segurança da América do Sul: uma nova perspectiva. **Contexto Internacional,** v. 35, n. 1, p. 77-104, 2013.

GALTUNG, Johan. Violence, peace and peace research. **Journal of peace research**, n. 3, v. 6, p. 167-191, 1969.

KACOWICZ, Arie; MARES, David. Chapter 1 - Security studies and security in Latin America: the first 200 years. In: MARES, David; KACOWICZ, Arie (eds.). **Routledge Handbook of Latin American Security.** New York: Routledge, p.11-30, 2016.

KENKEL, Kai. Five generations of peace operations: from the "thin blue line" to "painting a country blue". **Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional,** Brasília, v. 56, n. 1, p. 122-143, 2013.

LEVITSKY, Steven; ROBERTS, Kenneth (eds.). **The ressurgence of Latin American left.** Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2011. 496p.

UNITED NATIONS (UN). **Carta das Nações Unidas e Estatuto da Corte Internacional de Justiça.** Rio de Janeiro, 2001. 92p

UNITED NATIONS (UN). **United Nations Peacekeeping Operations**: principles and guidelines. New York, 2008. 100p.

RICHMOND, Oliver. **Maintaining order, making peace.** New York: Palgrave, 2002. 264p.

STUENKEL, Oliver. Brazil and Responsibility to Protect: a case of agency and norm entrepreneurship in the Global South. **International Relations,** v. 30, n. 3, p. 375-390, 2016.

WEISEHOMEIER, Nina. The meaning of left-right in Latin America: a comparative view. **Working Paper #370,** 2010. 35p. Disponível em: <https://kellogg.nd.edu/sites/default/files/old_files/documents/370_0.pdf>. Acesso em: 18 nov. 2018.

WILLIAMSON, John. What Washington means by policy reform. In: WILLIAMSON, John (ed.). **Latin America adjustment:** how much has happened? Washington: Institute for International Economics, 1990. 445p.