BRAZIL, A LEGITIMATE LEADER: FROM PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS TO PERMANENT VACANCY IN THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL

Giulia Scortegagna[1]
Jeancezar Ditzz de Souza Ribeiro[2]

ABSTRACT

From a brief analysis of its performance in the United Nations Security Council during the 2010-2011 biennium, it is intended to examine the legitimacy of the discourses and leadership of the Brazilian performance in the Council and in Peacekeeping Operations. Brazil, as an actor that values diplomatic and multilateral means, has gained great prominence within the United Nations and its instruments of maintenance of international security. The mission in Haiti, MINUSTAH, had great repercussions, because besides the military component being led by a Brazilian, Brazil was engaged in it in various ways, even emotionally, as said by Chancellor Celso Amorim. But the major problem is: would Brazil be a leader? How did it perform in the years 2010 and 2011, when it was a temporary member of the Security Council? And finally, does its legitimacy emanate from the Missions of Peace?

Keywords: Peacekeeping Operations. Brazilian Foreign Policy. Security Council.

[1] Bachelor's degree from the Laureate International Universities (IBMR – Centro Universitário), Rio de Janeiro (RJ), Brazil. E-mail: scortegagnag@gmail.com / Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4751-1276 2Doctor. University of São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, Brazil. E-mail: jeanditzz@hotmail.com / Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7856-5640

[2] Doctorate Degree. University of São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, Brazil. E-mail: jeanditzz@hotmail.com / Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7856-5640

INTRODUCTION

The following article will analyze the Brazilian role in the United Nations Security Council (UN) from the perspective of the concepts of leadership and legitimacy in the years 2010 and 2011, based on its performance in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH). The object of study is relevant to the construction and maintenance of Brazilian foreign policy over the years, through its participation in peace operations. In this way, it is possible to analyze whether or not the country has been assuming a legitimate leadership position in the Security Council, and if it is recognized as a leader by the UN, in relation to the decision-making center represented by developed countries.

The object is justified since the Brazilian permeability in decision-making processes is more complex because it is a periphery country, and yet, over the time period analyzed, the Minister of Foreign Relations, Celso Amorim, ensured strategic breakthroughs using diplomacy to address second-level problems, i.e., those that were not a priority of the major powers in the international agenda, as for for example, poverty and hunger. This led the Brazilian State to act as a spokesperson for the international community regarding a variety of subjects, obtaining a prominent position within the United Nations.

The article aims to verify the correlation between Brazil's performance as a legitimate leader in the Security Council and the country's participation in Peace Operations. As for its specific objectives, they include examining the construction of Brazilian multilateralism; explaining the concepts of leadership and legitimacy; and analyzing the Brazilian role in the Security Council from the definition of the concepts developed.

The text will attempt to answer how Brazil's performance in the MINUSTAH corroborated the legitimacy of its leadership in the Security Council in 2010/2011. The initial hypothesis is that building a high international profile through peace operations has increased Brazil's credibility before other countries, and consequently, there has been greater support for Brazilian diplomacy, leading to its more prominent participation in the debates within the Security Council. Thus, the text will use the concepts of leadership and legitimacy developed by John William Gardner and Gelson Fonseca as theoretical framework. In relation to the literature, the studies of Maria Luiza Viotti and Eduardo Uziel will be considered, and the methodology adopted will be based on deductive

reasoning, so as to understand the functioning of the international system and what would be the consequence for the Brazilian position within it. The research approach will be qualitative, working with subjective questions and their meanings, such as the insertion of Brazil and its importance in relation to second-level issues. The purpose of this article is creating new knowledge, but without predicting its applicability and seeking to identify the causalities of the study phenomenon and its description, based on a case study (basic, descriptive, explanatory research, case study).

The text will be divided into six parts: introduction, Brazilian multilateralism, theoretical foundation, case study, final conclusions and bibliographical references. The historical context will be divided into two sections that will address the multilateralism of Brazilian foreign policy and its contributions to the UNSC, also describing the general context of the Brazilian participation in Peace Operations. The theoretical framework will be divided between the two key concepts: leadership and legitimacy. Subsequently, the Brazilian performance in the UNSC and its correlation with the Peace Missions will be analyzed, after which the final conclusions will be presented.

BRAZIL, FROM A TO Z

The context of globalization requires a greater dose of multilateralism of emerging countries to ensure the governance of the international system in the construction of a new post-Cold War order. This may be explained by two factors: the relative hegemonic emptiness, and the complexification of the international agenda. The former is related to the growing importance of China, and to Russia's transformation into a regional power, with episodes of global influence. As for the latter, it is related to the rise of new themes in the agenda due to the inevitable integration of new State actors (independence of old colonies), as well as new non-State global actors, like civil society (FONSECA JR., 2018).

Some internal transformations of Brazilian society in the last 25 years have influenced the construction of this important profile. It is possible to mention reasons such as political and institutional stability, the end of inflation and achievement of financial soundness, significant and constant foreign investments, improved social conditions, strengthening of the South-South cooperation network (via MERCOSUR and UNASUR), expansion of the consular and diplomatic network (VILLANOVA, 2017),

democratization, among others (FONSECA JR., 2018; NASSER, 2012). It was no coincidence that one of the first major multilateral events focused on the debate about the new post-Cold War standards of conduct and legitimacy, Rio 92, occurred in its territory (FONSECA JR., 2018).

Some external signs corroborate this idea about the Brazilian performance. Like Japan, Brazil is one of the countries that has been designated as a non-permanent UNSC member the most often (NASSER, 2012), 10 times, with 182 votes (out of 183) in 2010. Since 1947, it has elected 6 judges for the International Court of Justice; also, it was an original member of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and of the Commission on Human Rights. The tradition of Brazil opening the general debate of the General Assembly was established in the beginning of the 1950s (FONSECA JR., 2018).

The diplomatic Brazilian discourse argues that the solutions for themes such as security, value, trade and the environment should be universal and grounded in multilateral cooperation, as the result would be precarious if achieved in any other way (FONSECA JR., 2018). In view of this, it has great willingness to create multilateral partial forums, as for example, IBAS, BRICS, and G20 (VILLANOVA, 2017). It is worth mentioning that it preserves the United Nations as its key platform of diplomatic performance (FONSECA JR ., 2018), because as said by Celso Amorim (2008), there is no better institution equipped for negotiation and dialogue since it is the universal forum par excellence.

At the same time, it has complementary projects, such as the promotion of summits between South America, African countries and Arab countries (VILLANOVA, 2017). This is an attempt to reconcile the three spheres (pan-American, Latin American, and global spheres), so they can reinforce each other, possibly changing the axis of world politics itself, expressed as a new multilateral order that contemplates the interest of all (ALMEIDA, 2007). An example is its presence at the San Francisco Conference, when it not only defended its interests, but acted as a spokesperson for Latin America (FONSECA JR., 2018).

Deepened in the Lula Government (2003-2010), Brazilian foreign policy had a unique ideology that characterized it as a lever for national development. This project was characterized by the Brazilian economy's integration in the international market, and the pursuit of the reorganization of the balance of power between countries, from a humanistic perspective. An example of concern about humanitarian issues was the "Action against

Hunger and Poverty" initiative in 2004, the agenda of which included development as a priority (AMORIM, 2008). It also promoted the association of South America with democratic ideals, and a prosperous, united, and politically stable social justice (ALMEIDA, 2007).

Characterized by chancellor Celso Amorim (2008) as "active and haughty", the Brazilian position in international relations (VILLANOVA, 2017) would not be just reactive to facts, also defending the country's own ideas and interests. Its pragmatic international position would fulfill the goal of exerting a "sovereign presence" in the world, gaining strength through national development. With the revitalization of MERCOSUR and the greater approximation between the social, cultural and scientific-technological dimensions of the countries in the South axis, there would be "strong continental integration" (ALMEIDA, 2007).

However, the main goal was achieving a permanent position in the Security Council (ALMEIDA, 2007). One of the six major agencies established by the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, as stated in its 24th article. The council is responsible for authorizing the use of force and sanctions, as stated in Article 51, the employment of the former being legal in case of self-defense, while the latter is adopted when international peace and security are threatened. Because its resolutions are binding, all the members in the organization must adopt the measures included in the document, as specified in Article 25 (VIEGAS, 2008).

Likewise, it sought to reform the Council so that it would be representative and suitable to the reality of developed and developing countries, in the various regions of the world (VARGAS, 2017; CORRÊA, 2013). Therefore, to withstand time, the improvement of the multilateral system was the necessary premise for democratic coexistence within nations. As its composition of permanent members had been frozen since 1945, it was necessary to make the UNSC more legitimate and transparent, especially when the number of States jumped from 51 to 191 (AMORIM, 2008).

Given the amount of times Brazil has represented itself in the UNSC, it would have the necessary authority to point out problems and imbalances affecting the council and propose the need for changes. The country's performance stood out within the council due to its "consistency, exemption, and good transit between delegations" (AMORIM, 2008). This recognition is explicit when, in 1999, with the impasse over the matter

of Iraq, the UNSC itself offered the presidency of the panels to Brazil. It also demonstrated the Brazilian capacity of assisting with agreements and employing multilateral means to remedy pending issues, which led to the known consequences for not having been previously solved in this manner (NASSER, 2012). The reception of former president Lula by the international press and G-7 reinforced the idea that this feat was achievable. Different strategies were thus developed, like the forgiveness of bilateral debts of poor countries and the constitution of G-4. However, some conditions justified the impossibility of modifying the council (AMORIM, 2008). The lack of engagement of some UNSC countries, mainly China and the United States of America (USA), may be mentioned. In this way, these facts would make the result achieved counterproductive for the Brazilian State (ALMEIDA, 2007).

THE BRAZILIAN PERFORMANCE IN THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF PEACE

The Brazilian participation in Peace Operations is the materialization of its discourse of search for solutions in a peaceful manner, through negotiations, which characterizes its foreign policy. It also corroborates the responsibility assumed by the country before international society, especially those in a state of fragility, a commitment that has been constitutionally confirmed in article 4 (SEITENFUS, 2008). The Brazilian State has experience in this area, having participated in over 30 missions (AMORIM, 2008) and supported the first few, such as the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) in the Suez Canal (FONSECA JR., 2018).

However, between 1968 and 1988, Brazil decreased its participation in the Peace Missions and in the UNSC (NASSER, 2012; UZIEL, 2015). This fact would not be explained only by the military regime, in view of the termination of its mandate in the UNSC in 1964, and of its participation in the 1967/1968 biennium. The perception that the army should contain internal, and not external threats, because there are no immediate security or border-related problems; the withdrawal of troops from the Suez Canal, which resulted in fatalities due to the fights between Israelis and Egyptians; and its immobilization in the UNSC because of the rivalry between the US and the USSR, led to the belief that the authority of the UN in this context was not enough to promote peace, and that Brazil had no reason to

assume a more active stance, in addition to the risk of it becoming a target of criticism due to its internal context (UZIEL, 2015).

With the thawing of the UNSC in 1980, its internal redemocratization, return to multilateral fora, and more active position at the UN led Brazil to once again launch its candidacy for the Council in 1988-89, and start participating in new Peace Missions (NASSER, 2012). Its reinsertion happened slowly thanks to changes in the last 20 years, including both procedural changes within the UN, and the clarification of operations in the Brazilian legal sphere. The country's participation was evaluated based on the military experience and political support gained in other instances, its inclination towards the deployment of military observers due to issues of cost and logistics, and also its preference for operations with clear rules governing the use of force (UZIEL, 2015).

Between 1988 and 2008, Brazil deployed military, police and civilian forces to different places like Cyprus, Liberia, Chad, Western Sahara, Croatia, Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and others, in about 30 operations. Brazil collaborates with this peacekeeping instrument aiming at better international insertion. This would result in greater influence within UN agencies, reinforce the idea of the country being deserving of a position in the CSNU and regarding multilateralism as one of its interests, and help it identify new opportunities for cooperation with the host countries (UZIEL, 2015; NASSER, 2012; AMORIM, 2008).

Despite having acted as a supporter since the first few missions, such as the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) in the Suez Canal (FONSECA JR., 2018), and having supported more than 30 missions (AMORIM, 2008), the intensification of its engagement was illustrated by the military command in the UNAVEM (United Nations Verification Mission in Angola) (ALMEIDA, 2007), and mainly in the MINUSTAH (United Nations Stabilization Force in Haiti) (CORRÊA, 2013; VILLANOVA, 2017; NASSER, 2012). The deepening of the Brazilian commitment to the initiative of leading the military component in Haiti, however, was largely due to its aspiration to become part of the Security Council (UZIEL, 2015, ALMEIDA, 2007).

In addition to deploying a contingent of over 1200 soldiers, it worked on different fronts to promote the political, economic, and social development of Haiti, because it understood that the resolution of the problem did not reside solely in the sphere of security (UZIEL, 2015; NASSER, 2012). Its intention was to, together with the international

community, provide the feasible conditions for the Haitian people to develop autonomously by strengthening the country's national capabilities. With this aspiration, it actively participated in the Peace Consolidation Council in 2006 (AMORIM, 2008). The development of Brazil as a leader through the legitimacy of its discourse will be discussed next.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LEGIMITATE LEADER

In this part of the article, the two concepts – leadership and legitimacy – will be defined according to the paradigm of some authors.

Through a brief theoretical explanation, it is intended to prevent them from being understood from the perspective of everyday life, but rather, based on the theoretical framework. This avoids misinformation and allows analytically understanding Brazilian resourcefulness and the country's importance as an active actor in the international system.

THE ISSUE OF LEADERSHIP

The term "regional leadership" has been excluded from Brazilian diplomacy, although there is some demand for its inclusion, as a statement such as this would generate instability in South America. This fact can be explained by the historical distrust associated with the size of Brazil and the different priorities of the surrounding countries (ALMEIDA, 2007). Often its use becomes problematic, because they confuse this concept with dominance. However, a hegemon is a country that, due to the great asymmetry of material resources, manages to impose its dispositions, knowing that the other side cannot oppose them (YOUNG, 1991).

Although leadership is the most examined event, it is the least assimilated or theoretically understood. The empirical data led to the emptying of its meaning and definition, in addition to the lack of a doctrine suited to modernity. Authority was fundamental to the State, which, especially in the West, was the means to control chaos. However, for this to be possible, power must be legitimate. It used to be granted through religion, tradition, some kind of process or right of succession (BURNS, 2012).

Revolutionary disturbances and even exaggerations like the French Terror made it impossible for authority to be administered as before. Thus, contemporary figures such as Hitler and Mussolini have led to this

common negative perception of authority, but also of leadership, due to the lack of literature and theoretical foundations (BURNS, 2012). This is because they confuse official authority and leadership. When assuming a high position in a company, an individual becomes responsible for the subordinates. Depending on the boss' attitudes, they may follow him/her or not. That is, it does not depend on the position or organization, but on the person him/herself (GARDNER, 1993).

A status position does not ensure leadership despite being able to elevate its possibility due to the traditions and esteem it entails. Likewise, it should not be confused with power, whether military, economic or otherwise. A dictator or even a thief with a weapon has power, but this is not leadership, and does not ensure them the ability to lead. However, this does not mean that a leader has no power, but rather, that a leader has power to the extent he/she is able to persuade or induce a group (GARDNER, 1993), which can be understood as an expression of power (BURNS, 2012).

Leadership would mean the process of motivated and capable actors who seek to fulfill both their desires and interests and those of their followers. Moreover, the purpose is to serve a purpose (BURNS, 2012), through persuasion. In other words, it implies a sense of non-resignation that seeks to improve, change and/or renew the structure, based on values and principles that often have a larger reach than expected. Martin Luther King Jr., with his eloquence, courage and profound philosophical insight, established himself as a great historic figure in troubled times (GARDNER, 1993).

Thinking at the level between States and people, leadership is not an attribute, but a relationship between elements, and how they recognize a certain order and position, even informally; after all, there is no leader without followers (CLARK, 2009, 2011, apud VU, 2017, p. 5). The two influence and communicate with each other, adapting and being adapted (GARDNER, 1993) in a dynamic process that often lacks intercultural experiences that allow them to develop their skills in this environment (CALIGIURI, 2006, 219-228 apud KIM & DYNE, 2011, p. 273).

Cultural intelligence is the ability of individuals to effectively manage and function in different cultural contexts (ANG & VAN DYNE, 2008 apud KIM & DYNE, 2011, p. 276), and from this coexistence, their metacognitive skills improve, i.e., they create mental maps of cultural differences and similarities. This leads to a more throughout observation,

helping them improve their verbal and nonverbal communication when interpreting and learning about new cultures. In this way, these negotiators would be better qualified to act in different contexts and would be able to meet more complex international demands (KIM & DYNE, 2011).

Leaders are those that, during institutional bargaining, i.e., when there is a meeting of sovereign States or international organizations to establish rules and agreements on a theme, strive to resolve or circumvent problems that are common to the parties seeking collective gains (YOUNG, 1991), serving a purpose and satisfying their own desires and motivations, as well as those of their followers (BURNS, 2012). In addition, they have the necessary cultural intelligence to know which strategy is best suited to the situation (KIM & DYNE, 2011).

THE ISSUE OF LEGITIMACY

As stated in Burns' work (2012) and previously observed, for an authority to exercise its power, it had to be legitimized by an institution such as religion, tradition, right of succession, among others. However, it is necessary to inquire about the meaning and function of this legitimacy. Notwithstanding the unanimity of its definition, its political reality is understandable in practice (FONSECA JR., 1998).

This fact, which would explain the essence of legitimacy, would be affected by the culture in which it is inserted. This is because each society interprets its rules and customs by assigning them common meanings (BASS, 2008; FONSECA JR., 1998). At the level of the States, this process would take place as a collective assessment of values that, despite countries having different internal contexts, would be recognized as common, and accepted by international society as legitimate. The role of a certain nation in this context, as well as the norms established between countries, should also be considered (MARTIN WRIGHT, 1977, p. 153-173 apud LAFER , 1989, p. 567).

From a realistic perspective, the great powers, because of the power differences between States, command the international system by creating an expected model of behavior, which is considered legitimate due to its recurrent acceptance. This means that they believe in the existence of legitimate bases for this formal procedure, as well as for the application of the laws established through it (HABERMAS, 1973). North-American ideals started being considered legitimate in the postwar world because

of their expression and acceptance in the external environment, due to the country's efforts to rebuild the world order. Furthermore, it is considered illegitimate to breach the agreements established by the Organizations created in this same context, like the UN, for example (LAFER, 1989).

From an international perspective, there is no force above the States that has the same power to punish they have nationally. Therefore, apart from the assumption that rules are obeyed for fear of punishment, even if sanctions are possible (FRANCK, 1990), there is a clearer idea of legitimacy (FONSECA JR., 1998). In other words, the States have coercive monopoly in the domestic context, and are sovereign in the international environment. Thus, they may choose to concede part of this sovereignty by accepting rules and norms. The question, however, would be about the benefits of giving up part of their sovereignty for the sake of legitimacy.

A State may even be a great power, but without acting by legitimate means, it will have influence, but will not be a leader. The opposite is also valid. With great legitimacy, it can have great expression even if it has no significant war or economic power, among others (FONSECA JR., 1998). It is worth noting that the States are not self-sufficient, and their actions affect the interstate dynamics in which they are inserted. Therefore, by choosing to act through the means deemed appropriate by the international community, a State can often obtain more benefits than by acting alone. In other words, it may end up being recognized as a spokesperson for a situation, gaining power through the support of other nations.

The first allusion to legitimacy is found in the Westphalian context, in which sovereignty is the most coveted value, serving as a guide for the States. Thus, with the birth of the Modern States, some foundations on which to base the reorganization of the interstate relationship itself were established. In addition to a delimited territory with a centralized government and population, and the mutual recognition of the actors while States, the principles of non-intervention and legal equality between countries were developed for the construction and maintenance of sovereignty. In this way, these factors, combined with the fulfillment of other values, constitute the actual legitimacy of this time period (FONSECA JR., 1998).

Like Bass (2008), Fonseca Jr (1998) understands that there is a space for this conjuncture to be dynamic, since the stability-change dialectic is a primordial characteristic of contemporary communities. The daily institutional environment, the political debate and the contradiction of

social forces sometimes reinforce and sometimes weaken the psychological reference supporting the stability of institutions, influencing the legitimate-illegitimate dichotomy. This exercise can improve or worsen the way a State is accepted by international society (LAFER, 1989), depending on its evaluation of the policies adopted (FONSECA JR., 1998).

Fonseca Jr. (1998) points to two perspectives from which to understand the relationship between social values and their acquiescence regarding what is legitimate or not in this temporal context. The former would be based on democratic measures, such as measuring the consensus of public opinion, politicians and intellectuals on the subject. The second would be philosophical in nature, recalling the idea of Antigone or of natural law that the legitimating source emanates from an association with ethics, being superior to the laws created by man. At present, in the context of the United Nations, it differs from traditional Westphalian legitimacy, as previously debated about this first allusion, due to the universal character of the norm. This organization provided an alternative to traditional choices based on egotistical self-preservation reasons of the State by creating a legal framework that makes the choice of war illegitimate and even illegal. This was only possible through the convergence of norms the international community is interested in maintaining (FONSECA JR., 1998).

International society starts adopting new references instead of sovereignty, creating an environment no longer of threats, but of opportunities to become richer and determine rules according to this ideal. In this way, the UN becomes the main forum for worldwide discussions, gaining the power to legitimize international actions due to its universal and impartial nature. That is, because it is a place where various events in the international environment are debated in the presence of various countries with equal power level, without positively or negatively affecting the parties involved, its results are understood as legitimate (FONSECA JR., 1998).

Thus, with the rise of the UN, sovereignty ceases being the main value to be followed as it was in the Westphalian period, and the international consensus and rules become the predominant values. Together with the States, international civil society becomes involved in the process of determining what is legitimate, delineating the conduct of the international system while considering new perspectives, such as, for example, the humanitarian conditions of a country's population (FONSECA JR., 1998; UNPO, 2008).

BRAZILIAN LEADERSHIP AND LEGITIMACY: FROM PEACE OPERATIONS TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL?

In a brief review, legitimacy would be determined by the consensus of international society, by the sense of justice and respect for the standards that have been agreed upon in this scenario through international organizations such as the UN (FONSECA JR., 1998). On the other hand, leadership would be the process through which motivated actors (BURNS, 2012) who are able to operate in the international environment (KIM & DYNE, 2011) use persuasion (GARDNER, 1993) to circumvent problems while seeking to meet common interests (YOUNG, 1991).

It is thus necessary to establish some parameters on which to base this case study. Due to the heterogeneity of the process of establishment of leadership, it is necessary to study the "plans of leadership", or the means employed to achieve goals and how they are implemented, to evaluate the performance of the rising actors (PARK, 2013, 93 apud VU, 2017, p. 7). It should be noted that it is necessary to evaluate the actor's behavior and how it mobilized other nations in relation to a certain subject, and not necessarily the actual results achieved (YOUNG, 1991) since they depend on other circumstances and elements, as will be seen below.

Another factor associated with leadership that has been pointed out previously is cultural intelligence, understood as one of the ways of empowering the actors involved in the bargaining process. Thus, in the present article, it is understood that both Brazilian diplomacy and soldiers at the tactical level have different cultural experiences. In addition to the quality of the diplomats' studies, many have had previous experience in other countries or in multilateral organizations. In relation to the military, many have already served in several parts of the Brazilian territory, with different cultural and geographical realities, and/or in other nations, and/or in the country while in contact with foreign instructors.

In the case of legitimacy, the argument must have universal reach and be debated impartially. In other words, a legitimate action is one that has been debated in an inclusive environment where the actors can debate as equals and without being favored or undermined by the organization, and that is not justified by reasons of power or sovereignty since this would lead it to be perceived with skepticism (FONSECA JR., 1998; UNPO, 2008).

2010/2011 CONTEXTUALIZATION AND ANALYSIS

The Security Council in the 2010-2011 biennium included IBSA members (India, Brazil and South Africa), BRICS members (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) and all G4 members (Germany, Brazil, India, and Japan). To a large extent, the reflection in this biennium was about reforming the Security Council (Villanova, 2017; VARGAS, 2017; ZIEMATH, 2016) to make its decisions more representative and transparent, therefore legitimate (CORRÊA, 2013; AMORIM, 2008; VIOTTI, 2014).

The justification was that since international security issues affect many countries, they should participate in decision-making and share their perspectives (VILLANOVA, 2017; VARGAS, 2017). The Brazilian concern about these processes highlights their legitimacy as it seeks universalistic decisions that are fair, inclusive and in accordance with international norms and opinions (FONSECA JR., 1998; LAFER, 1989). It is also a leader as it has acted as a spokesperson for the international community regarding this issue to achieve common goals, i.e., it is an actor that is able to act in this environment while seeking solutions to a collective problem (BURNS, 2012; KIM & DYNE, 2011; YOUNG, 1991).

Brazil promoted a high-level debate about development and security. From its point of view, these two concepts are interrelated and therefore the UNSC should consider the proposals of the Peacebuilding Commission and improve its coordination with the ECOSOC, provided for in Article 65 of the United Nations Charter, as well as other agencies. The Brazilian belief was that the mandates of the Peace Missions should be focused on peacekeeping *and* peacebuilding activities, so that people are granted access to services guaranteed to them by the bill of human rights, in pursuit of sustainable peace (CORRÊA, 2013; VIEGAS, 2008; VIOTTI, 2014).

Brazil also requested that Peacekeeping Operations should be focused on tackling the origins of the conflict, and not only remedying them (CORRÊA, 2013). In this sense, it also demonstrated solidarity with governments in vulnerable conditions, helping them, as was the case with Haiti, by participating in the MINUSTAH, and Guinea Bissau (NASSER, 2012), by trying to get its considerations included in the agenda, despite the disinterest of the permanent members (UZIEL, 2014).

In the two previous paragraphs, it may be seen that the Brazilian discourse is based on the values recognized as fair by international society, guaranteed to the population by the norms in this scope, such as access

to basic resources like health and education, along with the conditions necessary for their self-determination (VIEGAS, 2008; VIOTTI, 2014). Thus, Brazil uses arguments grounded in legitimacy (FONSECA JR., 1998). Moreover, it is noted that Brazil is recognized as a leader (GARDNER, 1993) for trying to overcome collective adversity by seeking different ways to find solutions, directing the community's attention toward issues that are often overlooked (BURNS, 2012; YOUNG, 1991).

Brazil is recognized in the United Nations as a credible actor. This can be explained by the fact its performance is based on democratic principles, aimed at international peace and security, and by its knowledge of the organization's procedures, making its presence indispensable for the discussion of several subjects, as previously mentioned, giving it a broader scope of action (UZIEL, 2015). Part of this positive notion comes from it being committed to exercising solidarity with countries in unstable conditions, with weakened national institutions, and which have difficulty developing (CORRÊA, 2013; NASSER, 2012).

The UN's recognition alone already indicates that Brazil should be regarded as a leader, or in other words, an actor who is able to act in the international context while seeking to find solutions to collective problems (BURNS, 2012; YOUNG, 1991; GARDNER, 1993). The Brazilian performance is based on legitimacy, i.e., on global, fair and legal principles, recognized as such by international society (FONSECA JR., 1998; LAFER, 1989).

It is precisely when its discourse deepens in practice, resulting in its greater engagement in Peacekeeping Operations, that the country rises in the "informal hierarchy" of the United Nations. Traditionally, for example, in peacekeeping missions, countries take turns assuming the position of force commander. However, the MINUSTAH became an exception, keeping Brazil in this position throughout the entirety of the mission (NASSER, 2012). This highlights its role as a leader (BURNS, 2012), through which it acts as a mediator of several conflicts, aiming at a scenario that is favorable to all (YOUNG, 1991), and legitimates its solutions, as they are developed based on international and inclusive standards (FONSECA JR., 1998).

In 2010, an earthquake occurred in the vicinity of Port-au-Prince, capital of Haiti (UZIEL, 2015; NASSER, 2012). At the time, three resolutions were adopted in response to this situation. Resolution 1908 increased the number of soldiers deployed to assist victims of the disaster and reorganize the country, for example (ZIEMATH, 2016). Brazil volunteered by sending humanitarian reinforcements, as well as logistical and military support

(VIOTTI, 2014). The country also acted as a leader by asserting its presence in Haiti and in the UNSC about this issue (GARDNER, 1993), seeking to address it based on legitimacy, i.e., on what is internationally accepted as such, following the standards and sense of justice endorsed by the international community (FONSECA JR., 1998).

In addition to its actions reflecting the principles it cultivates, such as development, the Brazilian credential was strengthened by the MINUSTAH (NASSER, 2012; UZIEL, 2015), appearing as a central actor in the development of certain policies. It may thus be noted that some matters that had been overlooked due to the lack of interest of the permanent members gained attention due to Brazil's insistence, such as that of Guinea Bissau (VIOTTI, 2014; ZIEMATH, 2016; UZIEL, 2014). The legitimacy of the Brazilian discourse can thus be associated both with the coherence of its actions in the UNSC (FONSECA JR., 1998), and with the leadership it exercises in its pursuit of solutions to common problems (BURNS, 2012; YOUNG, 1991).

It is worth noting that in 2010-2011, Brazil had great influence over the mandates of the Peace Operations and played a central role in developing "peace and security policies", as described in the previous paragraphs. There was thus a shift in the Brazilian behavior, as it used to only fulfill what had been determined. This is due to the experience it obtained in the MINUSTAH. One of the lessons learned was the establishment of alliances to ensure that the interests of Latin America would be considered. As the largest contributor to the Mission's troops, it was able to position itself before big players like France and the USA, limiting them and outlining their mandates according to its own principles (UZIEL, 2014).

Brazil, with the visibility it gained from the MINUSTAH, has been assimilating its profile as a leader, because it is motivated and in a prominent position (BURNS, 2012), presenting alternatives to overcome collective problems (CLARK, 2009, 2011, apud VU, 2017, p. 5; YOUNG, 1991). This is also due to it being recognized as having the necessary experience and credibility for such, (NASSER, 2012; CORRÊA, 2013) basing itself on values considered fair by international society (FONSECA JR., 2018). Next, some cases that took place at the time will be presented.

The Brazilian delegation in the UNSC focused on preventive diplomacy and peaceful settlement of disputes (ZIEMATH, 2016). Brazil introduced a new idea in response (CORRÊA,2013) to the concept

unanimously adopted in 2005 ("responsibility to protect") (UN, 2018; PEDROSA, 2015). The "responsibility while protecting" maxim would emphasize the prevention of conflict by diplomatic and developmental means, while avoiding international interference (NASSER, 2012). In case the use of force was necessary and not expected to increase the population's suffering, it could be authorized, provided it would be assertively delimited by the UNSC and monitored by the appropriate provisions (ZIEMATH, 2016).

Brazilian exercises its leadership when proposing a response to the concept absorbed by UN members in 2005, bargaining how it should be executed in view of the common interest (UN, 2018; BURNS, 2012; YOUNG, 1991). This new interpretation is legitimate as it seeks the fair and consistent implementation of the concept of "responsibility to protect" (FONSECA JR., 1998).

In 2011, the peaceful settlement of controversy came into the spotlight due to the conjuncture of the Middle East with what became known as the "Arab Spring" (CORRÊA, 2013). Brazil voted according to this principle, which it stands for by emphasizing the use of regional institutions, such as the African Union and the Arab League, to solve conflicts peacefully (ZIEMATH, 2016). The Brazilian delegation also showed solidarity with the claims and manifestations of the populations, and condemned human rights transgressions (VIOTTI, 2014).

Brazil also preferred solutions that avoided interventions, as demonstrated in resolution 1970, pertaining to the crisis in Libya (VIOTTI, 2014). It was the chairman of the Council during this time, and the institution promptly responded, favoring a solution by peaceful means. Unfortunately, this consensus was dissolved, leading to resolution 1973, and to the Brazilian abstention. Brazil advocated against the use of all means necessary to restore peace, due to the lack of provisions to monitor the use of force. The Brazilian considerations were not only aimed at the protection of civilians, but also of the opinions of the regional organizations on how to act (ZIEMATH, 2016).

The alignment between the Brazilian discourse and its actions is thus illustrated in the last two paragraphs, as it always sought to pursue multilateral and diplomatic channels, assimilating the opinion of regional organizations that would be beneficial to the concerned parties, thus avoiding the misfortune of civilians and worsening of conflicts. (ZIEMATH, 2016; CORRÊA, 2013). Therefore, it is considered legitimate for

seeking universal solutions, in accordance with international standards (FONSECA JR., 1998), and recogzined as a leader for addressing collective concerns and interests. (BURNS, 2012; YOUNG, 1991).

It was also based on resolution 1973 that Brazil claimed that the principles of "preventive diplomacy" and "responsibility while protecting" (CORRÊA, 2013; NASSER, 2012) should be adopted in the matter of Syria (ZIEMATH, 2016). It committed itself to getting UNSC members to reach a consensus and generate an assertive response, so as to obtain productive tactical consequences (VIOTTI, 2014). This falls within the definition of leadership proposed in this text. Through its capacity to negotiate in the international context (KIM & DYNE, 2011), it sought to persuade (GARDNER, 1993) countries to address common problems (BURNS, 2012; YOUNG, 1991).

The Arab Spring, however, did not include the Israel-Palestine issue in its agenda despite its great importance for stability, especially in the Middle East. For this reason, Brazil highlighted the case at the UNSC to find a solution and achieve peace. In this way, it advocated for the inclusion of Palestine as a full member of the UN for considering the Palestinian population's self-determination claims legitimate (CORRÊA, 2013). Due to expectations of the UN and Brazil's plans to help the Middle East achieve peace, the country agreed to lead the military component of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) (VIOTTI, 2014).

The country bases its stance on the Palestinian issue on arguments that are grounded in what is internationally regarded as the right of a country and of a people (CORRÊA, 2013; NASSER, 2012). That is, it acts according to what is established as legitimate. In addition, it may be recognized as a leader in the UNIFIL by the UN itself (VIOTTI, 2014), and for its commitment to clarifying the seriousness of the problem to USCN members, seeking the stabilization of the international scenario (BURNS, 2012; YOUNG, 1991).

This is not unique to the 2010-2011 biennium, but the country's performance during this period perpetuated the recognition of its active stance at the UN. Although not a permanent member, it has unparalleled permeability to develop new concepts (UZIEL, 2014), such as "responsibility while protecting" and the interrelationship between development and security (VIEGAS, 2008; VIOTTI, 2014). In several cases, as noted above, Brazil led the process based on claims (CORRÊA, 2013; NASSER, 2012) that

are grounded in the concepts of legitimacy coined by international society (FONSECA JR., 1998).

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Over the past 20 years, Brazil has been building and deepening its multilateral profile. In practice, this translates into greater insertion in multilateral and universal fora, such as the WTO and the UN, which may be illustrated by its recurring candidacy for the Security Council, where it often acted as a spokesperson for the interests of marginalized regions. Another example is its progressive engagement in Peacekeeping Operations, which resulted in its more expressive performance in Haiti, deploying contingents of soldiers and not just military observers in individual operations.

Brazil was recognized as an international actor with credibility and legitimacy for respecting international norms and rules. Its opinion is respected at the UNSC and its presence is often indispensable, because certain issues are only included in the international agenda due to its mobilization for this to happen, also acting as a spokesperson for certain regions such as Latin America. This notion can be explained by its multilateralism and complemented by the Brazilian participation in Peace Operations, which reflects the pragmatism of its discourse, i.e., the Brazilian elements translate the values preached in the diplomatic sphere.

The Brazilian participation in the MINUSTAH was not an isolated behavior. It also gained great experience within the UN. In order to achieve its goals and assume a more active stance in the UNSC, it was necessary for Brazil to learn to position itself and negotiate with the other actors of the council to obtain support and limit the influence of powers like France and the USA, leaving a legacy not only to Haiti, but also to Brazilian diplomacy.

An important change during this period was that Brazil ceased only "following orders" and began writing its own formulations, albeit timidly. In this way, in addition to fulfilling its commitments to the international community, it developed maxims such as "responsibility while protecting" and contributed to defining how Peace Operations should be conducted. There is thus a direct relationship between the experience it gained in the MINUSTAH and the leadership and legitimacy it exercises within the Security Council, as proposed in the hypothesis

of this article, because it was through this event that Brazil was able to obtain the conditions necessary for it to positively express its position in the council.

Brazil should maintain its geopolitical-strategic alignment throughout the years, reconciling the interests of the nation and those of the government. This coherence could help tailor its actions to the goals set. Over the course of its governments, presidents would thus share the same purpose, which would in turn promote the continuity of their actions, allowing them to become more prominent, frequent and reliable in environments such as the UN. What this research indicated is that there is space for and even expectations of Brazil occupying a prominent position, and it is up to it to decide how it should act in the future.

BRASIL, UM LÍDER LEGÍTIMO: RUMO AO ASSENTO PERMANENTE NO CSNU MEDIANTE OPERAÇÕES DE PAZ

RESUMO

A partir de uma breve análise de sua atuação no Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas no biênio de 2010-2011 pretende-se examinar a legitimidade dos discursos e liderança da atuação brasileira no Comitê e nas Operações de Paz. Por ser um ator que preza por vias diplomáticas e multilaterais vem ganhando grande destaque dentro da Organização das Nações Unidas e nos instrumentos de manutenção da segurança internacional. A MINUSTAH, missão no Haiti, teve grande repercussão, pois além do componente militar ser liderado por um brasileiro, o país se engajou de diversas formas, até emocionalmente como dito pelo Chanceler Celso Amorim. Mas a grande problemática é: o Brasil seria um líder ? De qual forma isso se deu nos anos de 2010 e 2011 quando esteve como membro temporário no Conselho de Segurança? E por fim, sua legitimidade emana das Missões de Paz?

Palavras-chave: Operações de Paz. Política Externa Brasileira. Conselho de Segurança.

REFERENCES

ALMEIDA, Paulo Roberto. O Brasil como ator regional e global: estraté-gias de política externa na nova ordem internacional. Cena Internacional, Rio de Janeiro, v. 9, n. 1, 2007.

AMORIM, Celso. Conceitos e estratégias da diplomacia do governo Lula. In: Diplomacia, estratégia e política. Brasília, 2004.

BASS, Bernad M. Bass & Stogdill´s Handbook of leadership: theory, rese-arch, and managerial applications. 4. ed. New York: Free Press, 2008.

BURNS, James Macgregor. Leadership. New York: Open Road Integrated Media, 2012.

CORRÊA, Luiz Felipe de Seixas. Brazil in the United Nations: 1946-2011. Brasília: Funag, 2013. Apresentação à terceira edição de Luiz Felipe de Seixas Corrêa.

ELMAN, Colin; ELMAN, Miriam Fendius. Rogress in international rela-tions theory: understanding the debate. Londres: Mit Press, 2003. p. 277-310

FRANCK, Thomas M. The Power of Legitimacy among Nations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990

GARDNER, John William. On Leadership. ed. rev. [s. L.]: Free Press, 1993. HABERMAS, Jürgen. The legitimation crisis. 1th ed .Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.

FONSECA JUNIOR, Gelson. A diplomacia multilateral do Brasil: cons-tantes e variações (1889-2010). Porto Alegre: Leitura XXI, 2015.

FONSECA JUNIOR, Gelson. A legitimidade e outras questões internacio-nais: poder e ética entre as nações. 2. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1998.

KENKEL, Michael 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.

KIM, Jin You; VAN DYNE, Linn. Cultural Intelligence and International Leadership Potential: the Importance of Contact for Members of the Ma-

jority. Michigan State University, Usa: International Association Of Applied Psychology, 2011. Published by Blackwell Publishing

LAFER, Celso. Derecho y legitimidad en el sistema internacional: soberanía nacional y comunidad mundial. Foro Internacional, México, v. 29, n. 4, p. 561-582, 1989

NASSER, Filipe. Pax brasiliensis: projeção de poder e solidariedade na estratégia diplomática de participação brasileira em operações de paz da organização das nações unidas. In: KENKEL, Kai Michael; MORAES, Rodrigo Fracalossi de. O Brasil e as operações de paz em um mundo globalizado: Entre a tradição e a inovação. Brasília: Ipea, 2012. Cap. 8. p. 213-241.

PEDROSA, Fernando Velôzo Gomes. Violência e pacificação no Caribe: tropas brasileiras em operações de paz na República Dominicana (1965-1966) e no Haiti (2004-2005): um estudo comparado. Rio de Janeiro: Biblioteca do Exército, 2015. 272 p. (Biblioteca do Exército, 921. Coleção General Benício, v. 520).

SEITENFUS, Ricardo. DE SUEZ AO HAITI: A PARTICIPAÇÃO BRASILEIRA NAS OPERAÇÕES DE PAZ. In: GUSMÃO, Fundação Alexandre de. O Brasil e a ONU. Brasília: FUNAG, 2008. p. 252

UZIEL, Eduardo. O Conselho de Segurança, as missões de paz e o Brasil no mecanismo de segurança coletiva das Nações Unidas. 2. ed. Brasília: Funag, 2015.

VARGAS, João Augusto Costa. Reforma administrativa das Naçõ es Unidas: porque é difícil e porque é urgente. Cadernos de Política Exterior. Instituto de Pesquisa de Relações Internacionais, Brasília, v., n. 5, p.37-75, 2017. Semestral

VIEGAS, Marcelo. A Atuação Recente do Conselho de Segurança e o Brasil. In: GUSMÃO, Fundação Alexandre de. O Brasil e a ONU. Brasília: FUNAG, 2008.

VILLANOVA, Carlos Luis Duarte. Diplomacia pública e imagem do Brasil no século XXI. Brasília: Funag, 2017.

VIOTTI, Maria Luiza Ribeiro. DUNLOP, Regina Maria Cordeiro. FERNANDES, Leonardo Luís Gorgulho N.(organizadores). O Brasil no Conselho de Segurança da ONU : 2010-2011. – Brasília : FUNAG, 2014. VU,

Truong-minh. International Leadership as a Process: The case of China in Southeast Asia. Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional, [s.l.], v. 60, n. 1, 2017. ISSN 1983-3121.

YOUNG, Oran R. Political leadership and regime formation: on the development of institutions in international society. International Organization. [s. L.], p. 281-308. jun. 1991

ZIEMATH, Gustavo Gerlach da Silva. O Brasil no Conselho de Segurança das Naçõ es Unidas (1945-2011). Brasília: FUNAG, 2016.

UZIEL, Eduardo. O décimo mandato do Brasil (2010-2011) e a presença reiterada de um membro eletivo no Conselho de Segurança da ONU. Política Externa. v. 22, n. 4, 2014. Disponível em: <http://politicaexterna. com. br/2407/o-decimo-mandato-brasil-2010-2011-e-presenca-reite-rada-de-ummembro-eletivo-conselho-de-seguranca-das-nacoes-unidas/>. Acesso em: 10 nov. 2018.

UNITED NATIONS. Responsibility to Protect. United Nations Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect. 2018. Disponível em: https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/about-responsibility--toprotect. shtml. Acesso em: 11 set. 2018.

UNITED NATIONS. Annual Reports. United Nations Security Council. 2018. Disponível em: http://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/reports/. Acesso em: 22 de nov. 2018.