

# **The United Nations and Peacebuilding Discourse**

Evelien Thieme Groen  
Wageningen University

Evelien Thieme Groen 850428829120

23 July 2010

International Development Studies

Bachelor Thesis RDS 80912

Supervisor: Monique Nuijten

Wageningen University

## Table of Contents

Summary	1
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Theoretical framework	1
1.3 Research objective	5
1.4 Detailed Formulation of the Research Question	6
2. The United Nations and its conceptualisation of peace	7
2.1 A brief history of the United Nations	7
2.2 The structure of the United Nations	8
2.3 UN conceptualisation of peace	9
2.4 Conclusion	11
3. Peacebuilding discourse and the UN: until the end of the Cold War	12
3.1 Theories of change	12
3.2 The development of peacebuilding: World War Two and the Cold War	13
World War Two and aftermath	13
The Cold War	15
3.3 Conclusion	17
4. Peacebuilding discourse and the UN: a 'New World Order'	18
4.1 Peacebuilding discourse: the turn of the century	18
New World Order	18
The Brahimi Report	21
Global Fears and Insecurity	22
4.2 The UNs liberal market democracy ideals	22
4.3 Propagating discourses	23
4.4 Discussion	24
5. Conclusion and reflection	27
6. References	30

## Summary

This paper discusses the main discourses found in peacebuilding and relates these to historical events and its influence on the United Nations. This will be analysed using a power/knowledge approach and a discourse analysis. Firstly, the UN is discussed with a focus on its establishment, structure and conceptualisation of peace. The conceptualisation of peace and peacebuilding for the UN has its foundation on Boutros-Ghali's Agenda for Peace where the importance of post-conflict peacebuilding was first acknowledged. In the next section this paper discusses what kind of different peacebuilding discourses exist and relates these to those of the UN. This has been done in historical perspective. Five major events unfold. Firstly we see the rise of peace as a goal in the international world at the end of the 19th century. Secondly the influence of the Cold War and the following 'new world order'. The Agenda for Peace and the Brahimi Report are two events in the UN that have been important for peacebuilding discourse. Lastly the 9/11 terrorist attacks have again transformed the peacebuilding approach. This paper show how discourse as well as our history can severely influence the approaches of people and organisations. It also describes how hard it is to fully change these discourses.

### **1. Introduction**

The methods used by different organisations regarding peace missions are all subject to a specific underlying assumptions about peace and development. While Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and civil society play a large role in peacebuilding the United Nations (UN) has deployed major missions in all parts of the world to build sustaining peace in post-conflict countries.

In recent years we have seen much literature on the critique of development. They discuss issues such as power relations between the funder and the receiver of the funding, but also between those who give aid and those who receive it. Other issues discussed concern certain knowledge discourses or discourses that prevail in the development world. This thesis focuses on the knowledge discourses regarding peace missions and the discourses with a specific focus on the missions of the United Nations.

#### 1.1 Theoretical framework

Escobar (2005) describes how 'development' and the 'Third World' is constructed. He states that most critiques about development intervention have not reached any goals. They do not make for changes in the development world. Critique of development doesn't help because it doesn't really lead to any changes. All critique is only incorporated into the already existing main discourse. It is the main discourse that needs to change in order for development practices to change. A critique of the major discourse in development is, according to Escobar, the best way to create alternatives and new ways of thinking. So if we are critical of the main discourse, we can see other, alternative ideas. Escobar believes that it is an invention of the West to see countries in Africa, Asia and South America as the Third World. Development is the concept through which we have imagined this, and consequentially it marginalising this Third World. If we want to move away from this idea

we must first become conscious of our existing notions of development and what modernity entails and the rethink them. Escobar feels that development links forms of knowledge produced in the West about the Third World with power and intervention. To find alternatives for the current ways of thinking and actions we must reject this discourse. (Escobar, 2005).

According to Escobar (1992) the history of 'development' is not long. It began after the Second World War when 'apparatuses of knowledge', as he states, such as the World Bank and the United Nations were established when a new body of truth was created. It is the creation of a network between international organisations, universities and NGOs that allowed these apparatuses to function and eventually define the way things are to be perceived. Escobar (1992) adds that all the different ideas that fall under 'development' are in fact a repetition of this 'truth' and say the same thing. All development and the 'Third World' is constituted and kept alive through the way it is depicted. It is this preserving, insistent discourse that doesn't allow for change. It is very difficult to imagine a completely different sphere of thought. Escobar (1992) states that critical thought should allow us to see the development of a discourse.

This perspective relates to Foucault who discusses a relationship between power and knowledge. Michel Foucault, a French philosopher, describes how what we assume to be normal and take for granted is in fact constructed by networks in society and our history (Oksala, 2008). History is arbitrary and what we assume to be normal is but one of the ways our society could have become. Human practices are contingent and these actions form the things we now take so for granted. Foucault attempts to denaturalise certain human occurrences, he wants to show how they are not natural but are formed by our actions in the course of history. This way of thinking is social constructivist thought and it includes the argument that human phenomena are not a result of natural processes but that they are in fact social (Oksala, 2008, pp 7-13).

Another interesting concept of Foucault is that of power/knowledge. Practices, he states, compose social reality. Practices make objects of knowledge. According to Foucault there is a connection between power relations and the creation of what is called scientific knowledge (Oksala, 2008, pp 12-14). The norms or rules that determine science are connected to a certain power balance visible in the specific society. This inherent connection between discourses of knowledge and balances of power is what Foucault has called power/knowledge. Power is always used in certain ways, these ways are always supported by specific systems of knowledge. Knowledge gains power even by being scientifically validated. We can also view this power/knowledge relationship in a different way. Social and political wants and needs determine the funding and stimulation of specific research, which in turn form these social and political wants and needs. Still these truths are scientifically supported and actually impartially true. Answers provided by science and scientific research for those who are in power are shaped by the power systems. The

question is of course how much science is influenced by power structures and if all areas are influenced. The point is that Foucault sees science as a social practice, all societies have specific institutions that produce knowledge. (Oksala, 2008, pp 48-50).

The people who have more power than others are those people who have control over definitions of knowledge. They can tell others what to do and how to do it, and it would be seen as normal to do it. These powerful groups control the dominant discourses that determine what and how we think about certain areas of life (Kidd, Legge & Harari, 2010), including peacebuilding.

Most importantly for this thesis, Foucault states that elements of knowledge have to adhere to a certain set of rules which are an essential element of scientific discourse of a certain time period and field. However, this does not mean that these 'truths' are inherently true, or false. It is a sort of social agreement in society. It is important, though, that we keep questioning these beliefs so that we can transform these discourses. Foucault limited this analysis to human sciences where certain assumptions can easily influence science. (Oksala, 2008, pp 50-51).

De Sousa Santos uses a very similar approach concerning major discourses and the power/knowledge relationship. De Sousa Santos talks about epistemological assumptions, these are assumptions about what counts as knowledge. He states that there is a hegemonic scientific and technological knowledge discourse in our society. We must question this discourse and find out whether it is always useful and valid and see if there are other knowledges available and useful. Science confirms this hegemonic discourse and thereby downplays the other counter-hegemonic knowledges. This is what he calls 'monoculture of knowledge' and it makes science the only truth and everything that is not scientific knowledge is deemed unimportant or untrue. An interesting term used by de Sousa Santos is that of utopias. He distinguishes between a conservative and a critical utopia, in which the first is of specific interest. Alternatives to the main discourse are refuted because they are idealistic. The main discourse in the West for example is that is liberal democracy. Any other way of state formation is seen as unrealistic and therefore utopian. A conservative utopia, such as the market under the current neoliberal system in the west, establishes itself and its utopian dimension through complete fulfilment of the ideal. If there is a problem within the ideal it is due to incomplete application, not because the ideal is wrong. In other words, a conservative utopia should be fully applied for it to work, if it is not applied completely it is cause for failure. This leaves no room for alternatives, it is an end-goal in itself. The end-goal is to fulfil the utopia completely and apply it everywhere. A critical utopia entails the critique of current reality and the current ideals. (de Sousa Santos, 2003). This idea shows how it is hard for people to think outside the box. Once we have an idea, a strong discourse it we cannot think around it because it is not questioned but is inherent in our thought.

In this thesis a power/knowledge approach will be used to discuss the major discourse in peace missions and its relation to the UN. We will look at the approach of the UN in relation to peace and how it has possibly changed in relation to changes in historical and political context and align this with major peacebuilding discourses.

A similar approach has also been used by Merlingen and Ostrauskaite (2005) in their paper on international peacebuilding in Bosnia. They used the concept of power/knowledge to describe how peacebuilding is assumed by people to help a country recovering from conflict out of trouble and aid them in transitioning to a peaceful society based on rule of law and fundamental freedoms. Peacebuilding is framed to be a positive and civilising undertaking. This is based on the assumption of what they call liberal peace. What is not realised is the fact that there are forms of power visible in these missions which become visible when we talk about the 'will to 'improve'' conflict-torn societies, as Merlingen and Ostrauskaite (2005) put it. In this thesis the focus of power/knowledge is directed more at issues of major discourses.

This power/knowledge approach is useful and interesting in this thesis because it allows us to look critically at the different structures of power and knowledge visible in international peace missions, specifically those of the UN. Knowing what the major discourses are gives us insight on the assumptions and ideals of the peace missions and of the UN in particular. It is a good way to find out where the discourses come from and whether they influence the assumptions of the UN regarding what best way is to help a country out of conflict and rebuild peace in a state.

## 1.2 Concepts

In this paper peace missions will be a main concept. Peace missions is a very wide concept and implies many things. In the academic world of peace and conflict studies terms such as peacebuilding, peacekeeping, peace-management, peace-enforcing, etc., are used commonly but not always consistently. Within different organisations concerning themselves with peace in a country moving towards conflict, in the middle of a violent conflict or transitioning to a peaceful society, there are many different definitions and concepts used. I do not want to focus on all the conceptual definitions. To be clear though, in this paper the focus lies more on the transition period. I want to focus specifically on the ending of conflict and the ways of rebuilding a society after violent conflict. In this phase the ideals and discourses regarding what peace and a peaceful state entails come more to the fore. Peacebuilding is best used to describe this phase. Peacebuilding is an umbrella term which refers to a long-term process to prevent violent conflict or transform violent conflict into a sustainable, peaceful managing of conflict (Paffenholz & Spurk, 2006). The UN has a more precise definition of post-conflict peacebuilding which will be thoroughly described in chapter two.

The term conflict is also used in different ways. To clarify this concept we can imagine a transition from a peaceful society to a society in war and back to a peaceful society. Within a peaceful society periods of conflicting interests can occur but this does not mean that a country is in war. There are different phases in which a country might find itself regarding war and peace. So, conflict doesn't always lead to violence (Paffenholz & Spurk, 2006). When I talk about violent conflict I refer to a state which is in the midst of war. Conflict is a country in an un-peaceful stage but not necessarily in a state of war.

Discourse is also an important concept in this thesis. It refers to a certain way of thinking in a field of study and it determines what can and what cannot be said. It affects the way we see and perceive things. Young (1981, in Hook, 2001) describes that according to Foucault there is a set of rules, practices and systems that is formed by our 'will to knowledge'. They create a realm where knowledge is produced, the discourse. Discursive practices however make it impossible to think outside this realm. Thinking outside the box is thinking without reason (Hook, 2001). This shows again how discourse and knowledge are linked to power. A discourse is sometimes used along with discourse. A discourse is a set of views, assumptions and values that support, or is the foundation of, a certain theory or methodology or way of thinking (The Free Dictionary, 2010).

### 1.3 Research objective

Many papers have been written about peace missions, their successes and failures and how best to go about ending conflict and rebuilding peace. However, it is also important to look at underlying assumptions regarding these missions. With these assumptions I refer to ideals that come across in the practice and goals of the missions. Paris (2004, p.4) states that 'Observers have [...] paid relatively little attention to the conceptual foundations of peacebuilding itself, or the basic premises upon which these operations are based.'

In this thesis I want to analyse how the peacebuilding practices of the UN relate to historic changes and the discourses of peacebuilding. First we must know how the UN is structured and how they conceptualise peace and peacebuilding. Then I will compare the approaches of the UN with historical instances and relate them to changes in peacebuilding discourse. I will use papers of the UN and ideas of different authors in this literature study. I would also like to include the UN Peacebuilding Commission established at the end of 2005 as part of the UN and their focus on peacebuilding. I do not wish to judge on the missions of the UN or evaluate them, nor do I wish to suggest what peacebuilding approach is the best to take. I merely want to analyse the different discourses visible and look at the UN through this historical discourse analysis.

My hypothesis is that the UN has a very specific approach to peace and that the missions have not changed during the years. I also expect that the missions are like a blueprint that does not regard the differences between the countries and the civil wars that occurred. In other words, that they do not look at the context, and that their approaches

have not changed due to external factors such as major events in our recent history. Furthermore, I believe that the UN, maybe unbeknownst to themselves, imposes the western democratic or liberal ideals on these countries.

#### 1.4 Detailed Formulation of the Research Question

The main research question is as follows. What are the approaches of the United Nations regarding peacebuilding? To answer this question I will pose the following questions.

- How does the UN conceptualise peace?
- What kind of discourses exist in the peacebuilding world and in the UN?
- How do these discourses relate to historical events?



## **2. The United Nations and its conceptualisation of peace**

In this section a brief historical overview of the foundation of the United Nations will be given. It is good to get an idea what the ambitions were of the founders and the goals they wished to achieve. This will give insight in the ideals of the UN as a whole and the assumptions they have regarding peace and peacebuilding. An historical overview will also tell us more about the context in which the UN was founded, this could also have influence on their assumptions and approaches. The establishment of the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission will also be discussed. In this chapter a description will also be given on how the UN conceptualises peace. I will do this by studying different reports of the UN. This is important because it show us what peace means for the UN and what possible approaches relate to this. Lastly, several reports of the UN will be discussed. These reports describe the ideas the UN has had concerning peace and peace missions of the UN. This is good to analyse because it will give us insight on the perceptions of the UN regarding peace missions and their general ideals of peace.

### **2.1 A brief history of the United Nations**

The United Nations came into existence officially on October 24, 1945, when the Charter had officially been ratified by 51 original member states (UN, 2010a). The Charter can be seen as a constitution of the organisation and is to be signed by all member states. It sets out the rules, regulations and the rights of the members and describes procedural processes of the organisation. (UN, 2010b). The name United Nations was thought of by President Roosevelt. It was first used in 1942, during the Second World War, in the 'Declaration by United Nations' in which 26 nations committed to fight against the axis alliance, Germany, Italy and Japan (UN, 2010b).

The idea of a United Nations was developed much earlier. The predecessor of the UN was the League of Nations. It was created during the First World War and established under the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. They aspired to "promote international cooperation and to achieve peace and security" (UN, 2010a). The League of Nations however came to an end after falling through in preventing the Second World War (UN, 2010a). The League's major problem was that it did not have any effective power. The bodies of the League could only make recommendations and only if they where unanimous, so any government could choose to reject them. Binding resolutions could not be made. There was also no organisational body that coordinated military or even economic actions against a wrongdoing state. Finally, important states, such as the USA, were not members (Baylis, Smith & Owens, 2008).

As early as 1865 states across the world already started forming international organisations to work together on certain issues. It started of with and International Telecommunication Union which was followed by and International Telegraph Union and a

Universal Postal Union in 1874. These sectors are still part of the United Nations now (UN, 2010a). This shows us when we already started working together on these important issues of global communication and it is a first step to what we now call the UN.

In 1899 and 1907, an International Peace Conference was held in The Hague. Here they made the first statements about the rules of warfare and war crimes. They established measures on how to settle crises and war and create peace and prevent wars from erupting (UN, 2010a). This conference was the first step to the League of Nations

## 2.2 The structure of the United Nations

The main goals of the United Nations are included in the Charter. The UN aims to preserve peace and safety in the international world and develop good relations with other nations on the basis of equal rights. The UN also endeavours to achieve cooperation in solving economic, social, cultural and humanitarian issues. They wish to promote respect of human rights and freedom for everyone. (UN, 2010b).

Structurally, the United Nations consists of several different bodies concerning themselves with different fields of interest. The General Assembly is the main body and this is where the 192 member states deliberate on different topics and issue mandates on which the work of the UN is based. The Security Council's main task is to uphold international peace and security. There are five permanent members (China, France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom and the United States of America) in this council and ten non-permanent members. (UN,2010d). The decisions made by the Security Council are binding. Since 1948 they have led 63 peacekeeping operations. There is also an Economic and Social Council, a Trusteeship Council, a Secretariat, and the International Court of Justice. The latter is situated in the Hague and is the main judicial body of the UN, it settles conflict between states and gives other bodies of the UN judicial advice. (UN, 2010d).

Of specific interest to this thesis is a body of the UN which is focused on peacebuilding. The 'Supplement to An Agenda for Peace' (UN, 1995) describes the need for a separate body to coordinate peacebuilding. Boutros-Ghali, the sixth Secretary-General of the UN, believes that for peacebuilding to succeed we need governments, NGOs, programs and agencies of the UN to work together. Almost ten years later a peacebuilding commission was proposed. This finally connected security to social and economic developmental issues (Mosegaard Søjberg, 2006). United Nations Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) was established in a 2005 mandate by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The mandate states that the PBC should "marshal resources and [...] advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery" (UN, 2010e). The main attention of the PBC is on the reconstruction of states, building of institutions and stimulating sustainable development. To do this they propose strategies for the rebuilding of states coming out of conflict, help to ensure financing, set the problems on the international agenda and develop ways for those involved to work together more

effectively. The PCB is the body between the relief work of the UN and the development work. The funds used and the strategy applied allows the transition from conflict to a peaceful society to be made to be able to get durable peace and development. The goal is to minimise the chance of relapse. Currently Burundi, Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone are on the agenda of the Commission (UN, 2010e). The Brahimi Report (2005) has also had important effects on the changes that needed to be made to the way the UN operated its missions. This report will be discussed in chapter three.

### 2.3 UN conceptualisation of peace

As stated on the UN internet site, one of the main goals of the United Nations is to achieve peace and security across the globe (UN, 2010b). They indicate that they have been asked many times to prevent conflict from becoming violent and to help parties discuss their issues in diplomatic ways. If conflict does escalate they have been asked to help end conflict and bring peace to society. The UN claims that they have assisted many conflicts transform to peaceful states. This is often done through the Security Council, one of the main bodies of the UN that deals with international peace and security (UN, 2010c).

The UN sees a change in the type of conflict since the 1990s, there is more focus on civil war than conflict between countries. They have consequentially changed their peacekeeping approaches to meet the difficult tasks they face. They have involved different regional organisations in the peacebuilding process and strive to increase a states capacity to build a peaceful society. The UN deals with conflicts in an innovative way, as they say (UN, 2010c). Interestingly enough they acknowledge that some of their peace missions have been very challenging. Conflict in Somalia, Rwanda and the Balkan have been of such a challenge they did not establish new operations in these years. Before the turn of the century they have started to focus on peacebuilding more. They define peacebuilding as an attempt to reduce a country's risk to fall back into conflict right after peace has been restored. This would be achieved by strengthening the states own potential to manage conflicts and begin building structures needed for durable peace and development (UN, 2010c).

In the Secretary General report of 1992, Boutros Boutros-Ghali proposes major reform to the General Assembly, called 'An Agenda for Peace' (UN, 1992). In this report his innovative ideas are portrayed concerning peace issues namely preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping. To peacekeeping Boutros-Ghali has added what he believes to be the related concept of post-conflict peace-building. The focus of this thesis is on the transition period so less attention will be given to preventive diplomacy and peacemaking. Boutros-Ghali is believed to have brought new and innovative ideas regarding reform of peace, security and development sectors of the UN (Global Policy Forum, 2010). He is important man regarding peacebuilding and the UN.

In 'An Agenda for Peace' Boutros-Ghali discusses the changing context of international security and the many issues revolving around peace and threats to human rights. *'The concept of peace is easy to grasp; that of international security is more complex[...]'* (UN, 1992, p. 1). He talks about contradictions in the international world such as on the one hand arms reduction agreements and on the other hand a growth of weapons of mass destruction. An important point he also makes is that *'[...] the efforts of the Organization to build peace, stability and security must encompass matters beyond military threats [...] that have characterized the past.'* (UN, 1992, p. 2). During the Cold War the UN was ineffective due to veto rights of the main powers, and due to this many crises have not been taken on. Since the end of the Cold War this hasn't happened and the demands towards the UN to tackle certain conflicts has risen significantly. Now the UN has become an organisation able to deal with the prevention of war and its resolution and the upholding of peace. The aims of the UN must be, according to Boutros-Ghali: to identify the early stages of conflict, enter into peacemaking to resolve the issues, keep the agreements standing with peacekeeping missions, to assist in peacebuilding, and to address the root causes of conflict. (UN, 1992). Peacebuilding is clarified as *'[...] rebuilding the institutions and infrastructures of nations torn by civil war and strife; and building bonds of peaceful mutual benefit among nations formerly at war'* (UN, 1992, p. 2). Boutros-Ghali makes note that the foundation of these missions must lay by the state and that respect for state sovereignty must be upheld. However, absolute sovereignty does not exist anymore, we must find a balance between internal governance and international interdependence (UN, 1992).

Boutros-Ghali defines post-conflict peacebuilding as an *'action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict'* (UN, 1992, p. 2). For peacemaking and peacekeeping to be successful peacebuilding is needed. That means they must *'include comprehensive efforts to identify and support structures which tend to consolidate peace and advance a sense of confidence and well-being among people. Through agreements ending in civil strife, these may include disarming the previously warring parties and the restoration of order, the custody and possible destruction of weapons, repatriating refugees, advisory and training support for security personnel, monitoring elections, advancing efforts to protect human rights, reforming or strengthening governmental institutions and promoting formal and informal processes of political participation.'* (UN, 1992, p. 6). Once peacemaking and keeping has done its job it is only peacebuilding that must *'cooperatively work to deal with underlying economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems [that can] place an achieved peace on durable foundation.'* (UN, 1992, p. 7). In the final section of the 'Agenda for Peace' Boutros-Ghali states that *'democracy at all levels is essential to attain peace for a new era of prosperity and justice'* (UN, 1992, p. 9). This quote refers to the democracy within the organisation that is the United Nations.

Mosegaard Søjberg (2006) discusses the PBC and states that the concept of peacebuilding introduced by the UN shows how their views have changed regarding the relationship between war and peace. The UN now discards a linear and negative definition of peace. A negative definition of peace means that peace is defined as the absence of war. The UN now recognises the importance of the transition period from war to peace.

## 2.4 Conclusion

The UN, and its preceding organisations were formed in a restless period near the turn of the previous century. Before the 20th century, WWI was coming up and put the development of an international organisation aside. After the war they picked up the idea again but this one was also affected by the rise of a second World War. To say the least, the UN was founded in the midst of war and great international unrest. Striving global peace doesn't seem so far fetched in this period. I believe that the establishment of the PBC in 2005, shows how important peacebuilding is to the United Nations. This also comes across in the article by Mosegaard Søjberg (2006). The UN concept of peacebuilding itself surfaced in a time of revived liberal international thought in the global community after the Cold War ended (Heathershaw, 2008).

In addition the UN has shown reform with regard to the thinking on peace and what is needed to end violent conflict and specifically to stop a country from falling back into armed conflict. From this chapter we can say something about the structure of the UN and their focus on specific issues, such as democracy. Firstly, the structure of the UN as an organisations is based on democratic principles as stated in the Charter according to Bourtos-Ghali in the Agenda for Peace (1992). Secondly, he mentions in the same paper how best to go about peacebuilding and what it entails. According to Heathershaw (2008) these post-conflict peacebuilding tasks stated in the Agenda for Peace (1992) show that the ideals and values of what he calls liberal-democracy come across plain and clear. The practical approach of the UN was from the beginning linked to democracy (Heathershaw, 2008).

### 3. Peacebuilding discourse and the UN: until the end of the Cold War

To answer the research question we must first know what possible discourses exist in the peacebuilding world. In this chapter and the following several theories will be discussed regarding different peacebuilding discourses visible in the last decades. There are also theories about the different discourses peacebuilding organisations (including those organisations affiliated with the UN) can work from. A short analysis of these theories will assist the understanding of possible UN peacebuilding approaches.

The section is split up in two chapters. Chapter three will discuss the theories of change in peacebuilding and will discuss the discourses and historical events of the UN until the end of the Cold War. Chapter four continues in this discussion with the 'new world order' a change that happened in the early 90s. Chapter four also considers issues of liberalism and democracy in the UN and issues of power.

An historical approach will be used in the chapter. A comparison will be made between significant historical events and changes that the UN have gone through because of them. These significant events will be discussed separately. Along with a comparison between historical events and changes in the UN peacebuilding approaches changes in discourse in the development and peacebuilding world will be included.

#### 3.1 Theories of change

In a very interesting article by Jantzi and Jantzi (2009) a connection is made between the discourse of development theory and those of peacebuilding. They want to analyse these discourses to allow for easy understanding and cooperation between the two fields. The authors describe three major discourses under which both development theory and peacebuilding can fall: modernisation, growth-with-equity and liberation from dependancy (Jantzi & Jantzi, 2009).

First, ten different theories of change will be discussed. Theories of change are the discourses of peacebuilding, the ideals. These theories of change tell us a lot about which approach a certain peacebuilding mission takes and in what type of discourse they fall. Also the missions of the UN can be characterised as following at least one of these theories of change. It is important to look at them because they relate both to peacebuilding discourse and peacebuilding approaches. Church and Rogers (in Jantzi & Jantzi, 2009) describe the following theories of change:

- *Individual:* peace depends on the transformative change of a critical mass of individuals
- *Healthy relationships and connections:* peace results from a process of breaking down divisions and prejudices between groups

- *Withdrawal of the resources of war:* interrupting the supply of people and goods to war-making system will cause it to collapse
- *Reduction of violence:* reducing levels of violence perpetrated by combatants or their representatives will allow peace to develop
- *Root causes/justice:* peace results from addressing underlying issues of justice, exploitation, threats to identity and security and people's sense of victimisation
- *Institutionalisation development:* peace is ensured through stable/reliable social institutions that guarantee democracy and human rights
- *Changes in political elites:* peace depends on political and other leaders considering it in their interest to take the necessary steps
- *Grassroots mobilisation:* 'When the people lead, the leaders will follow.'
- *Economics:* People make decisions based on rewards and disincentives. If the economies associated with are unattractive, peace occurs
- *Public attitudes:* peace can be promoted by using mass media to change public attitudes and build greater tolerance in society

*Source:* (Jantzi & Jantzi, 2009, p. 67)

These theories of change are important to note because they can lie at the foundation of the mandates of peacebuilding organisations and show how these focus points are coloured by an underlying assumption of how one can create peace and an ideal picture of what a peaceful state should look like. These theories of change fall under the discourses which will be discussed in the next section

### 3.2 The development of peacebuilding: World War Two and the Cold War

Events after the Second World War and the Cold War have been significant for the UN and the development of the discourse of the UN. In the following paragraphs we can see how. To describe the changes we have connected the discourses with different peace missions that UN has deployed over the years.

#### *World War Two and aftermath*

In our history since the Second World War we can see several phases that emerged in peacebuilding discourse and the United Nations. Through these phases we can get a clear view of how the UN peacebuilding missions have changed over the years and what events have caused these changes. In addition we will see if there is a similar change visible in the global discourse of peacebuilding.

Keep in mind that although temporal divisions have been made, changes in discourses, effects of historical events and other things do not fall nicely within decades or any specific period. There is overlap between the sections made, some changes occurred faster than

others and sometimes things don't really change at all. There can also overlap or lack congruency, this can be due to different perceptions or definitions of people.

Paffenholz and Spurk (2006) feel that the birth of what we now know as peacebuilding happened near the end of the 19th century during the the Hague Peace Conference, as stated in chapter two, which is believed to be the forerunner of the League of Nations and later the UN. Their main objective was to support peace throughout the world. This time in our history is interesting because it was organised just before two devastating wars that affected the lives of almost everyone in the world at that time, wars that changed the shape of our society to what it is now.

Jantzi and Jantzi (2009) discuss the discourse of modernisation. It was developed after the Second World War and still is the most common one in development theory. It entails a structuralist-functionalist approach which implies in this case that development goes through different phases, from primitive to modern. The supporters of modernisation have an internal view of poverty, this means that the causes of poverty are related to the affected group, the poor. An example of this kind of thinking is the Millennium Development Goals. (Jantzi & Jantzi, 2009)

For Peacebuilding this discourse assumes that societies are in conflict because they are not modern societies, and this is because they are lacking in certain supporting social and cultural factors (Jantzi & Jantzi, 2009). Peace can occur if these societies move into a modern system and hold values of individualism and rationality. Thus, peacebuilding entails the bringing of new values and institutions. The focus of the underlying assumption here is that of evolving societies and the cause of the problem, which would be violent conflict in this case, is in fact inherent to the involved groups. Jantzi and Jantzi (2009) continue by saying that out of the ten theories of change mentioned above, six are in line with the discourse of modernisation. These are *individual change, withdrawal of resources for war, reduction of violence, institutional development, political elites and public attitudes*. These are focused on transferring values, models, technology and systems. The conflicting groups lack these and therefore, according to this discourse, are in conflict. Jantzi and Jantzi (2009) believe that the discourse of modernisation is the largest one in peacebuilding. First of all, six out of ten of the theories of change fall under this category, this is striking but this doesn't necessarily mean anything. In spite of this though, a majority of the found assumptions to peace hold modernisation ideals.

Jantzi and Jantzi (2009) describe a second discourse which evolved out of modernisation, called growth-with-equity. This discourse is a movement away from the macro-level to the micro-level, the individual. However, the creed of modernisation still holds. The followers of this discourse look for external factors as the cause of poverty, such as the lack of access to resources and the lack of opportunity. An example is the community-based approach with the goal to provide access.



For peacebuilding the problems are shaped by obstruction from resources, not by a lack of want to change (Jantzi & Jantzi, 2009). Followers of this discourse believe that the modernisation technique of transference is inadequate and we must look at individual processes. The best way to build peace would be to work through local level initiatives. However, there is still an assumption, as in modernisation, that conflicts are caused by lack of integration and that this can be helped through local-level, opportunity creating projects. The theories of change according to Jantzi and Jantzi (2009) that fit under this discourse are the models of *healthy relationships* and *economics*. They both assume that access is blocked by certain things and that this can be fixed by individual level processes. Macro-level aspects are not involved.

These two theories developed after the Second World War. Like stated in the previous chapter this is the time when the United Nations officially came to being. Peacebuilding is a new concept that came about in the UN during the early 1990s. However, the UN has deployed peacekeeping missions since the end of World War Two. These peacekeeping mandates may also include aiding the state to transition into a stable, democratic government (UN, 2010f). An example of one of the first peace missions of the UN is that of UNEF 1. This was the first peacekeeping mission of the UN established by the General Assembly in 1956. The aim was to supervise the cessation of hostilities after a conflict between Egypt and Israel after the Egyptian nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company, France and Britain were also involved. The mandate was to '[...] *secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities, including the withdrawal of the armed forces of France, Israel and the United Kingdom from Egyptian territory and, after the withdrawal, to serve as a buffer between the Egyptian and Israeli forces and to provide impartial supervision of the ceasefire.*' (UN, 2010g). This mission was carried out with the permission of the involved countries, it was not a peace-enforcement mission. Another example in 1958 shows how the UN peace missions did not involve transitional aid from a conflict-ridden state to a properly functioning government. This mission was deployed in Lebanon to ensure that no supplies, personnel and arms crossed the border. A purely observational mission. (UN, 2010h.) These two early examples show how the UN was not involved with the government and peacebuilding. The missions are purely supported by a military force. However they do support slightly the theory of change of modernisation in which peace can develop when violence stops, *reduction of violence*.

### *The Cold War*

In the 60s peacebuilding actually became an established academic discipline. The main focus however in this period was on the Cold War (Paffenholz & Spurk, 2006). During the Cold War the main players in resolving conflict were the UN and the Security Council. Their actions were mostly based on diplomacy. The context of the conflicts involved the issues of that time, such as decolonisation and interstate conflicts. During the Cold War the dispute

was mainly between the communists and the defenders of democracy (van Leeuwen, 2008). The UN was incapable of taking any action during the Cold War because of veto rights of different permanent member states (Baylis, Smith & Owens, 2008). Both the United States of America and the Soviet Union had veto rights. Many conflicts involved these states. The UN was unable to do anything because they touched in the interests of the states involved. The UN was also restricted by state sovereignty issues. So military intervention had to come from individual governments. Until the end of the Cold War the hands of the UN were bound, restrained only to monitoring cease-fires through peacekeeping operations (van Leeuwen, 2008).

The during the civil war in Congo in the 1960s the UN sent a mission in negotiation with the Congolese government to make sure Belgian forces left the Republic after they gained their independence. They also aided the government with keeping law and order, later the mandate included maintaining independence of the country and preventing another civil war. This operation was a significant one because it included, besides a considerable military force, a large amount of civilian experts. After the force left four years later the civilian operation stayed active (UN, 2010i).

This example shows a mission fitted perfectly in the context of decolonisation. Furthermore, it shows a considerable amount of focus on making sure peace doesn't relapse into violent conflict again. Also government aid through civilians show that more attention is being given to the government. The modernisation discourse states that a society is in conflict because they are lacking in social and cultural supporting factors, systems and institutions. After the conflict and the gaining of independence this is what the UN believed the Republic of Congo needed and aided them with. The UN also focuses their actions on the first track, that is through government. This does comply with the modernisation discourse, but not with the growth with equity who like to take a more bottom-up, individual approach.

The third and last discourse Jantzi and Jantzi (2009) found in both development theory and peacebuilding is that of liberation-from-domination which came up in the 80s. This is an answer to the critique of modernisation and its structural-functionalist form. There is now an emphasis on the possession of power of one group over the other. Followers of this discourse believe that the Third World is integrated in modern society but they are exploited by those in power. Writings and programmes focus on empowerment through top-down changes or through grassroots mobilisation. (Jantzi & Jantzi, 2009.) In development theory much critique has been given on certain approaches where these imbalances of power become visible. They perceive there to be a power relation between the aider and the aided where the former has power over the latter. Even when the former tries to empower the latter this relationship is only confirmed (see Kothari, 2001).

For peacebuilding this discourse of liberation-from-domination focus on issues of power and unbalanced relationships between groups. They fear that conflict resolution

would uphold the existence of these power relations, and the power of the state. The cause of violence are assumed to be differences in power between groups. The theories of change that fall under the discourse of liberation are *root causes/justice* and *grassroots mobilisation*. (Jantzi & Jantzi, 2009.)

### 3.3 Conclusion

We have seen in this chapter that there are several different theories of change to which peacebuilders have built their mandates. These theories of change show underlying assumptions and discourses that these peacebuilders can have. We have also discussed different discourses by Jantzi and Jantzi (2009), taking in account the historical events and actions of the UN we see that the discourse of modernisation most comparable to the UN, it is the discourse which they live by.

After the Second World War the UN and its peace missions have been influenced immensely by the events of the Cold War. In the following chapter the changes from the end of the Cold War onwards will be discussed regarding peacebuilding discourse and the history.

## 4. Peacebuilding discourse and the UN: a 'New World Order'

After the Cold War many changes have occurred regarding peacebuilding discourse and the UN peace missions. This has been the result of changes in international politics but also changes within the UN and the peacebuilding world. In this chapter we will look at these changes in detail. Liberal democracy and power relation will be touched upon as well.

### 4.1 Peacebuilding discourse: the turn of the century

#### *New World Order*

Paris (2002) states that after the Cold War, the liberal market democracy bias became apparent (as stated below by Heathershaw (2008)). After the fall of the communism in the late 1980s international organisations such as the UN were able to promote western liberal ideals with a focus on elections.

After the 90s the emphasis was set more on intrastate wars, this means that focus lies more on wars inside a state than between states. This led to a change in those involved in war. These 'new wars' seem to involve citizens, horizontal networks as warring parties, and are difficult to contain. They involve crime and human rights violations (Kaldor, 2009). Due to this viewed change in violent conflict, focus was now more on the root causes of violent conflict. However, by the end of the 90s it became clear that the causes of violent conflict are complex and contingent (van Leeuwen, 2008). As we have seen in the previous chapter, the UN underwent some changes as well in this period and this influenced these aspects. Not only did the amount of peacekeeping missions of the UN increase but the practice of the missions changed too, towards a peacebuilding perspective (van Leeuwen, 2008). As we saw in the previous chapter it was only until the 90s that the UN started to pay attention to the importance of peacebuilding after a war is over. In the early 90s many missions were made. It was a time of experimentation of different methods (Paffenholz & Spurk, 2006).

John Heathershaw (2008) describes three basic discourses seen in the peacebuilding world from the 90s onwards. His descriptions of the discourse are different from Jantzi and Jantzi (2009) who try to compare peacebuilding discourse to that of development. Heathershaw (2008) focuses on liberal peacebuilding discourse for he believes that all the discourses in the peacebuilding world are of a liberal nature. According to Heathershaw (2008) '*peacebuilding as apparently little more than a composite of neoliberal problem-solving strategies...*' We should also see peacebuilding as a discourse, not only as something practical and apart from theory. It is both a practice and an ideal as we, in fact, intend to change the fundamentals of the organisation of country coming out of violent conflict (Cox and Schmid in Heathershaw, 2008). Many critiques believe that there is one single discourse concerning peacebuilding, namely that of liberal peace. In fact there are many within this discourse. Heathershaw (2008) believes that there are three main discourses of peacebuilding. These are democratic reform, civil society building, and state-building, of

which the latter two will be discussed in the next section. All these discourses are liberal democratic, they all approach it differently.

Democratic reform is the first of these discourses. *[T]he discourse of democratic peacebuilding presents a transition from war to peace with the [...] endpoint of a 'liberal democratic peace'* (Heathershaw, 2008). The ethics of liberalism lie at the heart of this approach. It was created in the early 90s in the time of Bush and Boutros-Ghali as a response to the Cold War: 'new world order'. The practical clarification of Boutros-Ghali's concept post-conflict peacebuilding shows explicitly how it is linked to liberal democracy. As we have seen earlier, the United Nations and Boutros-Ghali don't try to hide or deny their aim to build a democratic state in peacebuilding and their liberal democratic end-goal.

Peacebuilding assumptions and discourse is, according to many others also centred around neoliberal organisation. It is the strongest discourse in the peacebuilding world (Paris, 2002). Roland Paris (2002) supports Heathershaw's idea of a dominant liberal discourse. He refers to the term '*mission civilisatrice*' (Paris, 2002) which implies a colonial-type belief that European imperial powers should civilise their colonies. Peacebuilders still believe that a liberal democratic government is the model that is the best and most fitted model of government and state. This compares to the discourse of modernisation in which peacebuilders feel the need to transfer certain systems to societies so that they can also develop and become 'civilised'. Paris (2002) however adds that one should not compare peacebuilding to colonialism, that would take the similarity too far.

Paris (2002) also states that most international organisations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and the United Nations have aided in transforming post-conflict states into democratic societies with liberal markets, but so have governments and their development organisations, such as USAID. Even many NGOs are concerning themselves with transforming a state into a liberal democracy through civil society and participation (Paris, 2002).

In 1992 another important event occurred that would influence the approach and discourse of the UN regarding peacebuilding, namely the publication of the Agenda for Peace by Boutros-Ghali. This report called for a drastic change and major reform of the UN and their peace missions. It was the first time the importance of sustainable peace was explained. This report has been explained in detail in chapter two.

The UNTAC mission in 1992 in Cambodia marks the beginning of a peacekeeping mission that includes aspects of peacebuilding through strengthening the government and focuses on human rights aspects. The UN aimed to bring peace to the country with military forces but it also included civilian personnel to deal with measures of elections and other administrative issues in the government and also the new constitution. UNTAC was mandated to *'supervise the ceasefire, the end of foreign military assistance and the withdrawal of foreign forces; regroup, canton and disarm all armed forces of the Cambodian parties, and ensure a 70 per cent level of demobilization; control and supervise the activities of the*

*administrative structures, including the police; ensure and respect of human rights; and organize and conduct free and fair elections.'* (UN, 2010j). This case shows many different things. Firstly, it is an example of a peace mission that aims to make sure the transition period doesn't relapse into violent conflict again. So it demonstrates how peacebuilding is starting to become part of UN missions, especially if we compare this to the missions in for example Egypt. Secondly, it clearly states the aim of the UN to create a functioning democratic government in Cambodia, this can be done with the help of western civilians who aid to transfer systems and institutions in the government. Thirdly, we can see several theories of change come across that fall under the discourse of modernisation, such as *withdrawal of resources for war* by disarming the forces of Cambodian parties, *reduction of violence* by maintaining the ceasefire but also disarmament, and *institutional development* through aiding the government with administrative, electorate and policing issues. Lastly, we can say that their approach falls under Heathershaws (2008) discourse of democratic reform.

During the 90s another change was upon us concerning peacebuilding discourse. Van Leeuwen (2008) states that due to heavy critique on military peacekeeping operations in addition to the unsuccessful UN peacekeeping missions in for example Rwanda, peacebuilding consequently started to focus more on local civil-society peacebuilding. In the literature, civil-society peacebuilding is seen as positive for peace, allowing to build bridges, connect groups and allow for discussion. This has also gotten a lot of critique, questioning how representative, equal, neutral and open these organisations are (van Leeuwen, 2008).

The importance of civil societies lies in its relation to democracy. Since the beginning of the 90s we have started to believe that a society cannot develop sustainably without a participatory democracy, civil society is seen as to create long term changes and a real democracy. Civil society can strengthen the legitimacy of the government and their decision making. (Paffenholz & Spurk, 2006.)

Advocates of peacebuilding through civil society, the second of Heathershaws discourses, believe in a 'bottom-up', multitrack method of peacebuilding through the strengthening of the 'local capacities for peace' through civil society organisations at the 'grassroots' (Heathershaw, 2008). This means that they feel that peace would be best addressed through the local community in the midst of violent conflict. One can do this by reaching the leaders of certain groups in the area but avoiding to top leaders such as those in government. The goal is to allow the local community to become capable of creating their own possibilities to become a peaceful society. This approach has been part of peacebuilding since the end of the Cold War. Civil society peacebuilding relates to a 'peace-as-justice' tradition which was influenced by Christian humanism. Its growth is supported by the large amount of NGOs and their local partners. It became very popular, like stated above, when state-centres and military approaches failed (Heathershaw, 2008).

The UN has also been involved with civil society issues, they are affiliated or work together with organisations who concern themselves with small-scale civil society activities (Paffenholz & Spurk, 2006). One of these activities can be to organise world wide campaigns to create awareness on those who are excluded. As stated in the previous chapter, the UN also started to get involved with small scale organisations to try out different methods and approaches. A big role for international organisations and the UN is to create awareness and put issues on the international agenda (Paffenholz & Spurk, 2006), this is the way the UN can support peacebuilding through civil society.

### *The Brahimi Report*

Ahmed, Keating and Solinas (2007) also make an historical overview of evolutions of thinking in the UN. They note the importance of the Report of the Panel on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, also known as the Brahimi Report that came out in 2000. This paper is so important because it was the first large attack on the methods of the UN since 1995. It was in 2000 that the UN was not afraid to criticise its own actions and give those involved responsibility.

The report states that we should take the principles of the Charter, those of impartiality and the use of force only in self defence, less literally but still value them (Ahmed, Keating & Solinas, 2007). We should not allow others to come between UN missions and peace nor between them and the lives of civilians. Concerning peacebuilding the UN is requested to shift their focal point to rule of law. It is important to work together to strengthen the police and the rule of law and to protect human rights, this is the way that the population can realise peace in the form of reconciliation. The report also suggests that the UN integrates its elections activities in wider plan of supporting governmental institutions, this removes the end-goal of elections. To achieve all this the UN headquarters must work together better with the United Nation's Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO). Another recommended change was that of 'integrated missions', this means that the UN peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations must include good governance and development in their agendas. (Ahmed, Keating & Solinas, 2007)

The member states and the Security Council have both eventually agreed on these recommendations but want to approach them case by case in a practical way. Many were unhappy about the ideas too, they questions whether this combination is good for developing countries. Is development not better left to those who know more about it, instead of to the peace builders and peacekeepers? Ahmed, Keating & Solinas (2007) call this change a change in the doctrine of the UN. However, the changes were, what they call, very fragile.

### *Global Fears and Insecurity*

After the 9/11 terrorist attack on the Twin Towers in New York much has changed in the discourse of peacebuilding. Since the rise of the 'War on Terror' instigated by the former United States President Bush, peacebuilding has dropped the civil society approach and paid more attention to state-building (Heathershaw, 2008). This has to do with the focus on the new found issues of global security and the threat of terrorism. This fear also comes across in the discourse of peacebuilding at the time. The focus was on human security and unstable states. One dominant discourse in this area focuses on the danger of illiberal states and Islamic terrorist threat. This led to a resurgence of military intervention approaches, after we have seen them dropped in the early 90s (van Leeuwen, 2008).

The peacebuilding through state-building approach, one of the discourses envisioned by Heathershaw (2008), has thus become more popular lately after a drastic fall in popularity in the 90s. It is a 'top-down' approach that wants to build up a state. First they want to achieve a secure environment, 'security first', before they start to build institutions which are needed for a well-functioning state. This is referred to as 'institutionalisation-before-liberalisation'. (Heathershaw, 2008). The international community changed their focus again in the mid 90s. This conservative and interventionist approach opposes the sovereignty rights of states so advocated in the Agenda for Peace (1992). This is an interesting aspect of this approach as it holds on to the sovereignty of states but still insists that these states must be rebuilt. (Heathershaw, 2008).

The 'failed state' is the prey of the interventionist approach. Even though the concept was popular in the early 90s it resurged again after 9/11 and it has become popular once more. The failed state is important in the eyes of the United States and its security interests, they are seen as being the lair of terrorism. In 2008 state building as peacebuilding has been the most dominant ideal (Heathershaw, 2008). Van Leeuwen (2008) sees this development as well but he adds that the many organisations are still concerned with peacebuilding issues through civil society, and its effectiveness. He believes that civil society peacebuilding is still relevant.

The UN have condemned the attacks of 2001. Their approach since the turn of the century values the defending of human rights and development but now also includes security concerns (Malan, 2002).

#### 4.2 The UNs liberal market democracy ideals

As said earlier this paper does not aim to judge or evaluate the methods of the UN and its ideals and assumptions, merely to point them out and compare them to main discourses through an historical analysis. In this section the main discourse of the UN will be discussed shortly through the eyes of different authors. As we have seen it seems to be the case that many authors find the UN to be working in a liberal democratic discourse, this means that



the UN believes that this should be the end-goal for countries coming out of violent conflict. To be clear, it is not an underlying assumption of the UN, it is a clearly expressed goal.

After the end of the Cold war, the UN was able to propagate these ideals and set their plans for peacebuilding in motion. In many texts of the UN, such as the Agenda for Peace (1992) show this. As Heathershaw and Paris have stated in the previous sections, for peacebuilding in general, but also for international organisations in general, the peacebuilding discourse involves the transference of democratic and liberal values. These ideas are so intrinsic to the organisations, states or NGOs that they do not even realise it or question it, and they do not try to hide it either.

At the same time, during about the 90s, came the rise of civil society peacebuilding. Like Paffenholz and Spurk (2006) have stated, civil society is seen as an important quality of a good democracy and is therefore linked to it. What I mean to say is that the promoting of civil society strengthening and empowering (for sustaining peace) is the same as promoting democracy in a country.

### 4.3 Propagating discourses

Paris (2002) states that international organisations, especially the most influential ones, have supported missions where a state that is in violent conflict is aided into becoming a liberal market democracy. The United Nations is one of them. He names four ways in which these organisation can propagate liberal market democracies in post-conflict societies. Firstly, peacebuilders shape the content of agreements while they are written, those who sign the agreement are often stimulated to honour certain political and economic goals. For example, the agreement after the civil war in Namibia was drawn up by outside states. In Cambodia parties were asked to sign an agreement which incorporated a liberal democratic system. Mediators have this stimulating role (Paris, 2002). Secondly, the giving of expert advise by outsider states also influences the liberal market democracy bias. The UN advised certain democratic and liberal concepts to be included in the new Namibian constitution, the words made a point of elections, rights and liberties, etc. A third way that Paris (2002) feels organisations can stimulate this discourse doesn't directly concern the UN, but it does concern other international organisations. Some of these organisations require some prerequisites which aid receiving countries have to follow in order to get economic aid. These conditions regard specific political end economic improvements that for example the IMF approves of. Lastly peacebuilders can stimulate the discourse while they are interim governments of these states. Paris (2002) names the example of the rebuilding of the state of Kosovo in liberal and democratic fashion.

Before moving to the conclusion of this chapter some points need to made on different power issues concerning peacebuilding theory and practice. The authors mentioned above all touch on this subject as well, so it important to discuss this topic. These points show how discourses are sustained and propagated.

As stated in the introduction with regard to the power/knowledge theory, funding towards development organisations can be influenced by the dominant social discourse. Jantzi and Jantzi (2009) state that funding steers organisations in certain directions that are beneficial to the organisation who fund them. Peacebuilding will go in the same direction. Regardless of the myriad of critique towards neoliberal orientation of organisations this effect of funding still occurs.

This power can also come across in the relation between science and major discourse. The critique of academics can become integrated within a major discourse and become part of the new creed (Heathershaw, 2008). So, peacebuilding discourse is a reflection of critical work. However, the main discourse hasn't really change from what it was before. All it has done is incorporated the critique and thereby confirmed the existing discourse. According to Heathershaw (2008) this is shown by Roland Paris in some of his works. As he calls for a transformation of liberal peacebuilding he too does but confirm it further. This example shows how strong a discourse is and how hard it is to change it completely.

Van Leeuwen (2008) believes that the peacebuilding world has changed due to power processes. People involved are worried about the underlying political powers and interventionist motives of policy makers and their strategies and money making schemes. Peacebuilding '*has been turned in to a nation-building agenda*' (van Leeuwen, 2008) created by those in power and influence by our 'War on Terror'. The interest of multilateral financial institutions are being supported. The problem is that this affects the credibility of these institutions, peacebuilding and development aid in general. Van Leeuwen (2008) questions whose democracy and peace we are really fighting for. Another point he makes concerns the local community involved. He feels that the aid organisations are only trying to fulfil the political goals of their governments.

Power can also come across when you look at the dominant discourse and who upholds them. According to Paris (2002) international and multilateral organisations concerned with peacebuilding have internalised liberal and democratic values and want to transfer these to non-western societies coming out of violent conflict. He calls this the globalisation of a certain model, in this case liberal market democracy. This idea shows an unbalance in power relations between the North and the South as the former is transferring an idea, which has become so internalised, onto the latter. An interesting point made by Paris (2002) is that instead of globalisation dissolving the state, as many fear, the state is actually being stimulated to exist.

#### 4.4 Discussion

Peacebuilding is still a relatively young subject matter. It doesn't have a long history of changing ideas and philosophies as for example sociology has. We should see the peacebuilding arena as young and still evolving through different ideas and possibilities. When taking together different theories mentioned in chapter three and four about the

possible ideals and creeds regarding peacebuilding we do see several main discourses. Modernisation believes in a developmental or evolutionary path a society is to take with modern society as its end-goal. Growth with equity focuses on providing opportunities for those without access to resources. The liberation theory of Heathershaw (2008) emphasises different and unequal balances of power in society. Lastly we have the liberal discourse found to be a major discourse of peacebuilding of multilateral institutions and organisations. Peacebuilding theories of change fall under the first three discourses. They can also point to the last discourse I believe. For example *institutionalisation development* points to the importance of institutions and democracy to achieve peace. One can also see the whole liberal discourse as a part of the modernisation discourse because it is also about transferring values, institutions and technology onto societies who lack supporting social institutions. The discourse of modernisation and liberal democracy almost go hand in hand in my opinion. As supported by the authors they are the main discourses of the United Nations's peace(building) missions.

What is especially interesting is the historical perspective of these discourses compared to the practices and ideas of the United Nations and history in general. Above, we have seen five significant events unfold. Firstly, more than 100 years ago the international world started to discuss issues of world peace for the first time in recent history. Unfortunately this did not allow for a halt to the major wars of the 20th century. However, this is a significant event because it is when peace started to become important internationally.

A second important event is the Cold War. During this time the UN was unable to do anything and was in fact bound by its own chains. However, by the fall of the Berlin wall and the innovative Agenda for Peace brought important changes to the UN. They were not only able to take action on violent conflict all over the world (especially those proxy wars), but it was also the time when the UN started to recognise the importance of peacebuilding after the end of war. So in the 90s the UN was free to proclaim its liberal and democratic ideals. After the second world war, peace as an area of academics also came about.

A third significant event was that of the publication of the Agenda for Peace. It was a significant event for the creation of the term (post-conflict) peacebuilding in the international agenda and it describes the importance of peacebuilding to create sustainable peace. This event changed the way people and organisations looked at solving conflict between warring parties and starts the movement from peacekeeping to peacebuilding.

Fourthly, the Brahimi Report has been an important change for the UN. It is not significant per se because the change was seemingly fragile. It is also not an historical event, but it shows a change in the UN's approach on self-critique. It also demonstrates its want for change of ideology. Moving towards rule of law and human rights and 'integrated missions' which entails the inclusion of development in the peacebuilding missions. Even though this change has not directly been triggered by an historical event it is closely related

to the UN peacebuilding discourse and thus will be included in this paper as one of the main events of the UN discourse in historical perspective.

The fifth significant event was the 9/11 terrorist attack in the US. This caused rising fear of underdeveloped countries in the world, failing states and terrorism and the Islam. The only way we can solve these problems is by first hand involvement in (re)building the states of these countries to make sure they are not a threat to security. So fears go together with a will to take drastic measures, it seems, throwing the 'soft' methods of peacebuilding through the grassroots out the window.

In this chapter the importance of power is also discussed. Discourses are a very powerful entity, also in peacebuilding. Such discourses have been internalised and are left unquestioned. In this case a liberal, democratic view of modernisation is the dominant one and is being transferred to societies that seemingly need our help coming out of violent conflict and thus rebuilding its state and institutions.

## 5. Conclusion and reflection

In the conclusion a brief overview of the main points is given. In this final discussion theories of Foucault and Escobar will be brought together with conclusions found during the analysis of the UN peace mission. This section discusses the main finds of the previous chapters. On the basis of the different theories and discourses and the conceptualisations of the UN itself an analysis will be made possible and ideals will be discussed.

This paper aims to discuss the discourses of peacebuilding in general and how it relates to the assumptions, ideals and practices of the UN peace missions. This is done using an historical perspective. It is important to know why the UN executes its missions in certain ways, this question can be answered by looking at the underlying dominant discourses that were apparent in peacebuilding at the time. To answer this question we looked at the structure of the UN, its conception and the way they view peace and peacebuilding. We specifically discussed the Agenda for Peace written in 1992 by the Secretary General at the time, Boutros-Ghali. This paper was an innovative piece which changed the way the UN looked at peace. It described the importance of rebuilding of the state after war, what he called post-conflict peacebuilding.

This paper continued with a description of the peacebuilding discourse over the years and compared these to the discourse of the UN regarding peacebuilding missions. There were several significant events that affected the discourse of peacebuilding and the missions of the UN. A major effect was the Cold War. During this period the UN was unable to address issues of war because two of the member states were involved and had veto rights. After the fall of the Berlin Wall the UN acted. In this time a new world order erupted. Liberal and democratic values were freely spoken of and implemented in the peace missions. At the same time the Agenda for Peace asked for change in the UN and added peacebuilding to the missions. A paper that also influenced the UN and asked for serious reform of the UN was the Brahimi Report. This report asked for the inclusion of development in the missions in addition to integrating rule of law and human rights. In the 90s more changed in the discourse. After the critique on failed missions a more bottom-up, grassroots approach emerged. The focus being empowering local civil society. A final significant event was 9/11. Things changed in the peacebuilding discourse, fear grew and the only way one believed terrorism could disappear was by rebuilding the state right from its foundation. The civil society approach was dropped and state-building became the new way to go forward.

What also came across in the analysis is the significant liberal and democratic or western approach that the UN takes. Even though the missions have changed over the years, democracy has always been important to the UN as an end-goal, either achieved through empowering civil society, encouraging elections or rebuilding a state from scratch. When we look at the values, ideal and assumptions of the United Nations we can say that they value a liberal market democracy. This is however not a secret at all. They are open

about their end-goals and what they are trying to implement in conflict-ridden states across the world. In the Agenda for Peace the value of democracy is clearly stated, and the ways to achieve these goals as well. We have seen that different authors have stated that the UNs peace missions are clearly underlined by the liberal democratic discourse.

I expected in chapter one that the UN had a very singular approach to peacebuilding. In fact, even though the focus lies on democracy, the approaches have been quite different over the years. They seem to accept critique and changes, as happened after the failure in Rwanda. They are also, even if it is reluctantly, willing to reform, as happened after the Brahimi Report. I also expected the UN to have a blueprint ready for every mission, but in fact the missions differ and are adapted to the countries involved and the specific issues at hand, if they say so themselves.

If we only look at discourse we can see a general liberal democratic discourse that was able to be expressed fully after the Cold War. This discourse was able to be implemented into different approach through democratic reform, civil society building, and state-building as we have seen happen through the years. We can also state that these three approaches or discourses are rested on modernity and the closely related growth-with-equity. There is a general belief that in peacebuilding, and also in the UN, that liberal democracy is the way forward and is an end-goal for every state so that it may experience sustainable peace. The creed is that one can transfer their ideas onto others to help them to move to a society of peace and justice and where human rights are respected. The idea that there is a development a society goes through to reach a democratic end-goal is a structuralist-functionalist approach which is modernisation.

As stated above this paper does not aim to call judgement on peacebuilding in general and the missions deployed by the United Nations. It also doesn't want to give an opinion about liberal democratic discourse, not questioning or approving of it. What this paper can do is to make clear that there is a discourse visible in peacebuilding and that however it changes over time it is still the same. By this I mean that the approaches have changed, the angles, ideas and concepts have altered but liberal markets and democratic states is still the end-goal, however reached. This shows how strong a discourse is. This discourse is strengthened by certain ways of propagating discourse through, for example, funding, academics and politics. Even with critique from inside the UN or outside, the methods may change but the discourse does not. It is hard to think outside the box, wether that is necessary or not. However if reform is what is needed than to be able to come up with alternative one must look beyond what we now see and accept as the 'truth' to find something new. It is incredible how strong the power of knowledge really is. The United Nations, as an international organ or network, or 'apparatus of knowledge' has a strong hand in spreading the ideas and values and establishing a 'body of truth', at least in post-conflict peacebuilding activities. It seems that we are unable to shed our conservative utopia, all the questions and critiques seem to be answered by the idea that we have not

implemented liberal markets and democratic states everywhere and therefore we have no peace. To genuinely and intrinsically change ideas and practices one must drop this conservative utopia and to move beyond it, one must accept that there can be other possibilities.

## 6. References

- Ahmed, S., Keating, P. & Solinas, U. (2007). The United Nations and peacebuilding: prospects and perils in international regime (trans)formation. Shaping the future of UN peace operations: is there a doctrine in the house? *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, vol. 20(1).
- Anderson, M.B. & Olson, L. (2003). *Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners*. Cambridge: Collaborative for Development Action.
- Baylis, J., Smith, S. & Owens, P. (2008). *The Globalisation of World Politics. An introduction to international relations*. 4th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crocker, C., Hampson, F. O., Aall, P. (Ed.) (2008) *Leashing the Dogs of War. Conflict Management in a Divided World*. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Escobar, A. (1992) Imagining a Post-development Era? Critical Thought, Development and Social Movements. *Social Text*, vol. 31/32, pp. 20-56.
- Escobar, A. (2005). Imagining a Post-development Era. In Edelman, M. and Haugerud, A. *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization*. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Global Policy Forum (2010). Secretary Boutros Boutros-Ghali's (UN reform initiatives). Taken from <http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/226-initiatives/32282.html> on 19.06.10.
- Heathershaw, J. (2008). Unpacking the Liberal Peace: Dividing and Merging of Peace Discourses. *Millennium: journal of international studies*, vol. 36(6), pp. 597-622.
- Hook, D. (2001). Discourse, Knowledge, Materiality, History: Foucault and Discourse Analysis. *Theories of Psychology*, vol. 11(4), pp. 521-547.
- Jantzi, T. L. & Jantzi, V. E. (2009). Development Discourses and Peacebuilding Theories of Change: Analysing Embedded Assumptions in Development and Peacebuilding. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, vol. 5(1), pp. 65-80.
- Kaldor, M. (2009). New Wars. Counter-insurgency or human. The Broker. Taken from <http://www.thebrokeronline.eu/en/Special-Reports/Special-report-Who-is-the-enemy/New-wars> on 25.06.10.
- Kidd, W., Legge, K. & Harari, P. (2010). *Politics & Power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kothari, U. (2001). Power, Knowledge, and Social Control in Participatory Development. In Cooke, B. and Kothari, U. (eds). *Participation. The New Tyranny*. London: Zed Press.
- van Leeuwen, M. (2008). *Partners in Peace. Discourse and Practices of Civil-society Peacebuilding*. The Hague.
- Malan, M. (2002). The Post-9/11 Security Agenda and Peacekeeping in Africa. *African Security Review*, vol. 11(3). Taken from <http://www.iss.co.za/pubs/asr/11No3/Malan.html> on 13.07.10.



- Merlingen, M. & Ostrauskaite, R. (2005). Power/knowledge in International Peacebuilding: the Case of the EU police mission in Bosnia. *Alternatives*, 30, pp. 297-323.
- Mosegaard Søjberg, L. (2006). The UN's New Peacebuilding Commission. *Peace Magazine*. Taken from <http://globalpolicy.org/un-reform/un-reform-initiatives/secretary-general-boutros-...> on 14.06.10.
- Oksala, J. (2008). *How to read Foucault*. New York & London: Norton & Company.
- Paffenholz, T. & Spurk, C. (2006). Civil Society, Civic Engagement and Peacebuilding. *Social Development Papers. Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction*, vol. 36.
- Paris, R. (2004). 'Introduction', in: *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Paris, R. (2002). International peacebuilding and the 'mission civilisatrice'. *Review of International Studies*, vol. 28, pp. 637-656.
- de Sousa Santos, B. (2003). The World Social Forum: Toward A Counter-Hegemonic Globalisation (Part I). Taken from [www.choike.org/nuevo\\_eng/informes/1557.html](http://www.choike.org/nuevo_eng/informes/1557.html).
- The Free Dictionary (2010). Farlex. Taken from <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/discourse> on 05.07.10.
- UN (1992). An Agenda for Peace. Report of the Secretary-General. Pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992. Taken from <http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agpeace.html> on 08.06.10.
- UN (1995). Supplement to An Agenda for Peace: Position paper of the Secretary-General on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations. 3 January 1995. Taken from <http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agsupp.html> on 24.06.10.
- UN (2010a). About the United Nations/History. History of the UN. Taken from <http://www.un.org/aboutun/history.htm> on 07.06.10.
- UN (2010b). The United Nations: Organisation. Taken from <http://www.un.org/aboutun/untoday/unorg.htm> on 07.06.10.
- UN (2010c). United Nations Today. International peace and security. Taken from <http://www.un.org/aboutun/untoday/peacesec.htm> on 07.06.10.
- UN (2010d) United Nations. Main Bodies. Taken from <http://www.un.org/en/mainbodies/> on 07.06.10
- UN (2010e) United Nations. Peacebuilding Commission. Q&A. Taken from <http://www.un.org/peace/peacebuilding/qanda.shtml> on 07.06.10.
- UN (2010f) United Nations Peacekeeping. Mission statement of the department of peacekeeping operations. Taken from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/info/mission.shtml> on 05.07.10.

UN (2010g) United Nations. First United Nations Emergency Force. UNEF 1. Taken from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unefi.htm> on 05.07.10.

UN (2010h) United Nations. United Nations Observations Group Lebanon. UNOGL. Taken from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unogil.htm> on 05.07.10.

UN (2010i) United Nations. United Nations Operation in Congo. ONUG. Taken from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/onuc.htm> on 05.07.10.

UN (2010j) United Nations. United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia. UNTAC. Taken from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/untac.htm> on 06.06.010.