# NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

## SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

**COURSE CODE: INR 462**

**2 CREDIT UNITS**

**COURSE TITLE: AFRICA IN REGIONAL AND GLOBAL SECURITY**

# COURSE GUIDE

**INR 462**

**AFRICA IN REGIONAL AND GLOBAL SECURITY**

**Course Developer/Writer Dr. John Tor Tsuwa**
**Department of Political Science**
**Benue State University**
**Makurdi, Benue State.**

**Course Editor: Prof. Hakeem I. Tijani**
**Director Study Center**
**National Open University of Nigeria**
**Abuja, FCT.**

**Course Coordinator: Dr. Ebele A. Udeoji**
**Department of Political Science**
**Faculty of Social Sciences**
**National Open University of Nigeria**

**Team Leader: Dr. Aminu Umar**
**Department of Political Science**
**Faculty of Social Sciences**
**National Open University of Nigeria**

**NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA**

National Open University of Nigeria,
Headquarters,
14/16 Ahmadu Bello Way,
Victoria Island, Lagos.

Abuja Office,
5 Dar es Salaam Street,
Off Aminu Kano Crescent,
Wuse II, Abuja.

e-mail: centralinfo@nou.edu.ng
URL: www.nou.edu.ng

Published by:

National Open University of Nigeria

Printed 2018

ISBN: 978-058-951-1

**CONTENTS**

## INTRODUCTION

INR 462, "Africa in Regional and Global Security" is a one semester course in the fourth year of B.Sc. (Hons) degree in International Relations. It is a two unit credit course designed to increase your knowledge on vital issues on security, particularly in the African continent. The course begins with an introductory module which will help you to have a good understanding of Africa from the historical and modern perspectives, the nature and character of African societies and how Africa attempts to ensure security in the region and in the world (globe) through membership of various security organizations- regional and international. The course also brings to highlights various effects, consequences and relationship between development and security, etc. The study units are structured into modules and each module, except module 4 which has 5 units, is structured into 4 units. A unit guide comprises of instructional materials. It gives you a brief of the course content, course guidelines and suggestions and steps to take while studying. You can also find self-assessment exercises for your study.

## COURSE AIMS

The primary aim of this course is to provide students of international relations with comprehensive knowledge on African security issues from a regional and global perspective; the interplay between domestic and international security; domestic conflicts and regional/international security; interstate conflicts; and United Nations peace and security interventions in Africa.However, the course has specific objectives.

## COURSE OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this course are to enable you:

- have understanding of Africa in its historical and modern perspectives and how the nature and character of African countries impacts on the security of Africa and the globe;
- understand the meaning of security and how it influences development in Africa;
- familiarize with the different classifications of regional and global security arrangements;
- increase the students' knowledge of the different kinds of sub-regional security organizations in the four main regions of Africa and their activities and functions;
- gain knowledge on the peace and security missions of organizations such as AFRICOM and the United Nations in enhancing security in Africa and in the world; and
- To highlight the contributions of Africa and Africans towards global security particularly contributions during the First and Second World Wars.

The specific objectives of each study unit can be found at the beginning and you can make references to it while studying. It is necessary and helpful for you to check at the end of the unit, if your progress is consistent with the stated objectives and if you can conveniently answer the self-assessment exercises. The overall objectives of the course will be achieved if you diligently study and complete all the units in this course.

## WORKING THROUGH THE COURSE

To complete the course, you are required to read the study units and other related materials. You will also need to undertake practical exercises for which you need a pen, a note-book, and other materials that will be listed in this guide. The exercises are to aid you in understanding the concepts being presented. At the end of each unit, you will be required to submit written assignment for assessment purposes.At the end of the course, you will be expected to write a final examination.

## THE COURSE MATERIAL

In this course, as in all other courses, the major components you will find are as follows:

1. Course Guide
2. Study Units
3. Textbooks
4. Assignments

## STUDY UNITS

There are 17 study units in this course. They are:
Module 1: Introduction
Unit 1: Africa in Historical and Modern Perspectives
Unit 2: The Nature and Character of African Countries
Unit 3: Understanding the Concept of Security
Unit 4: The Nexus between Security and Development in Africa

Module 2: Security in Africa
Unit 1: Classifications of Regional and Global Security Arrangements
Unit 2: The Principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P)
Unit 3: Peace Operations: Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement
Unit 4: The African Union and Security in Africa

Module 3: Regional Security in Post-Colonial Africa
Unit 1: The ECOWAS and Security in Western Africa
Unit 2: The Southern African Development Community & Security in South Africa
Unit 3: The East African Community and Security in Eastern Africa
Unit 4: The Community of Sahel-Saharan States and Security in Northern Africa

Module 4: Africa, the United Nations and Global Security
Unit 1: International Aid, Neocolonialism and Security in Africa
Unit 2: Africa and AFRICOM
Unit 3: Africa and the United Nations
Unit 4: United Nations Peace and Security Missions in Africa
Unit 5: Africa's Contributions to Global and International Security

As you can observe, the course begins with the basics and expands into a more elaborate, complex and detailed form. All you need to do is to follow the instructions as provided in each unit. In addition, some self-assessment exercises have been provided with which you can test your progress with the text and determine if your study is fulfilling the stated objectives. Tutor-marked assignments have also been provided to aid your study. All these will assist you to be able to fully understand Africa's and Africans role in regional and global security.

## TEXTBOOKS AND REFERENCES

At the end of each unit, you will find a list of relevant reference materials which you may yourself wish to consult as the need arises - even though we have made efforts to provide you with the most important information you need to pass this course. However, I would encourage you, as a third year student to cultivate the habit of consulting as many relevant materials as you are able to within the time available to you. In particular, be sure to consult whatever material you are advised to consult before attempting any exercise.

## ASSESSMENT

Two types of assessment are involved in the course: the Self-Assessment Exercises (SAEs), and the Tutor-Marked Assessment (TMA) questions. Your answers to the SAEs are not meant to be submitted, but they are also important since they give you an opportunity to assess your own understanding of the course content. Tutor-Marked Assignments (TMAs) on the other hand are to be carefully answered and kept in your assignment file for submission and marking. This will count for 30% of your total score in the course.

## TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

At the end of each unit, you will find tutor-marked assignments. There is an average of two tutor-marked assignments per unit. This will allow you to engage the course as robustly as possible. You need to submit at least four assignments of which the three with the highest marks will be recorded as part of your total course grade. This will account for 10 percent each, making a total of 30 percent. When you complete your assignments, send them including your form to your tutor for formal assessment on or before the deadline.

Self-assessment exercises are also provided in each unit. The exercises should help you to evaluate your understanding of the material so far.

These are not to be submitted. You will find all answers to these within the units they are intended for.

## FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

There will be a final examination at the end of the course. The examination carries a total of 70 percent of the total course grade. The examination will reflect the contents of what you have learnt and the self-assessments and tutor-marked assignments. You therefore need to revise your course materials beforehand.

## COURSE MARKING SCHEME

The following table sets out how the actual course marking is broken down.

| **ASSESSMENT** | **MARKS** |
|---|---|
| Four assignments (the best four of all the assignments submitted for marking) | Four assignments, each marked out of 10%, but highest scoring three selected, thus totaling 30% |
| Final Examination | 70% of overall course score |
| **Total** | **100% of course score** |

## COURSE OVERVIEW/PRESENTATION SCHEME

| **Units** | **Title of Work** | **Week Activity** | **Assignment (End-of-Unit)** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Course Guide** | | | |
| **Module 1** | **Introduction** | | |
| Unit 1 | Africa in Historical and Modern Perspectives | Week 1 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 2 | The Nature and Character of African Countries | Week 2 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 3 | Understanding the Concept of Security | Week 3 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 4 | The Nexus between Security and Development in Africa | Week 4 | Assignment 1 |
| **Module 2** | **Security in Africa** | | |
| Unit 1 | Classifications of Regional and Global Security Arrangements | Week 5 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 2 | The Principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) | Week 6 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 3 | Peace Operations: Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement | Week 7 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 4 | The African Union and Security in Africa | Week 8 | Assignment 1 |
| **Module 3** | **Regional Security in Post-Colonial Africa** | | |
| Unit 1 | The ECOWAS and Security in Western Africa | Week 9 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 2 | The Southern African Development Community & Security in South Africa | Week 10 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 3 | The East African Community and Security in Eastern Africa | Week 11 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 4 | The Community of Sahel-Saharan States and Security in Northern Africa | Week 12 | Assignment 1 |
| **Module 4** | **Africa, the United Nations and Global Security** | | |
| Unit 1 | International Aid, Neocolonialism and Security in Africa | Week 13 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 2 | Africa and AFRICOM | Week 14 | Assignment 1 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Unit 3 | Africa and the United Nations | Week 15 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 4 | United Nations Peace and Security Missions in Africa | Week 16 | Assignment 1 |
| Unit 5 | Africa's Contributions to Global and International Security | Week 17 | |
| | **Revision** | Week 18 | |
| | **Examination** | Week 19 – 20 | |
| | **Total** | 20 Weeks | |

## WHAT YOU WILL NEED FOR THE COURSE

You may need to purchase one or two recommended textbooks as important for your mastery of the course content. You need quality time in a study friendly environment every week. If you are computer-literate (which ideally you should be), you should be prepared to visit recommended websites. You should also cultivate the habit of visiting reputable physical libraries accessible to you.

## TUTORS AND TUTORIALS

There are 15 hours of tutorials provided in support of the course. You will be notified of the dates and location of these tutorials, together with the name and phone number of your tutor as soon as you are allocated a tutorial group. Your tutor will mark and comment on your assignments, and keep a close watch on your progress. Be sure to send in your tutor marked assignments promptly, and feel free to contact your tutor in case of any difficulty with your self-assessment exercise, tutor-marked assignment or the grading of an assignment. In any case, you are advised to attend the tutorials regularly and punctually. Always take a list of such prepared questions to the tutorials and participate actively in the discussions.

## ASSESSMENT EXERCISES

There are two aspects to the assessment of this course. First is the Tutor-Marked Assignments; second is a written examination. In handling these assignments, you are expected to apply the information, knowledge and experience acquired during the course. The tutor-marked assignments are now being done online. Ensure that you register all your courses so that you can have easy access to the online assignments. Your score in the online assignments will account for 30 per cent of your total coursework. At the end of the course, you will need to sit for a final examination. This examination will account for the other 70 per cent of your total course mark.

## TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

Usually, there are four online tutor-marked assignments in this course. Each assignment will be marked over ten percent. The best three (that is the highest three of the 10 marks) will be

counted. This implies that the total mark for the best three assignments will constitute 30% of your total course work. You will be able to complete your online assignments successfully from the information and materials contained in your references, reading and study units.

## FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING

The final examination for INR 462: Africa in Regional and Global Security will be of three hours duration and have a value of 70% of the total course grade. The examination will consist of multiple choice and fill-in-the-gaps questions which will reflect the practice exercises and tutor-marked assignments you have previously encountered. All areas of the course will be assessed. It is important that you use adequate time to revise the entire course. You may find it useful to review your tutor-marked assignments before the examination. The final examination covers information from all aspects of the course.

## HOW TO GET THE MOST FROM THIS COURSE

1. There are 17 units in this course. You are to spend one week in each unit. In distance learning, the study units replace the university lecture. This is one of the great advantages of distance learning; you can read and work through specially designed study materials at your own pace, and at a time and place that suites you best. Think of it as reading the lecture instead of listening to the lecturer. In the same way a lecturer might give you some reading to do. The study units tell you when to read and which are your text materials or recommended books. You are provided exercises to do at appropriate points, just as a lecturer might give you in a class exercise.

2. Each of the study units follows a common format. The first item is an introduction to the subject matter of the unit, and how a particular unit is integrated with other units and the course as a whole. Next to this is a set of learning objectives. These objectives let you know what you should be able to do, by the time you have completed the unit. These learning objectives are meant to guide your study. The moment a unit is finished, you must go back and check whether you have achieved the objectives. If this is made a habit, then you will significantly improve your chance of passing the course.

3. The main body of the unit guides you through the required reading from other sources. This will usually be either from your reference or from a reading section.

4. The following is a practical strategy for working through the course. If you run into any trouble, telephone your tutor or visit the study center nearest to you. Remember that your tutor's job is to help you. When you need assistance, do not hesitate to call and ask your tutor to provide it.

5. Read this course guide thoroughly. It is your first assignment.

6. Organize a study schedule – Design a 'Course Overview' to guide you through the course. Note the time you are expected to spend on each unit and how the assignments relate to the units.

7. Important information; e.g. details of your tutorials and the date of the first day of the semester is available at the study center.
8. You need to gather all the information into one place, such as your diary or a wall calendar. Whatever method you choose to use, you should decide on and write in your own dates and schedule of work for each unit.

9. Once you have created your own study schedule, do everything to stay faithful to it.

10. The major reason that students fail is that they get behind in their coursework. If you get into difficulties with your schedule, please let your tutor or course coordinator know before it is too late for help.

11. Turn to Unit 1, and read the introduction and the objectives for the unit.

12. Assemble the study materials. You will need your references for the unit you are studying at any point in time.

13. As you work through the unit, you will know what sources to consult for further information.

14. Visit your study center whenever you need up-to-date information.

15. Well before the relevant online TMA due dates, visit your study center for relevant information and updates. Keep in mind that you will learn a lot by doing the assignment carefully. They have been designed to help you meet the objectives of the course and, therefore, will help you pass the examination.

16. Review the objectives for each study unit to confirm that you have achieved them. If you feel unsure about any of the objectives, review the study materials or consult your tutor. When you are confident that you have achieved a unit's objectives, you can start on the next unit. Proceed unit by unit through the course and try to space your study so that you can keep yourself on schedule.

17. After completing the last unit, review the course and prepare yourself for the final examination. Check that you have achieved the unit objectives (listed at the beginning of each unit) and the course objectives (listed in the course guide).

## CONCLUSION

This is a theory course but you will get the best out of it if you cultivate the habit of relating it to issues and happenings around you – both local and international issues.

## SUMMARY

'Africa in Regional and Global Security', generally introduces you to an understanding of security within Africa and the world. All the basic course materials that you need to successfully complete the course are provided. At the end, you will be able to:

- understand the nature and character of African countries;
- review the meaning, type and dimensions of security;
- identify and discuss the different security arrangements;
- explain the relationship between security and development and appreciate how they influence each other;
- understand the different security arrangements and organizations in Africa;
- understand peacekeeping and peace missions in Africa.

**List of Acronyms**

**ADI** - Africa Development Initiative
**AFISCA** - African Union led International Mission in Mali
**AFRC** - Armed Forces Ruling Council
**AFRICOM** - US Africa Command
**AIDS** - Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
**AIDS** -Acquired Immune Deficiency
**AMIB** - Africa Union Mission in Burundi
**AMIS** - African Mission in Sudan
**AMISEC** - African Union Mission for support to the elections in Comoros
**ANC** - African National Congress
**APC** - All People's Congress
**APSA** - African Peace and Security Architecture
**ASEAN** - Association of Southeast Asia Nations
**ASF** - African Standby Force
**AU** - African Union
**AU-AHSG** - African Union-Assembly of Head of State and Government
**AVEOM** - Africa Union Electoral Observation Mission
**BCP** - Basutoland Congress Party
**BNP** - Basuto National Party
**CEN-SAD** - Community of Sahel-Saharan States
**CEWS** - Continental Early Warning System
**CFE** - Conventional Armed Forces and Cooperation
**CIA** - Central Intelligence Agency
**CivPols** - United Nations Civilian Police
**COMESA** - Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
**DOD** - Department of Defence
**DOS** - Department of States
**DPKO** - Department of Peace Keeping Operations
**DRC** - Democratic Republic of Congo
**EAC** - East African Community
**EACSO** - East African Common Services Organization

**EAHC** - East Africa High Commission
**EALA** - East Africa Legislative Assembly
**EASBRIG** - Eastern African Standby Brigade
**EBID** - ECOWAS Bank for Investment and Development
**ECOMOG** - ECOWAS Monitoring Group
**ECOSOCC** - Economic, Social and Cultural Council
**ECOWAS** - Economic Community of West African States
**ERP** - European Recovery Programme
**EU** - European Union
**EUCOM** - United States European Union
**EWS** - Early Warning System
**FOISD** - Force Only In Self Defence
**FRELIMO** - Mozambique Liberation Front
**GAO** - Government Accountability Office
**GDP** - Gross Domestic Project
**GNP** - Gross National Project
**HDI** - Human Development Index
**HIV** - Human Immunodeficiency Virus
**IGAD** - Intergovernmental Authority on Development
**IGR** - Internally Generated Revenue
**IMF** - International Monetary Fund
**ISIS** - Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant
**KAR** - Kings African Rifles
**LCD** - Lesotho Congress for Democracy
**MDGs** - Millennium Development Goals
**MENA** - Middle East and North America
**MMPR** - Mixed Member Proportional Representation
**MPLA** - Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola
**NATO** - North Atlantic Treaty Organization
**NSC** - National Security Council
**OAS** - Organization of American States
**OAU** - Organization of African Unity
**OECD** - Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
**ONUMO** - United Mission in Mozambique
**OSCE** - Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
**PACOM** - United States Pacific Command
**PAP** - Pan African Parliament
**R2P** - Responsibility to Protect
**RUF** - Revolutionary United Front
**SACU** - South African Customs Union
**SADC** - South African Development Community
**SALWs** - Small Arms and Light Weapons
**SANDF** - South African National Defence Force
**SAP** - Structural Adjustment Programme
**SEOM** - SADC Electoral Observation Mission
**SRSG** - Special Representative of the Secretary General

**SWAPO** - South West African People's Organization
**TFG** - Transitional Federal Group
**TSCTI** - Trans-Saharan Counterterrorism Initiative
**UK** - United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland
**UN** - United Nations
**UNAMIR** - United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda
**UNASOG** - United Nations Auozu Strip Observer Group
**UNCTAD** - United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
**UNCTAD** - United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
**UNDP** - United Nations Development Programme
**UNESCO** - United Nations Educational and Scientific Organization
**UNF** - United Nations Force in Congo
**UNICEF** - United Nations International Children Fund
**UNMEE** - United Nations Mission in Eritrea and Ethiopia
**UNMIH** - United Nations Mission in Haiti
**UNMOP** - United Nations Mission and Observers inn Prevlaka
**UNOSOM** - UN Mission in Somalia
**UNOSOM II** - UN Mission in Somalia II
**UNPROFOR** - United Nations Protection Force
**UNSC** - United Nations Security Council
**UNTAET** - United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor
**UNTSO** - United Nations Truce Supervision Organization
**USA** - United States of America
**WAHO** - West African Monetary Organization
**WAMA** - West African Monetary Agency
**ZANU-PF** - Zimbabwe African National Union – Patriotic Front

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## MODULE ONE: INTRODUCTION

**Unit 1: Africa in Historical and Modern Perspectives**

**Unit 2: The Nature and Character of African Countries**

**Unit 3: Understanding the Concept of Security**

**Unit 4: The Nexus between Security and Development**

## UNIT 1: AFRICA IN HISTORICAL AND MODERN PERSPECTIVES



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Africa is the world's second largest and second most-populous continent (behind Asia in both categories). At about 30.3 million km2 (11.7 million square miles) including adjacent islands, it covers 6% of Earth's total surface area and 20% of its land area. With 1.2 billion people as of 2016, it accounts for about 16% of the world's human population. The continent is surrounded by the Mediterranean Sea to the north, the Isthmus of Suez and the Red Sea to the northeast, the Indian Ocean to the southeast and the Atlantic Ocean to the west. The continent includes Madagascar and various archipelagos. It contains 54 fully recognized sovereign states (countries), nine territories and two de facto independent states with limited or no recognition. The majority of the continent and its countries are in the Northern Hemisphere, with a substantial portion and number of countries in the Southern Hemisphere.

Africa's average population is the youngest amongst all the continents; the median age in 2012 was 19.7, when the worldwide median age was 30.4. Algeria is Africa's largest country by area, and Nigeria is its largest by population. Africa, particularly central Eastern Africa, is widely accepted as the place of origin of humans as the earliest Homo sapiens (modern human), found in Ethiopia, and date to circa 200,000 years ago. Africa straddles the equator and encompasses numerous climate areas; it is the only continent to stretch from the northern temperate to southern temperate zones. Africa hosts a large diversity of ethnicities, cultures and languages. In the late 19th century, European countries colonized almost all of Africa; most present states in Africa originated from a process of decolonization in the 20th century. African nations cooperate through the establishment of the African Union, which is headquartered in Addis Ababa.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

This unit has the following objectives:

i. To intimate students on the history of the African continent;
ii. To discuss Africa's peoples, geography, demography, politics, economy and religion;
iii. At the end of this lecture, the student is expected to understand how Africa's history and modern realities shapes security on the continent.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 Early Civilizations

At about 3300 BC, the historical record opens in Northern Africa with the rise of literacy in the Pharaonic civilization of Ancient Egypt. One of the world's earliest and longest-lasting civilizations, the Egyptian state continued, with varying levels of influence over other areas, until 343 BC. Egyptian influence reached deep into modern-day Libya and Nubia, and, according to Martin Bernal, as far north as Crete. An independent center of civilization with trading links to Phoenicia was established by Phoenicians from Tyre on the north-west African coast at Carthage.

European exploration of Africa began with Ancient Greeks and Romans. In 332 BC, Alexander the Great was welcomed as a liberator in Persian-occupied Egypt. He founded Alexandria in Egypt, which would become the prosperous capital of the Ptolemaic dynasty after his death. Following the conquest of North Africa's Mediterranean coastline by the Roman Empire, the area was integrated economically and culturally into the Roman system. Roman settlement occurred in modern Tunisia and elsewhere along the coast. The first Roman emperor native to North Africa was Septimius Severus, born in Leptis Magna in present-day Libya, his mother was Italian Roman and his father was Punic.

Christianity spread across these areas at an early date, from Judaea via Egypt and beyond the borders of the Roman world into Nubia; by AD 340 at the latest, it had become the state religion of the Aksumite Empire. Syro-Greek missionaries, who arrived by way of the Red Sea, were responsible for this theological development. In the early 7th century, the newly formed Arabian Islamic Caliphate expanded into Egypt, and then into North Africa. In a short while, the local Berber elite had been integrated into Muslim Arab tribes. When the Umayyad capital Damascus fell in the 8th century, the Islamic center of the Mediterranean shifted from Syria to Qayrawan in North Africa. Islamic North Africa

had become diverse, and a hub for mystics, scholars, jurists, and philosophers. During the above-mentioned period, Islam spread to sub-Saharan Africa, mainly through trade routes and migration.

Pre-colonial Africa possessed perhaps as many as 10,000 different states and polities characterized by many different sorts of political organization and rule. These included small family groups of hunter-gatherers such as the San people of southern Africa; larger, more structured groups such as the family clan groupings of the Bantu-speaking peoples of central, southern, and eastern Africa; heavily structured clan groups in the Horn of Africa; the large Sahelian kingdoms; and autonomous city-states and kingdoms such as those of the Akan; Edo, Yoruba, and Igbo people in West Africa; and the Swahili coastal trading towns of Southeast Africa. By the ninth century AD, a string of dynastic states, including the earliest Hausa states, stretched across the sub-Saharan savannah from the western regions to central Sudan. The most powerful of these states were Ghana, Gao, and the Kanem-Bornu Empire. Ghana declined in the eleventh century, but was succeeded by the Mali Empire which consolidated much of western Sudan in the thirteenth century. Kanem accepted Islam in the eleventh century. In the forested regions of the West African coast, independent kingdoms grew with little influence from the Muslim north. The Kingdom of Nri was established around the ninth century and was one of the first. It is also one of the oldest kingdoms in present-day Nigeria and was ruled by the EzeNri. The Nri kingdom is famous for its elaborate bronzes, found at the town of Igbo-Ukwu. The bronzes have been dated from as far back as the ninth century.

The Kingdom of Ife, historically the first of these Yoruba city-states or kingdoms, established government under a priestly oba ('king' or 'ruler' in the Yoruba language), called the Ooni of Ife. Ife was noted as a major religious and cultural center in West Africa, and for its unique naturalistic tradition of bronze sculpture. The Ife model of government was adapted at the Oyo Empire, where its obas or kings, called the Alaafins of Oyo, once controlled a large number of other Yoruba and non-Yoruba city-states and kingdoms; the Fon Kingdom of Dahomey was one of the non-Yoruba domains under Oyo control.The Almoravids were a Berber dynasty from the Sahara that spread over a wide area of northwestern Africa and the Iberian Peninsula during the eleventh century. The BanuHilal and BanuMa'qil were a collection of Arab Bedouin tribes from the Arabian Peninsula who migrated westwards via Egypt between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. Their migration resulted in the fusion of the Arabs and Berbers, where the locals were Arabized, and Arab culture absorbed elements of the local culture, under the unifying framework of Islam.

Following the breakup of Mali, a local leader named Sonni Ali (1464–1492) founded the Songhai Empire in the region of middle Niger and the western Sudan and took control of the trans-Saharan trade. Sonni Ali seized Timbuktu in 1468 and Jenne in 1473, building

his regime on trade revenues and the cooperation of Muslim merchants. His successor Askia Mohammad I (1493–1528) made Islam the official religion, built mosques, and brought to Gao Muslim scholars, including al-Maghili (d.1504), the founder of an important tradition of Sudanic African Muslim scholarship. By the eleventh century, some Hausa states – such as Kano, Jigawa, Katsina, and Gobir – had developed into walled towns engaging in trade, servicing caravans, and the manufacture of goods. Until the fifteenth century, these small states were on the periphery of the major Sudanic empires of the era, paying tribute to Songhai to the west andKanem-Borno to the east.

### 3.2 Colonialism and Independence Struggles

In the late 19th century, the European imperial powers engaged in a major territorial scramble and occupied most of the continent, creating many colonial territories, and leaving only two fully independent states: Ethiopia (known to Europeans as "Abyssinia"), and Liberia. Egypt and Sudan were never formally incorporated into any European colonial empire; however, after the British occupation of 1882, Egypt was effectively under British administration until 1922. The Berlin Conference held in 1884–85 was an important event in the political future of African ethnic groups. It was convened by King Leopold II of Belgium, and attended by the European powers that laid claim to African territories. The Berlin Conference sought to end the European powers' Scramble for Africa, by agreeing on political division and spheres of influence. They set up the political divisions of the continent, by spheres of interest that still exist in Africa today.

Imperial rule by Europeans would continue until after the conclusion of World War II, when almost all remaining colonial territories gradually obtained formal independence. Independence movements in Africa gained momentum following World War II, which left the major European powers weakened. In 1951, Libya, a former Italian colony, gained independence. In 1956, Tunisia and Morocco won their independence from France. Ghana followed suit the next year (March 1957), becoming the first of the sub-Saharan colonies to be granted independence. Most of the rest of the continent became independent over the next decade. Nigeria gained flagship independence in October, 1960.

Portugal's overseas presence in Sub-Saharan Africa (most notably in Angola, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and São Tomé and Príncipe) lasted from the 16th century to 1975, after the Estado Novo regime was overthrown in a military coup in Lisbon. Rhodesia unilaterally declared independence from the United Kingdom in 1965, under the white minority government of Ian Smith, but was not internationally recognized as an independent state (as Zimbabwe) until 1980, when black nationalists gained power after a bitter guerrilla war. Although South Africa was one of the first

African countries to gain independence, the state remained under the control of the country's white minority through a system of racial segregation known as apartheid until 1994 when Nelson Mandela, who was imprisoned for more than 25 years by the apartheid government, became the President.

### 3.3 Geology and Geography

Africa is the largest of the three great southward projections from the largest landmass of the Earth. Separated from Europe by the Mediterranean Sea, it is joined to Asia at its northeast extremity by the Isthmus of Suez (transected by the Suez Canal), 163 km (101 mi) wide (Geopolitically, Egypt's Sinai Peninsula east of the Suez Canal is often considered part of Africa, as well.) The coastline is 26,000 km (16,000 mi) long, and the absence of deep indentations of the shore is illustrated by the fact that Europe, which covers only 10,400,000 km2 (4,000,000 sq. mi) – about a third of the surface of Africa – has a coastline of 32,000 km (20,000 mi).[81] From the most northerly point, Ras ben Sakka in Tunisia (37°21' N), to the most southerly point, Cape Agulhas in South Africa (34°51'15" S), is a distance of approximately 8,000 km (5,000 mi). Cape Verde, 17°33'22" W, the westernmost point, is a distance of approximately 7,400 km (4,600 mi) to Ras Hafun, 51°27'52" E, the most easterly projection that neighbors Cape Guardafui, the tip of the Horn of Africa. Africa's largest country is Algeria, and its smallest country is Seychelles, an archipelago off the east coast. The smallest nation on the continental mainland is The Gambia. The African Plate is a major tectonic plate straddling the equator as well as the prime meridian. It includes much of the continent of Africa, as well as oceanic crust which lies between the continent and various surrounding ocean ridges. Between 60 million years ago and 10 million years ago, the Somali Plate began rifting from the African Plate along the East African Rift. Since the continent of Africa consists of crust from both the African and the Somali plates, some literature refers to the African Plate as the Nubian Plate to distinguish it from the continent as a whole.

Geologically, Africa includes the Arabian Peninsula; the Zagros Mountains of Iran and the Anatolian Plateau of Turkey mark where the African Plate collided with Eurasia. The Afrotropicecozone and the Saharo-Arabian desert to its north unite the region biogeographically, and the Afro-Asiatic language family unites the north linguistically.Africa boasts perhaps the world's largest combination of density and "range of freedom" of wild animal populations and diversity, with wild populations of large carnivores (such as lions, hyenas, and cheetahs) and herbivores (such as buffalo, elephants, camels, and giraffes) ranging freely on primarily open non-private plains. It is also home to a variety of "jungle" animals including snakes and primates and aquatic life such as crocodiles and amphibians. In addition, Africa has the largest number of

megafauna species, as it was least affected by the extinction of the Pleistocene megafauna.

The climate of Africa ranges from tropical to subarctic on its highest peaks. Its northern half is primarily desert, or arid, while its central and southern areas contain both savanna plains and dense jungle (rainforest) regions. In between, there is a convergence, where vegetation patterns such as Sahel and steppe dominate. Africa is the hottest continent on earth and 60% of the entire land surface consists of drylands and deserts. The record for the highest-ever recorded temperature, in Libya in 1922 (58 °C (136 °F)), was discredited in 2013. Africa has over 3,000 protected areas, with 198 marine protected areas, 50 biosphere reserves, and 80 wetlands reserves. Significant habitat destruction, increases in human population and poaching are reducing Africa's biological diversity and arable land. Human encroachment, civil unrest and the introduction of non-native species threaten biodiversity in Africa. This has been exacerbated by administrative, inadequate personnel and funding problems.

Deforestation is affecting Africa at twice the world rate, according to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). According to the University of Pennsylvania African Studies Center, 31% of Africa's pasture lands and 19% of its forests and woodlands are classified as degraded, and Africa is losing over four million hectares of forest per year, which is twice the average deforestation rate for the rest of the world. Some sources claim that approximately 90% of the original, virgin forests in West Africa have been destroyed. Over 90% of Madagascar's original forests have been destroyed since the arrival of humans 2000 years ago and about 65% of Africa's agricultural land suffers from soil degradation.

### 3.4 Religions, Languages and Cultures

Africans profess a wide variety of religious beliefs, and statistics on religious affiliation are difficult to come by since they are often a sensitive topic for governments with mixed religious populations. According to the World Book Encyclopedia, Islam is the largest religion in Africa, followed by Christianity. While according to Encyclopedia Britannica, 45% of the population are Christians, 40% are Muslims, and 10% follow traditional religions. A small number of Africans are Hindu, Buddhist, Confucianist, Baha'i, or Jewish. There is also a minority of people in Africa who are irreligious.

By most estimates, well over a thousand languages (UNESCO has estimated around two thousand) are spoken in Africa. Most are of African origin, though some are of European or Asian origin. Africa is the most multilingual continent in the world, and it is not rare for individuals to fluently speak not only multiple African languages, but one or more European ones as well. There are four major language families indigenous to Africa:

i. **The Afro-asiatic languages** are a language family of about 240 languages and 285 million people widespread throughout the Horn of Africa, North Africa, the Sahel, and Southwest Asia.

ii. **The Nilo-Saharan language** family consists of more than a hundred languages spoken by 30 million people. Nilo-Saharan languages are spoken by ethnic groups in Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Sudan, South Sudan, Uganda, and northern Tanzania.

iii. **The Niger-Congo language** family covers much of Sub-Saharan Africa. In terms of number of languages, it is the largest language family in Africa and perhaps the largest in the world.

iv. **TheKhoisan languages** number about fifty and are spoken in Southern Africa by approximately 400,000 people. Many of the Khoisan languages are endangered. The Khoi and San peoples are considered the original inhabitants of this part of Africa.

Following the end of colonialism, nearly all African countries adopted official languages that originated outside the continent, although several countries also granted legal recognition to indigenous languages (such as Swahili, Yoruba, Igbo and Hausa). In numerous countries, English and French are used for communication in the public sphere such as government, commerce, education and the media. Arabic, Portuguese, Afrikaans and Spanish are examples of languages that trace their origin to outside of Africa, and that are used by millions of Africans today, both in the public and private spheres. Italian is spoken by some in former Italian colonies in Africa. German is spoken in Namibia, as it was a former German protectorate.

Some aspects of traditional African cultures have become less practiced in recent years as a result of neglect and suppression by colonial and post-colonial regimes. For example, African customs were discouraged, and African languages were prohibited in mission schools. Leopold II of Belgium attempted to "civilize" Africans by discouraging polygamy and witchcraft. Obidoh Freeborn posits that colonialism is one element that has created the character of modern African art. According to authors Douglas Fraser and Herbert M. Cole, "The precipitous alterations in the power structure wrought by colonialism were quickly followed by drastic iconographic changes in the art." Fraser and Cole assert that, in Igboland, some art objects "lack the vigor and careful craftsmanship of the earlier art objects that served traditional functions. Author Chika Okeke-Agulu states that "the racist infrastructure of British imperial enterprise forced upon the political and cultural guardians of empire a denial and suppression of an emergent sovereign Africa and modernist art." In Soweto, the West Rand Administrative Board established a Cultural Section to collect, read, and review scripts before performances could occur. Editors F. AbiolaIrele and Simon Gikandi comment that the current identity of African literature had its genesis in the "traumatic encounter between Africa and Europe." On the

other hand, MhozeChikowero believes that Africans deployed music, dance, spirituality, and other performative cultures to (re)asset themselves as active agents and indigenous intellectuals, to unmake their colonial marginalization and reshape their own destinies." There is now a resurgence in the attempts to rediscover and revalue African traditional cultures, under such movements as the African Renaissance, led by Thabo Mbeki, Afrocentrism, led by a group of scholars, including Molefi Asante, as well as the increasing recognition of traditional spiritualism through decriminalization of voodoo and other forms of spirituality.

## 3.5 Politics and Economy

### 3.5.1 Politics

The African Union (AU) is a 55-member federation consisting of all of Africa's states. The union was formed, with Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, as its headquarters, on 26 June 2001. The union was officially established on 9 July 2002 as a successor to the Organization of African Unity (OAU). In July 2004, the African Union's Pan-African Parliament (PAP) was relocated to Midrand, in South Africa, but the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights remained in Addis Ababa. There is a policy in effect to decentralize the African Federation's institutions so that they are shared by all the States (countries).

The African Union, not to be confused with the AU Commission, is formed by the Constitutive Act of the African Union, which aims to transform the African Economic Community, a federated commonwealth, into a state under established international conventions. The African Union has a parliamentary government, known as the African Union Government, consisting of legislative, judicial and executive organs. It is led by the African Union President and Head of State, who is also the President of the Pan-African Parliament. A person becomes AU President by being elected to the PAP, and subsequently gaining majority support in the PAP. The powers and authority of the President of the African Parliament derive from the Constitutive Act and the Protocol of the Pan-African Parliament, as well as the inheritance of presidential authority stipulated by African treaties and by international treaties, including those subordinating the Secretary General of the OAU Secretariat (AU Commission) to the PAP. The government of the AU consists of all-union (federal), regional, state, and municipal authorities, as well as hundreds of institutions, that together manage the day-to-day affairs of the institution.

Political associations such as the African Union offer hope for greater co-operation and peace between the continent's many countries. Extensive human rights abuses still occur in several parts of Africa, often under the oversight of the State. Most of such violations occur for political reasons, often as a side effect of civil war. Countries where major

human rights violations have been reported in recent times include the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Sudan, Zimbabwe, and Côte d'Ivoire.

### 3.5.2 Economy

Although it has abundant natural resources, Africa remains the world's poorest and most underdeveloped continent, the result of a variety of causes that may include colonial handover, corrupt governments that have often committed serious human rights violations, failed central planning, high levels of illiteracy, lack of access to foreign capital, and frequent tribal and military conflict (ranging from guerrilla warfare to genocide). According to the United Nations' Human Development Report in 2003, the bottom 24 ranked nations (151st to 175th) were all African countries.

Poverty, illiteracy, malnutrition and inadequate water supply and sanitation, as well as poor health, affect a large proportion of the people who reside in the African continent. In August 2008, the World Bank announced revised global poverty estimates based on a new international poverty line of $1.25 per day (versus the previous measure of $1.00). 80.5% of the Sub-Saharan Africa population was living on less than $2.50 (PPP) per day in 2005, compared with 85.7% for India. Sub-Saharan Africa is the least successful region of the world in reducing poverty ($1.25 per day); some 50% of the population living in poverty in 1981 (200 million people), a figure that rose to 58% in 1996 before dropping to 50% in 2005 (380 million people). The average poor person in sub-Saharan Africa is estimated to live on only 70 cents per day, and was poorer in 2003 than in 1973, indicating increasing poverty in some areas. Some of it is attributed to unsuccessful economic liberalization programmes spearheaded by foreign companies and governments, but other studies have cited bad domestic government policies more than external factors.

From 1995 to 2005, Africa's rate of economic growth increased, averaging 5% in 2005. Some countries experienced still higher growth rates, notably Angola, Sudan and Equatorial Guinea, all of which had recently begun extracting their petroleum reserves or had expanded their oil extraction capacity. The continent is believed to hold 90% of the world's cobalt, 90% of its platinum, 50% of its gold, 98% of its chromium, 70% of its tantalite, 64% of its manganese and one-third of its uranium. The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) has 70% of the world's coltan, a mineral used in the production of tantalum capacitors for electronic devices such as cell phones. The DRC also has more than 30% of the world's diamond reserves. Guinea is the world's largest exporter of bauxite. As the growth in Africa has been driven mainly by services and not manufacturing or agriculture, it has been growth without jobs and without reduction in

poverty levels. In fact, the food security crisis of 2008 which took place on the heels of the global financial crisis pushed 100 million people into food insecurity.

In recent years, the People's Republic of China has built increasingly stronger ties with African nations and is Africa's largest trading partner. In 2007, Chinese companies invested a total of US$1 billion in Africa. A Harvard University study led by Professor CalestousJuma showed that Africa could feed itself by making the transition from importer to self-sufficiency. "African agriculture is at the crossroads; we have come to the end of a century of policies that favored Africa's export of raw materials and importation of food. Africa is starting to focus on agricultural innovation as its new engine for regional trade and prosperity." During US President Barack Obama's visit to Africa in July 2013, he announced a US$7 billion plan to further develop infrastructure and work more intensively with African heads of state. He also announced a new programme named Trade Africa, designed to boost trade within the continent as well as between Africa and the US.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

No single discussion on Africa can cover all the aspects of the content but it is important for the student to know that Africa is a bright continent with adequate material resources for potential auto-centric development but after decades of independence, Africa remains the least developed continent in the world. It is even referred to as the Dark Continent and African peoples no matter their standard of education and achievements are looked down upon and ridiculed everywhere. Many people think of Africa as the continent of Africa together with Madagascar but that is a total misconception. As a consequence of the forces of history and migration there is Africa in Europe, Africa in the Americas, and Africa in Asia, etc. The same demeaning forces of slavery and colonialism extended the boundaries of Africa into Europe and into the hearts of the Americas. All Africans irrespective of their location on this planet are of a common ancestry and as such belong to the same family.

Though religion, languages and cultures among Africans is different, Africans share the same ancestry and as such, are from the same family. However, colonial policies, such as the divide and rule system in Nigeria, has helped to stifle development on the continent and fuels insecurity among Africans especially as today, many, if not all, African countries are still under some form of foreign control, otherwise known as neocolonialism. This is because independence granted on the terms of the colonizer did not mean decolonization for the colonial structures remained intact. Because African leaders are themselves mentally enslaved, they are blind to taking the appropriate actions to unite Africans for auto-centric development. Instead of thinking of themselves as

Africans who should collectively benefit from the human and material resources of Africa, they continue to think of themselves as Ghanaians, Sierra Leoneans, Tanzanians, Liberians, Ethiopians, Nigerians, Kenyans, etc. Meanwhile the resources of Africa continue to be plundered to the benefit of Europeans and Euro-Americans.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we discussed Africa in historical and modern perspectives. In doing this, we narrated the history of Africa and the different aspects of the continent, its superstructures (cultures, religion, demography, languages, etc.) and its substructure (the economy, development). Importantly, it is imperative for the student to understand that Africans, wherever they are, belong to the same family because they have one ancestry. Also, it is instructive for students to understand that the issue of security on the continent is tied to the way and manner Africans grow and development. This goes to say that some cultures in Africa are anti-development and until these cultures are modernized, the fallouts of their practices would continue to spring insecurity issues on the continent.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

i. Discuss the precolonial experience of any country in Africa.
ii. What are the roles of language and culture in Africa's politics?
iii. Discuss the impacts the spread of Christianity and Islam has had on the precolonial experience of Africa countries.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Asante, M. (2007). The History of Africa. US: Routledge

Ayoub, M. M. (2004). Islam: Faith and History. Oxford: Oneworld.

Clark, J. D. (1970). The Prehistory of Africa. London: Thames and Hudson

Davidson, B. (1966). The African Past: Chronicles from Antiquity to Modern Times. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Gordon, A. A. and Donald L. G. (1996). Understanding Contemporary Africa. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers

Khapoya, V. B. (1998). The African experience: an introduction. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall

Meredith, Martin (2006). "The Fate of Africa – A Survey of Fifty Years of Independence". Washington post. January 20th.

Sayre, A.P. (1999), Africa, Twenty-First Century Books.

## UNIT 2: The Nature and Character of African Countries



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Critical to understanding security in Africa is an understanding of the nature and character of African countries. This is important because it is only when one understands the nature and character of a society that one can justifiable determine the causes of insecurity in that society. Most African nations were colonized territories of imperialist countries and as such, they were incorporated into the capitalist system when their economies were not ripe for it. Also, because of colonialism – which translated to economic maximization of the continents surplus by the colonialists – the internal economic sectors of many African countries do not enjoy complementarity within themselves. They were disarticulated. However, African countries' economies enjoyed complementarity and articulation with the economies of the colonizers. Thus, while African countries were forced to produce only primary products like cocoa and cotton, the countries of the West (colonialists) were mainly engaged in the manufacturing sector and producing chocolates (cocoa) and clothes (cotton). It is also important to note that the quantity and prices of both primary and manufactured products was determined by the colonizers. This, and many other reasons, is why many African countries are struggling. This is one of the reasons why many African states are regarded as failed/failing states. This is also part of the causes of conflict in Africa.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, students are expected to:

i. Have a good understanding of the nature and character of African countries;
ii. Identify the indices of failed/failing States;
iii. Identify the causes of conflicts in Africa.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 The Nature and Character of African States

According to Ayittey (1992:117), the state in Africa is a vampire state. By this he means that those in power in Africa capture state power and use such powers to acquire for themselves and their families and cronies the wealth of the state and deprive the masses the opportunity of enjoying the largesse their resources affords them. He argues that, majority of African countries are vampire states because state apparatus are used in keeping the ruling party and their candidates in power and state-controlled security agencies are used for intimidation and arrest of 'dissents', state-owned radio stations are used for spreading propaganda and the intimidation of opposition groups while financial regulatory bodies are used to coerce compliance from the opposition. According to Ayittey (1992), since the vampire state strengthens the power and wealth of those in charge, elections are hardly conducted credibly and fairly (that is, if they are allowed to take place at all). The case of Nigeria's Olusegun Obasanjo who hatched a third term plan is a ready instance. In Africa, leaders hate the electoral process and as such would want to perpetuate themselves or their family members in positions of leadership. Examples abound of African leaders who operated the sit-tight syndrome and would not relinquish power, even if it costs them their lives. Idi Amin of Uganda, Matthew Kereku of Benin, Paul Biya of Cameroon, Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe and former leaders such as Mobutu SeseSeko of Zaire ( Congo DR), Hosini Mubarak of Egypt, Muhmar Gaddafi, etc.

Ayittey's description of African states as vampire entities which naturally turned majority of African states into semi-military states was succinctly captured by the World Bank Report thus:

> By 1990, half of Africa's states had military or quasi-military governments. In parallel with authoritarian military governments came a trend towards a single-party rule under autocratic civilian leaders, largely passing interventionist economic policies …when combined with external shocks, the resulting economic

decline and politicization of the bureaucracy much of what remained of intuitional governance capacity (World Bank Report, 2000:653).

It is therefore apt to join Guest (2004:71) to argue that to stay peaceful, countries need governments that serve their citizens instead of robbing them. The absence of a practical electoral reformist system, a just judicial and legal system and a sound people oriented constitution in majority of African societies therefore creates a character of an autocratic statist structure which exacerbate the security and development crisis in the continent.

As earlier noted, the ruling political elites in Africa have failed to provide for the people and often resort to violent and harsh rule to forcefully gain legitimacy. Besides, their desire to perpetuate themselves into office usually propel them to use force to capture and retain political power by any means necessary and as such, politics has assumed a do-or-die position and a zero sum game, where the victor takes all and the loser is crushed. In most cases, their ability to capture and retain power is depended on the use of political thugs who are sometimes officially armed, recognized and collaborate with the state security agencies. These arms are not usually retrieved from these political thugs after elections and the consequence is that when the elected officials fail to patronize these thugs after assuming office, they become ready tools to be mobilized for conflict and other criminal activities within and outside the state.

The issues of state failed or collapsed states in Africa have also compounded the problem of security and development on the continent. Helman and Ratner (1993:12) were the first to analyze the term "failed state". They described the failed state as that which is utterly incapable of sustaining itself as a member of the international community. To them, a state is also referred to as failed when it impoverishes its citizens and threatens their neighbors through refugee flows, political instability and random warfare.

### 3.2 Indicators of a Failing/Failed State

Continuing from where Helman and Ratner stopped, Rolberge (2003:5) argues that there are three main indicators of a failed or failing state. These indicators are:

i. The persistence of political violence especially violence between the government and rebel groups within the state;
ii. High growth of criminal syndicates, armed groups and drugs traffickers that stimulate violence. He argues that, the inability of the state to provide basic security for the people gives birth to non-state actors/gangs. It is these gangs that government, groups and other individuals seek protection from.

iii. The inability of the state to control its border and protect its territorial integrity.

What we can conclude, from a look at Rolberge's indicators as outlined above that African countries such as Mobutu's Zaire, Chad, Somalia under President Siyad Barre, Burundi and former Sudan have all passed through failed status not only as a result of wars of disengagements but also as a result of the withdrawal of external aid, internal waste, corruption and clientalist leadership. Within these failed states, authority is anchored on the power of wealth, networks of business contacts and military capabilities represented in some cases in the formation of private military organizations or the creation and sponsorship of militia groups. There is also no unifying decision making authority when the state failed and the regime also collapse as in Somalia. In this kind of situation, there are many *de facto* states, built on alliances of lineage groups and occupied by militias.

Zartman (1995:5), on the other hand argues that, the state in Africa particularly sub-Saharan Africa has not only failed but it has collapsed with the consequences of collapsed states dotted everywhere. He described a collapsed state as a state that the decision making center of government has paralyzed and as such has become inoperative. A state where laws are not made, order is not preserved, and societal cohesion is not enhanced. According to Zartman, a collapsed state has lost its power of conferring name on its people and a meaning on their social nation. As a territory, a collapsed state no longer assures security and provision of the basic needs of the people by a central sovereign organization. It also no longer functions with neither traditional nor charismatic nor institutional sources of legitimacy. It has also lost the right to rule.

### 3.3 Reasons for the Failing Nature of African States

In line with Zartman, and in trying to give the reasons for state collapse, Maier (2000:4) argues that, the propensity of state collapse and conflicts in Africa is a product of dominative and exploitative policies of colonialism that introduced the politics of resource plunder and the ideal of a predatory state. He captured the crisis and the conflicts in Nigeria and described Nigeria as the house that has fallen. To him, Nigeria and by extension majority of African countries were designed by alien occupiers and abused by military rule for three quarters of their brief life span. In such a situation, the military and the militia governments in the post-colonial state have foisted an alien style of leadership on the people. Politics and governance in Africa have therefore been militarized, a condition that easily stimulate conflicts.

The failure of the state to protect and provide for the citizenry has also continued to endanger the peace process in Africa. According to Ezeh (1986:16) in a situation where the state has failed to coordinate the governance process, provide for the citizenry, and sustain the democratization process, conflict becomes inevitable. He argues further that;

> In a situation of generalized violence and ravages, with no state structures to protect individuals and groups, it must be expected that some social structures would emerge to provide some degree of protection. This degree of protection may become conflictual. Ezeh (1986:17).

It has become clear that, most of these conflicts arise due to the inability of the political leadership to galvanize development and concretize the democratic process that will eliminate the fear of deprivation and marginalization amongst the citizenry. In this condition, identity politics becomes the order of the day as groups construct and reconstruct their identities to gain access to the wealth of the nation hence the prevalence of identity related conflicts. It can therefore be observed that, the deconstruction of economic and democratic values by vampire African leaders have continued to put Africa on the doted path of insecurity (and underdevelopment).

### 3.4 Causes of Conflicts in Africa

The fissiparous nature of conflicts in Africa ostensibly announces the multiplicity of its causality. This in turn underpins the interest that has been generated in the study of such causality factors. Considerably, many factors have been identified as causes of conflicts in Africa, these causes, though variegated; revolve around similar themes – themes of ethnicity, capitalist expansionism, interface between globalization and localization, resources – identity – environmental rights' struggle and social elite cleavages.

Recent studies are however, beginning to shift grounds from what is considered as human factor and psychological considerations. According to Kuna, (2005:5), the conflicts in Africa can be explained under two grounds, this is, Ideological and territorial perspectives, resource control and globalization drives. He argues that, while ideological and psychological drives largely underpinned conflicts in Africa in the past decades, the situation is not all the same in the present day Africa. He opines that, while variables like, threats (actual or potential) of states emerging from resource struggles, *warlordism*, states collapse, elite rivalry, economic crises and ideology are useful in explaining African conflicts, such explanations are narrow, Kuna (2005:2).

He maintains that:

> Contemporary conflicts are less sharply ideologically devastating, and evermore complex in terms of multiplicity of shifting interest and alliances involving states, militias, vigilantes and criminal groups are apt observations that merit serious scholarly attention.

He goes further that:

> These observations no doubt gives us a glimpse of the nature and dynamics of contemporary conflict in Africa, and underscore some of the transformations these conflicts have undergone in the recent past. But such observations largely remain discrete snapshots of specific events that fail to rigorously link the dynamics and trajectories of contemporary African conflicts to their wider international contexts (Kuna, 2005:3).

Implied in Kuna's reasoning is the limited validity of such explanatory constructions, which are considered to have been historicized to the extent that the current crisis is abstracted from historical specificities and dynamics of the state formation.

As an alternative strategy, Kuna postulates that contemporary African conflicts are best viewed from the prism of the requirements of global capital and Africa's increasing marginalization. His thesis is that, "the nature and forms of conflicts in Africa can only be apprehended within the dynamics of contemporary global capital; that to project these conflicts as merely internal problems of governance, state collapse, resource and elite struggles or clash of civilizations would be to reduce these conflicts to a particular notion of security that is, state security (Kuna, 2005:6-7).

This line of thinking has enjoyed support from other scholars who also see the realities of contemporary conflicts in Africa in global perspective. Oyovbaire for instance while emphasizing the global tone of conflicts in Africa argued that the factors and forces of political instability that can frustrate the realization of the objectives of the union (African Union) have assumed global dimensions.

He notes that:

> While the factors and forces are not entirely new and unknown to observers and African leaders, they have acquired global dimensions and responses in the past 10 to 20 years. These are largely the same forces that constrained the OAU in its efforts to achieve its aims and objectives" (Oyovbaire 2002:38).

Understandably, the thinking in this school is that the changing patterns in the international system has occasioned dramatic changes in the patters of life and this

development has in no small measure orchestrated conflictual situation arising from the clash of interest; be it economic political, social and psychological.

For instance, Nnoli (2006) while agreeing that globalization has accentuated conflicts in Africa indicates also that the imperialist contacts between African peoples and the developed capitalist West had placed Africa on the path of conflicts, which is now furthered by the villagization of the world. He maintains that:

> A weak state may not only find it difficult to obtain external resources, it may, as a result of struggle by the major power for its internal resources, have its pattern of life severely disrupted and its resources plundered by the major powers. This has been the historical experience of Africa without due regard to cultural, ethnic and historical boundaries. And various ethnic groups were arbitrarily lumped into various countries. Consequently, various security problems have plagued contemporary African states including secession, irredentism, ethnic violence and inter-state border wars" (Nnoli 2006:56).

The note being intoned here is that colonial contact between Africa and the imperialist powers had negatively affected the stability of the continent. The legacy of autocracy that, colonial regimes had bequeathed to Africa. A process which Nnoli describes in the following words:

> The conflict process in the African countries suffers greatly from (1) state coercive unilateralism and (2) state partisanship. With respect to state coercive unilateralism, the history of the African state has been characterized by the use of force to implement policies." (Nnoli 2006:64).

The common denominator which inheres in these arguments is that African conflicts are by-products of the process of the uneven expansion of capital and the responses to the contradictory interface between globalization and localization. Such notions ostensibly consider political factors, economic and poverty conditions in Africa as being perpetrated by the faulty foundations on which lay the present structures.

Another salient cause of conflicts in Africa according to Kuna is that of production and sale of arms. Arms are produced by some states for purposes of generating national income. Sales of these arms to those states that need them helps to boost the readiness of the procuring states to engage in conflicts with others. Kemp (2001:69). It has been documented that, from 1990 to 2002, the US alone supplied arms to Africa worth $608,912,899 (Kuna 2005:15). This projection is aside from other countries like Russia, France, Germany, UK, Italy, Canada and Japan. Kuna has given graphic details of some

of the scenario of arms supply to Africa which tended to encourage African conflicts. He notes:

> Links between arms sales and transfers on the one hand and conflicts on the other are nowhere most clearly demonstrated as in the conflict in the Great Lakes Region. This hydra sided war has a large array of combatants involving states, militias, criminal groups and multinational mining concerns from at least eight countries. On the side of the Congolese state, are the armed forces of Zimbabwe, Namibia, Chad, and to some certain extent some reported level of Sudan and Libyan support. On the opposing side is an alliance of Rwanda, Uganda, Burundi and Congolese opponents of Kabira" (Kuna 2005:16).

Kuna has gone ahead to indicate that it is however not just in the Great Lakes Region that arms are fueling conflicts. Some of the largest arms sales and transfer according him have been to countries that were either in conflict, or which became embroiled in conflicts shortly after. The susceptibility of Africa's peace and security arising from the sales and transfer of arms by the producer countries, to her territories has been very aptly captured in the following words; these arms fueled internal repression and military conflicts that led to the deaths of many hundreds of thousands of people, most of whom were civilians. (Volmani, D. cited in Kuna 2005:17).

To make clearer the arms transactions between Africa and the western world data is presented in the statistical table below.

***Table 2: Post-Cold War US Arms Transfer to Governments involved in the Congo War, 1989 – 1998 (in 1998 constant Dollars) Hoartung and Moix).***

| Country | Foreign Military Sales | Commercial sales | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Angola** | 0 | 31,000 | **31,000** |
| **Burundi** | 74,000 | 312,000 | **386,000** |
| **Chad** | 21,767,000 | 24,677,000 | **46,444,000** |
| **DRC** | 15,151,000 | 218,000 | **15,369,000** |
| **Namibia** | 2,311,000 | 1,934,000 | **4,245,000** |
| **Rwanda** | 324,000 | 0 | **324,000** |
| **Sudan** | 30,258,000 | 1,815,000 | **32,073,000** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Uganda** | 1,517,000 | 9,903,000 | **11,420,000** |
| **Zimbabwe** | 567,000 | 828,000 | **1,395,000** |
| **Total** | **71,969,000** | **39,718,000** | **111,687,000** |

**Source:** Mohammed J. Kuna 2005: p.17.

The table above reveals the economic implication of arms sales and transfer to Africa as much as it does the fueling of conflicts in the region. Such expositions no doubt review the negativism of US ties with third world countries and Africa in particular. Two things are clearly indicated here namely; (1) that through sales of arms to Africa, the economic resources of African states which become clients are heavily drained through such channels. (2) That this trade in arms increases the propensity of African countries to engage others in conflicts and or within nationalities in the country when their military strengths receive boost from the external supplies. One fact remains that, apart from merely supplying arms in trade terms, the US goes ahead to ignite conflicts in areas where her interest is threatened.

It has also been identified that conflicts result from perceived fear of domination by certain states. The argument here is that most of the conflicts recorded in Africa are by and large, products of what levy refers to as "perceptions of statesmen". According to Levy (2001:8)

> The idea that sates have neither permanent friends nor permanent enemies, just permanent interest" applies to contemporary conflicts as well as to the great power politics of earlier centuries. So does the idea that states facing rapidly rising adversaries may be tempted to initiate a preventive war in order to defeat the adversaries while the opportunity is still available.

This view has been echoed in the writings of Howard (2001:31) when he says; "The causes of war remain rooted, as much as they were in the pre-industrial age, in perceptions by statesmen of the growth of hostile power and the fears for the restriction, if not the extinction of their own."

Quite clearly, the international arena is naturally anarchical. There is no authority that regulates conduct of states in the international system. This therefore means that, state actions are guided by the interest of state actors. Invariably, therefore, uncertainties loom the international spread. Suspicion and anxiety regarding adversaries (manifest or latent) become very poignant – thus generating tension and conflicts. For instance, it is argued that wars do not only occur because some states prefer war to peace (such as Hitler's

Germany 1939) but also because of the unintended consequences of actions by those who prefer war and who are more interested in preserving their security than in extending their influences.

The argument follows too that "even defensively motivated efforts by states to provide for their own security through armaments, alliances, and deterrent threats are often perceived as threatening by others, which leads to counteractions and conflict spirals that become difficult to resolve. This is the "security dilemma" – actions to increase ones security may decrease the security of others and lead them to respond in ways that decrease one's own security." (Jervis cited in Levy 2001:7).

The hub of the argument above is that, conflicts in the contemporary world result because; there is the absence of an authority that regulates state relations or interstate politics. The precautionary measures taken by states to wade off perceived aggression from their latent or presumed adversaries become threats to others – a process which often times sparks off conflagrations in the international system. This standpoint is of the realist persuasion and it considers this as an attempt to balance power in the international system. The 1st and 2nd World Wars and the European war against Napoleonic France a century before were each "balance-of-power" wars that resulted from the formation of military coalition to block a threatening state from achieving a position of dominance.

This proposition therefore has practical relevance for regional and ethno-national conflicts in the contemporary world. (Levy 2001:8). It can therefore be said that there are streaks of suspicion and the need to guide against then which in themselves become threatening thereby giving rise to counter efforts to balance the situation, resulting in conflicts in the international system.

In his typology of causes of conflicts Brown (2000:214) enumerates the causes of conflicts to include the following; structural factors, political factors, economic/social factors and cultural/perpetual factors.

According to him, structural factors include; weak states, intrastate security concerns and ethnic geography. Political factors involve; discriminatory, political institutions, exclusionary national ideologies, intergroup politics and elite politics. He names economic/social factors to include; economic problems, discriminatory economic systems, economic development and modernization. Patterns of cultural discrimination and problematic group history are found under cultural/perceptual factors.

Implicit in Brown's thesis is that, econo-political and socio-cultural forces in any given state account largely for the level of insecurity that such state suffer. This proposition however lacks the eclecticism that is required of such analysis. For one thing, it does not

harness the external variables identified by other scholars such as Howard, Levy and Ejie who rather suggest that external factors by far underpin conflicts in Africa.

According to Bassey (2007:15) most of the conflicts in Africa can be attributed to the underdevelopment crises in the continent. To him, underdevelopment breeds conflicts and conflict in turn sustains the quagmire of economic crisis in Africa. This economic crisis leads to high incidences of poverty and hunger that creates a condition for conflicts.

Africa and Africans were subjected to a beggar condition and a beggar continent by the colonial exploiters, their (colonial masters) departure witnessed the emergence of an unproductive political elite which according to Tsuwa (2009:5) concentrated on the distribution of wealth rather than the innovation and development of the production process. This condition has resulted the evacuation of African resources to Nations of the West living majority of Nigerians especially those outside the corridors of power to wallow in abject poverty. It is commonly said that "a hungry man is an angry man", so Africans in order to fight and extricate themselves from the poverty cycle have always resorted to violent conflict.

In fact, the variegated nature of conflicts and wars had led to a consensus on the causes of war especially its root cause impossibly broad. This is because apart from the plethora of causes that have been identified, there are instances where states go to war just to satisfy their hunger for aggression. A classic example of this situation was offered by Howard (2001) when he avers that:

> There have certainly been necessitous when states have gone to war in a mood of ideological fervor like the French in 1792; or of Swaggering aggression like the Americans against Spain in 1898 or the British against the Boers a year later; or to make more money as did the British in the war of Jenkin's Bar in 1739; or in a generous desire to help peoples of similar creed or race as perhaps the Russians did in 1877 and the British dominions certainly did in 1914 and 1939.

Considering the catalogue of causes discussed above, the world have seen that wars and conflicts are often times triggered off as a means of achieving very definite and rationally determinate purposes as most authors are wont to say. But then, Howard's further contribution has broadened our horizon to see that the causes of conflict do not all lend, themselves to ideological, economic, political and ethnological explanations. This is why Faleti (2006:12) concluded that in the same way that it is difficult to point to a single factor as being responsible for order within society, it is as difficult to point to a single explanation for the emergence, escalation, or protraction of conflict whether violent or otherwise. In the case where a conflict has degenerated into the point of crisis, it is

common that those involved will even find it difficult to remember what led to the initial disagreement.

Another dimension of conflicts in Africa is pointed out by Egwu (2006:65). Egwu (2006) considers states' failure as a serious cause of conflicts in Africa. While accepting that social, economic, psychological and such other factors account for the conflicts in Africa, Egwu (2006) avers that "it is more productive to problematize the question of organization of state power and prevailing governance regimes in the explanation of conflicts in Africa." It follows logically that the challenge of state reform and the construction of a democratic and inclusive framework of governance must be at the forefront of political agenda in coming to terms with violent and destructive ethno-religious and political conflicts in Africa.

In a sense, Egwu (2006) analytical background has leaning on the theory of failed state, which explains the escalating level of conflicts in Africa as a by-product of the failure generally of African states themselves. It has to be restated that while other factors such as globalization and resource struggle are significant variable in explaining the dynamics of conflicts in Africa, the tendency to discount the primacy of the state in explaining the domestic politics, and therefore, of the political processes and conflicts needs to be resisted.

This is necessary because the continued salience of identity politics and conflicts resulting from the political and social mobilization of these identities even in the context of the massive rolling back of the state in several African countries since the era of Structural Adjustment Programme. (SAP) in the 1980s call attention to the need to re-examine the linkage between the state in Africa and the protracted ethno-religious and political conflicts that have continued to ravage the continent (Egwu, 2006).

As earlier mentioned, incidence of state collapse has in recent times became a fundamental cause of majority of the intra- state conflicts in Africa. According to Ezeh (1986:16) in a situation where the state has failed to coordinate the governance process, provide for the citizenry and sustain the democratization process, conflict becomes inevitable. According to him:

> In a situation of generalized violence and ravages, with no state structures to protect individuals and groups, it must be expected that some social structures would emerge to provide some degree of protection. This degree of protection may become conflictual.

It has become clear that, most of these conflicts arise due to the inability of the political leadership to galvanize development and concretize the democratic process that will

eliminate the fear of oppression and marginalization that exist between the different ethno-religion nationalities.

In sum, a survey of literature on the causes of conflicts in Africa reveals quite an avalanche of them. There are both internal causes as well as externally motivated causes. Internally, ethno-political factors and religious. Undertones are found. It has also been shown that psycho-social factors operate to give vent to conflicts in Africa.

On the external plain, colonial contact and imperialist expansion, enjoys a fair share of the blame. In contemporary Africa, where colonial vestiges seem to be disappearing, new form of subjugation or influences are found- globalization which seeks to *villagize* the whole world does not make for peace and stability in Africa. Rather it has been blamed for advancing, the interest of the advanced capitalist states of the west. Of more concern to the fact that, the advancement in atmosphere of conflicts such that it is accused of fueling conflicts and ensuring that such conflicts become an endemic feature of African states.

The production, sales and transfer of armaments to conflict prone zones in Africa has also been noted. On the whole, conflicts in Africa are not uniform just as they are not propelled by same factors. As such, they assume different dimensions, nature and character. The variety of causes will be blamed in part on the different characters and dimension they assume hence the need to turn our attention to the nature and dimensions of African conflicts.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

The conclusion here is that African states have failed as a result of a myriad of causality factors ranging from contestations over resources, identity crisis, nepotism, colonial contact and imperialist expansion among others. These conflicts also arise due to the inability of the political leadership to galvanize development and concretize the democratic process that will eliminate the fear of deprivation and marginalization amongst the citizenry. Most African states have become failed states due to the crisis of underdevelopment which has been exacerbated by failed leadership.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

This chapter discusses the African condition, the nature and causes of conflicts in Africa and the factors that have made African states to be the way they are especially in terms of

their inability to meet the needs of their people and their societies through a robust development strategy and security architecture.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSESSMENT

i. In what ways did the colonialists contributed to the underdevelopment and insecurity of the continent?
ii. What are the indicators of a failed/failing State?

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Asfaw K, James H. W, and John F. J. (2011). Conflict and Human Security in Africa: Kenya in Perspective. Palgrave Macmillan US.

Bassey, C. O. (2010). Governance and Border Security in Africa. African Books Collective.

Claire M. (2016). Security in Africa: A Critical Approach to Western Indicators of Threat. Rowman& Littlefield.

Fantu C, and Renu M. (eds.) (2013). Agricultural Development and Food Security in Africa: The Impact of Chinese, Indian and Brazilian Investments. Zed Books.

Mohamed B, K. M. (2017). Environmental Change and Human Security in Africa and the Middle East. Springer International Publishing.

Abrahamsen, R. (ed.) (2013). Conflict and Security in Africa. Boydell& Brewer Ltd.

## UNIT 3: UNDERSTANDING THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY

## CONTENTS



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Security and issues surrounding security are as old as man himself. Traditionally, security is seen as the protection of the State from external aggressors. This notion of security was dominant during the Cold War and still remains dominant till date – the post-Cold War era - it still remains dominant in countries like the United States of America, even though it has lost its relevance in many countries (Sheehan, 2010). In the traditional approach to security, security is a military phenomenon that centers on military capabilities and as such, the military gets the biggest budgetary allocations by governments. Under this approach, States were seen as entities that provided 'collective goods' to their citizens, of which the most important was freedom from external attacks (Kapstein, 1992:14). Thus, the traditional definition of security sees security in overwhelmingly military terms,

specifically as the military protection of states and citizens against the threats posed by the armed forces of other states.

However, after the Cold-War and as security studies since the 1990s have demonstrated, military security (that is, the protection of the State against external attack) alone cannot keep a State safe (and peaceful). So, security began to take other forms - most notably human security. Human security sees security as that which caters for the needs of the human being. This approach believes that for there to be security, the socio-economic needs of citizens must be met. This notion sees internal security as the most important form of security unlike the traditional approach that focuses on strengthening the state against external aggression.

Security centers on several issues which can be categorized into different forms, namely; internal security, international security, economic security, national security, environmental security, amongst others.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of the lecture, you are expected to be able to:

i. Demonstrate an understanding of what security is;
ii. Understand that the absence of security is insecurity;
iii. Articulate the influence of political, social and economic conditions on security;
iv. Demonstrate an understanding of the different categories of security.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 The Concept of Security

Numerous contentious definitions abound on the meaning of security but a major agreement from the different meanings of what security means is that it has to do with threats to survival. Nnoli (2006) sees security from two perspectives: objective and subjective perspectives. According to him, security in an objective sense, means the absence of threat, anxiety or danger while from the subjective perspective, which is more important, security is the absence of the fear that threat, anxiety or danger will materialize. This means that subjective security is backed with the confidence of physical safety as well as the safety of other cherished values. Wolfers (1962) notes that "security in any objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values, in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked". Nnoli (2006) also explains that subjective security is much more important than objective security because even

when there is security in the objective term but there is no confidence that such security exist, then there is no security. However, even when there is no security in objective term but there is confidence that there is security, then there is likely to be security.

Clarifying the concept of security is never an easy one as it means different things to different people and its subjective nature has made the concept ambiguous and elastic. Because of this, one person's security can be another's insecurity. Also, what constitutes security for one State, may be insecurity for another. Bellamy (1981) emphasize that: "Security itself is a relative freedom from war, occupied with a relatively high expectation that defeat will not be consequence of any war that should occur". Bellamy stressed the subjective character of security by using the term "high expectation" indicating that security aims at a position in which the physical and other values held in esteem can be continuously attained by the security seeker.

Notwithstanding this ambiguity and differences, there are key ingredients that settles in with what security is. From the plethora of definitions, one common attribute is that security is the absence of threat to life and property. Security can be seen as the degree of resistance to, or protection from harm and this protection from harm applies to individuals, communities, countries, continents and the world.

Traditionally, the state is the referent object – that is, the state is the object to be protected and be secured – and states do this through military might. However, after the Cold War in the early 1990s, other referent objects, apart from the state-centric focus of the traditional security, have become equally important to be secured as the state. This is why security in the post-Cold War era now covers different aspects such as the economy, people, energy, environment, et cetera.

In his contribution to clarifying the meaning of security, Danfulani (2010) reminded us to not only see security as the state of peace and the absence of war as defined in terms of militarism. To him, other conditions – apart from a state of peace and the absence of war – can also imply security. These other conditions are:

i. Terrorism, which is currently confronting the most powerful states to the end of their wits;
ii. Pandemics like HIV/AIDS which are decimating large populations without apparent cure within the foreseeable future, even with the deployment of the most modern scientific and medical research;
iii. Mass dislocations of human communities through local conflicts, extreme poverty, hunger and natural disasters in very wretched conditions which defy the resources of any individual state;

iv. Environmental and natural cataclysms which border on end of time scenarios; and
v. Unprecedented advances in science and technology some of which are being deployed towards nightmarish ends (Danfulani, 2010:248).

All these conditions as explained by Danfulani (2010) falls within the purview of determining security. Security cannot be said to exist even in the absence of war when all or any of these conditions are prevalent in any society. What this means is that security is much more than a state of peace and the absence of war, it involves other aspects of societal life. Therefore, a societal can be said to enjoy security when there is a state of peace, the absence of war and the absence all or most of these conditions.

From the different definitions above, it is clear that security includes now only the freedom from fear but also the freedom from want. On the other hand, and in its most basic sense, insecurity is the risk of something bad happening to a thing that is valued.

As mentioned earlier, traditionally, security means the protection of the state from external aggression thus security is military-focused. But with the realities of the times, the notion of security has changed because nations now face more internal threats to their security that external threats. Threats such as environmental degradation, famine, HIV/AIDS, political instability, corruption, injustice, etc. are becoming more and more damaging than the fear of the attack on the territory of a nation by another. Renner (2006) outlines the reasons why there is this shift in the notion of what security entails. He explains why contemporary security is far and above regime security, that is security organized primarily for the protection of the state. The reasons for this rethinking of security as given by Renner (2006:2) are:

1. Weapons do not necessarily provide security. This is true for adversarial states armed with weapons of such destructive power that no defense is possible. It is true in civil wars, where the easy availability of weapons empowers the ruthless but offers little defense for civilians. And it was true on September 11th, 2001 when a determined group of terrorists struck with impunity against the world's most militarily powerful country-United States of America which led to the decimation of the World Trade Centre and Pentagon. Proliferation of weapons and military technologies are being recognized as growing concern for global security.
2. Real security in a globalizing world cannot be provided on a purely national basis (or even on the basis of limited alliances). A multilateral and even global

approach is needed to deal effectively with a multitude of trans-boundary challenges.

3. The traditional focus on state (or regime) security is inadequate and needs to encompass safety and well-being of the state's population. If individuals and communities are insecure, state security itself can be extremely fragile. Security without justice will not produce a stable peace. Democratic governance and a vibrant civil society may ultimately be more imperative for security than an army.
4. Non-military dimensions have an important influence on security and stability. Nations around the world, but particularly the weakest countries and communities, confront a multitude of pressures. They face a debilitating combination of rising competition for resources, severe environmental breakdown, the resurgence of infectious diseases, poverty and growing wealth disparities, demographic pressures, and joblessness and livelihood insecurity.

All these reasons given by Renner (2006) succinctly demonstrates many of today's challenges and sustains the arguments that threats to society cannot be resolved by traditional idea of security centered on military power. Unlike traditional military threats, emanating from a determined adversary, many of today's security challenges are risks and vulnerabilities within borders. While the poorest countries are most directly affected, none of these issues respect human-drawn borders, and we might think of them as "problems without passports." The pressures facing societies and people everywhere do not automatically or necessarily trigger violence. But they can translate into political dynamics that lead to rising polarization and radicalization. Worst-case outcomes are more likely where grievances are left to fester, where people are struggling with mass unemployment or chronic poverty, where state institutions are weak or corrupt, where arms are easily available, and where political humiliation or despair over the lack of hope for a better future may drive people into the arms of extremist movements. Insecurity can manifest itself in ways other than violent conflict. The litmus test is whether the well-being and integrity of society are so compromised that they lead to possibly prolonged periods of instability and mass suffering (Renner, 2006).

Thus, in defining security, it is important not to only understand it strictly in terms of military security as new dimensions, especially after the end of the Cold War – social, economic, health and environmental – have been added to what security means. The unfolding discourse challenged orthodox assumptions about national security, deepening it "upwards" (from national to global security) and "downwards" (from territorial security focused on states and governments to people security - individuals and communities), and widening it by arguing that non-military dimensions, such as social

wellbeing and environmental integrity, are important prerequisites for ensuring security (Renner, 2006).

### 3.1.1 New Dimensions of Insecurity

Some of the new dimensions causing insecurity which led to the redefining and the rethinking of the broad meaning of security include but not limited to the following:

i. **Struggles over oil and other resources**: Resource wealth has fueled a series of civil wars, with governments, rebels, and warlords in Latin America, Africa, and Asia clamoring over resources such as oil, metals and minerals, gemstones, and timber. Oil is the most strategic and lucrative commodity in the world economy. Struggles over access and control have long fueled geopolitical maneuvering, civil wars, and human rights violations. In Nigeria, the militants in the Niger Delta are fighting the federal government over what they see as marginalization. Major Powers have repeatedly intervened in resource-rich countries, militarily and by other means, in order to control lucrative resources such as the US invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan, both oil producers. The result has often been enduring political instability.

ii. **Water scarcity**: Disputes also arise over access to renewable natural resources such as water, arable land, forests, and fisheries. This is particularly the case among groups - such as farmers, nomadic pastoralists, ranchers, and resource extractors - that depend directly on the health and productivity of the resource base but often have incompatible or directly conflicting needs. Example of insecurity caused by water scarcity is the frequent conflict between herders and farmers in north central Nigeria states of Benue, Plateau and Nassarawa. This is not surprising as water is the most precious resource. Both the quantity and quality are crucial for such fundamental human needs as food and health. Worldwide, more than 430 million people currently face water scarcity, and the numbers are set to rise sharply. Given population growth, nearly 3 billion (3,000 million) people, 40 percent of the projected world population, will likely live in water-stressed countries by 2015 (Renner, 2016). Growing scarcity may invite increased conflict as intra-state (local and regional) disputes and clashes over water are already far more common and may well further proliferate.

iii. **Food insecurity**: A reliable supply of food is one of the most basic determinants of how secure or insecure people are. Food security is at the intersection of poverty, water availability, land distribution, and environmental degradation. But war and social disruptions also play an important role in some cases. And the proliferation of factory farming and the promotion of monocultures have triggered growing worries about the safety and quality of food supplies. Worldwide, nearly 2 billion people suffer from hunger and chronic nutrient deficiencies. About 1.4 billion people, almost all of them in developing countries, confront environmental fragility. Of these, more than 500 million people live in arid regions, more than 400 million people eke out a meager living on soils of very poor quality, some 200 million small-scale and landless farmers are compelled to cultivate steep slopes, and 130 million people live in areas cleared from rainforests and other fragile forest ecosystems (Renner, 2006). The hungry man is an angry man and as such, many conflicts have emanated from food scarcity.

iv. **Infectious diseases**: Disease burdens can in some cases be sufficiently severe to undermine economies and threaten social stability. Although the poor are most vulnerable, societies across the planet are now confronting a resurgence of infectious diseases. Some 20 known diseases have re-emerged or spread geographically, and many new ones, such as SARS, Ebola and avian flu, have been identified. Pathogens are crossing borders with increasing ease, facilitated by growing international travel and trade, migration, and the social upheaval inherent in war and refugee movements. Logging, road-building, dam construction, and climate change enable diseases like malaria, dengue fever, and schistosomiasis to spread to previously unaffected areas or bring people into closer proximity with new disease vectors. In the poorest developing countries, infectious diseases are weakening and impoverishing families and communities, deepening poverty and widening inequality, drastically reducing life expectancy, and severely taxing overall economic health. The AIDS epidemic has a particularly devastating impact on farm production and food security because it incapacitates and kills primarily young adults during their peak productive years. AIDS is projected to claim a fifth or more of the agricultural labor force in most southern African countries by 2020, heightening the risk of famine (Renner, 2006). AIDS not only decimates farmers, it strikes many others in the prime years of life - including soldiers, teachers, health practitioners, and other professionals. The disease

cripplessocieties at all levels, undermining a state's overall resilience and its ability to govern and provide for basic human needs.

v. **Environmental Decline and Natural Disasters**: A combination of resource depletion, ecosystem destruction, population growth, and economic marginalization of poor people has set the stage for more frequent and more devastating "unnatural" disasters—natural disturbances made worse by human actions. The pace is likely to accelerate as climate change translates into more intense storms, flooding, heat waves, and droughts. In addition to sudden disasters, there is also the "slow-onset" degradation of ecosystems, in some cases sufficiently extreme to undermine the habitability of a given area. This is most calamitous for the poor because they tend to be far more directly exposed, have inadequate protection, and have little in the way of resources and wherewithal to cope with the consequences. Although there are no reliable data for the numbers of such "environmental refugees," it is clear that many millions are affected and that their ranks are likely to skyrocket in the years ahead. Desertification alone, for example, puts an estimated 135 million people worldwide at risk of being driven from their lands (Renner, 2006). The displaced may not be welcome elsewhere, causing tensions over access to land, jobs, and social services.

vi. **Unemployment**: Lack of employment, uncertain economic prospects, and rapid population growth make for a potentially volatile mix. A 2004 report from the International Labor Organization found that three quarters of the world's workers live in circumstances of economic insecurity. Most worrisome in some ways is the vast reservoir of unemployed young people in many developing countries. According to Renner (2006), youth unemployment is skyrocketing to record levels, with the highest rates found in the Middle East and North Africa (26 percent) and in sub-Saharan Africa (21 percent). At least 60 million people aged 15–24 worldwide cannot find work, and twice as many—some 130 million—are among the planet's 550 million working poor who cannot lift their families out of poverty. When large numbers of young men feel frustrated in their search for status and livelihood, they can be a destabilizing force. Their uncertain prospects may cause criminal behavior, feed discontent that could burst open in street riots, or foment political extremism. Particularly if political grievances linger, the malcontented may be easy to recruit into insurgent groups, militias, or organized crime—as experiences in places like Rwanda, Kosovo, and East Timor have shown in recent years. This was the major incidence that led to the Arab Spring when the

young unemployed Bouzizi dosed himself in petrol and burnt himself to death in Tunisia. The impact of his action was felt throughout the MENA region with despotic leaders like Ben Ali, Mubarak, Gaddafi deposed and the fire is still raging in Syria.

These challenges cannot be resolved by resorting to traditional security tools—such as raising military expenditures, dispatching troops, sealing borders or, for that matter, maintaining the status quo in a highly unequal world.

## 3.2 Categories of Security

As mentioned in the introduction, there are many categories of security, but in this unit, we shall discuss five (5) categories of security: human security, internal security, international security, economic security, internal security and national security. These five categories are selected for discussion because all other forms of security that exist likely falls into one of these categories. For example, food security, which is also a category of security, can be classified under the broad category of human security. Emphasis is however placed on the human security category as it is a break from the traditional approach that focuses overwhelming attention on militarization.

### 3.2.1 Human Security

Human security is a new security paradigm that challenges the traditional militaristic notion of security. This aspect of security argues that the most important referent for security should be the human being rather than the State. This category of security is people-centered and believes that 'freedom from want' is the best way to tackle issues of insecurity in the State. Human security means ensuring that individuals in States are catered for, especially in meeting the three basic necessities of life of food, clothes and shelter and in so doing, individuals and groups will not be pushed to engage in criminal and nefarious activities that altogether make the State insecure.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) 1994 definition of human security argues that the scope of global security should be expanded to include threats in seven (7) areas; economic security – tackling issues of unemployment and poverty; food security – ensuring people have access to basic food at all times; health security – guaranteeing protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles; environmental security – protect people from deterioration of the natural environment; personal security – protecting people from

physical violence; community security – protect traditional relationships, values and traditions; and political security – protecting human rights.

Human security as an aspect of overall security became prominent in the mid-1990s as empirical observations and data from several researches and studies began to show the connection between conflict and development. This nexus between conflict and development became apparent as it became clear that majority of the conflicts that have taken place in the post-Cold War era have happened within the borders of countries battling with issues of growth and development and not between countries. In most of the developing countries, the government is most times engaged in conflict with armed groups and rebels. Kerr (2010) notes that the significance of the relationship or connection between conflict and development is not that it raises issues around ethics about human suffering but that its frequent outcome especially in the developing countries – has negative consequences for local, regional and global stability. Human security highlights the idea that the threat to mankind is ever-changing and increasing. Apart from violence between and within countries, there are so many non-military threats to humans such as energy crisis, environmental pollution, diseases and sicknesses, poverty, pandemics such as HIV/AIDS, refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), etc. The point here is that, like military threats, these non-military threats also have dare consequences for security within a country, a region, a continent, and the world.

The key points to note when making sense of the concept of human security are:

- It emphasizes the desire to ensure that human being is secure.

- The concept highlights issues in politics such as political violence, the relationship between conflict and development, obstacles to human development, etc.

- The concept seeks to focus attention on other aspects of security instead of the traditional state-centric view that the state is and should be the primary object of security.

- Human security advocates see security as the end while state-centric security is the means to that objective.

### 3.2.1.1 Schools of Thought on Human Security

Though advocates of this type of security all agree that the human being should be the reference point when discussing security, instead of the state, there is apparent disagreement between them on what the scope of human security should be. This tension

has divided advocates of human security into two schools of thought; the narrow school and the broad school.

#### 3.2.1.1.1 The Narrow School

This school of thought prioritizes the scope of human security and covers threats of political violence to the people by the state, or any other organized political actor. The main scope of the narrow school is that human security deals with 'freedom from fear' of the threat or use of political violence and that human security is the protection of individuals and communities from war and other forms of violence (Human Security Center, 2005a). This school of thought looks at security as mainly covering issues around systemic violence and sees other forms of insecurity as tied to systemic violence. For example, poverty and poor governance often leads to violence. The narrow school sees human security as covering threat to violence to human beings.

#### 3.2.1.1.2 The Broad School

The broad school argues that the scope of human security covers much more than just the threat of violence. It argues that human security does not only include the 'freedom from fear' but also the 'freedom from want'. Thakur, an advocate of this school, holds that 'human security is concerned with the protection of people from critical life-threatening dangers, regardless of whether the threat are rooted in anthropogenic activities or natural events, whether they lie within or outside states, and whether they are direct or structural (Thakur, 2004a:347). Another advocate of the broad school of human security, Alkari (2004:360) argues that the objective of human security is 'to protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that advance human lives in ways that advance human freedoms and human fulfillment'. Basically, the broad school focuses on threats arising from underdevelopment and threats to human freedoms, and not just the fear of violence.

It is important that even though human security questions the military stance of the traditional approach, it does not make the traditional approach less important. The best form of security is when both approaches are in unison. For example, soldiers cannot be expected to be 'armed social workers' but the presence of such trained civilian staff may be crucial to the long term success of any military operations (Lamb, 2007). In 2004, the European Union proposed the creation of a new type of mixed military-civilian formation called the 'Human Security Response Force' of which two-thirds would be military and one-third would be from the police and civilian social and development specialists (Barcelona Report, 2004). From this proposition by the European Union, one can see that even though there is a mixture of the traditional and human aspects of security, an overwhelming emphasis was placed on the military form of security.

### 3.2.2 National Security

The concept of national security has its roots in Europe before, during and even after the Thirty Years War of 1618 to 1648. It is a concept covered in mystery and mystic (Nnoli, 2006). This is so because most actions of the State, whether they are carried out in the interest of the State or the ruling elite, are most times classified as national security. For example, in the name of national security thousands of Tutsis were killed by the Hutus, Nazi Germany killed about six million Jews, governments have built intelligence focused on spying, surveillance, repression and behind-the-scenes operations.

The scope of national security does not only mean ensuring internal security, it also means the protection of a state from external aggression. Ayoob (1995:9) makes this point when the notes that '(national) security – insecurity is defined in relation to vulnerability - both internal and external – that threaten or have the potential to bring down or weaken state structures, both territorial and institutional, and governing regimes'. Luciani (1989:151) defined national security strictly from an external perspective when he defines the term as 'the ability to withstand aggression from abroad'.

From the different definitions and clarifications of the concept, the main points to know is that national security holds every arm of government; executive, judiciary and legislature responsible for the protection of the state and its citizens against all kinds of 'national' crises such as terrorism, external threat, unemployment, poverty, disasters, violence, environmental degradation, poor healthcare, etc. by deploying all its resources including political, economic and military into securing the state. Thus, national security embraces all aspects of the security architecture. Therefore, national security, apart from protecting the state from external aggression and attacks, also covers non-military aspects such as economic security, energy security, food security, political security, environmental security, etc. This is because contemporary security threats involve not only military forces but also social forces like poverty and crime.

Most countries now have an office of national security saddled with the onerous responsibility of protecting them from all aspects of insecurity, whether military or non-military.

### 3.2.3 Internal Security

Internal security is the act of keeping peace within the borders of a sovereign State by defending the State against internal aggressors. In other words, internal security is that category of security that concerns itself strictly with the maintenance of law and order within a State. Some of the internal threats that States may face are civil disorders, organized crime, kidnappings, militancy, violence, terrorism, insurgency, etc. Threats to

internal security is either directed at the government or the citizens to create fear and a feeling of powerlessness. In most countries, the responsibility of safeguarding the homeland rests with the police and Secret Service and, as in Nigeria, paramilitary agencies like the Civil Defense and Peace Corps.

In most countries, while the Ministry of Defense is concerned with protecting the state from external aggression, the Interior Ministry is tasked with the responsibility of maintaining internal security. As mentioned above, a State's internal security is maintained by the police and other law enforcement agencies. In the USA, for example, there exist Border Guards which exists to augment the police by securing the borders of the country. In exceptional circumstances such as large scale violence, or armed insurgency – and where the police and the paramilitary have been overwhelmed - the military can be deployed to maintain peace internally.

For many States – especially developing states who are often regarded as weak states, internal security strategies include repression and military expansion, employing mercenaries and private military companies, using divide-and-rule strategies, deliberately undermining state institutions, patronage politics and democratic manipulation (Jackson, 2010).

### 3.2.4 Economic Security

Economic security, sometimes called Financial Security, is the condition of having stable income to meet, at least, the basic needs for survival in the present and foreseeable future. Economic security implies continued solvency based on predictable income or cash flow of a country. At the individual level, that is the micro-level, economic security covers safeguarding the livelihoods of individuals, households and local communities while at the international level, that is the macro-level, economic security connotes the ability of a country to follow its choice of policies to develop its economy in the manner desired. Economic security is an important aspect of national security, almost at the same level with military security.

The increasing attention now afforded economic security became so after the Cold War (Ullman, 1983). Hence, a noticeable shifts from geopolitics to geo-economics, from competitions to be the military superpower to competing to be the economic superpower and from political competitions to economic competitions. Stremlau (1994) aptly captured this changing notion of security when he observed that "we are entering an era when foreign policy and national security will increasingly revolve around our commercial interests, and when economic diplomacy will be essential to resolving the great issues of our age". Ultimately, economic security is founded on minimizing threats

and maximizing opportunities the pursuit of which involves safeguarding the structural integrity and prosperity-generating capabilities and interests of a State in the context of various externalized risks and threats that confront it in the international economic system.

In the USA economic security became a key issue for government from the early 1990s (Dent, 2010). For example, in 1993, President Bill Clinton expanded the country's National Security Council (NSC) membership to include the Treasury Secretary and the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy. This move by the former President clearly demonstrated the importance of economic issues in the grand security of countries. Also, one can see the growing importance of economic security when one looks at the 9/11 terrorist attack on Washington by al-Qaeda. The terror group did not only target the Pentagon – the USA's military headquarters but also the World Trade Center, the center of American corporate and financial power. Their thinking (the terrorist) must be to not only weaken America militarily but to also bring the country to its knees economically.

The main focus of economic security is founded on emphasizing a threat minimizing and opportunity-maximizing stance the pursuit of which involves 'safeguarding the structural integrity and prosperity-generating capabilities and the interests of a politico-economic entity in the context of various externalized risks and threats that confront it in the international economic system' (Dent, 2010).

### 3.2.5 International Security

International security, sometimes called Global Security, means the coming together by States and international organizations such as the United Nations, African Union, European Union, Association of Southeast Asian Nations, etc. to ensure mutual survival and safety. International security is concerned with the security of the international system, i.e. the world. In ensuring security in the world, States employ different measures such as diplomacy, signing treaties and conventions and threat of military action. International security and national security share linkages because national security is international security albeit on a global scale. International security is the sum total of the national security frameworks of different States in the international system.

The idea of ensuring international security followed the devastations of the First and Second World Wars due to the conflicts in the different national security agendas of States in an international system without a government like what is obtainable within States. So far, the United Nations have been able to prevent a Third World War in the

international arena. From an international perspective, insecurity is actually more the norm than security is (Jackson 2010).

### 3.2.6 Environmental Security

The broader field of security has opened new areas of security that looks at security from other aspects instead of the militarized notion that characterized the periods before and during the Cold War. Environmental Security, like human security and economic security, is one of the new non-traditional security category that deepens our knowledge of the security of states. This category of security deepens the knowledge of the security of states as it looks at the 'global' environment as well as its many nested subsystems and various social systems (Barnett, 2010). Environmental security discusses issues other than war – issues concerning the risks posed by environmental change and things people value.

Even though the concept of environmental security emerged in the early 1990s, there have been different explanations on what the concept means. These differences have led to environmental security to be divided into six approaches. These approaches are: ecological security, common security, environmental violence, national security, greening defence and human security. Importantly however, environmental security is seen as the impacts human activities have on the environment. This means that humans are safe only when the environment is safe because they are part of the environment or what is called the ecosystem. Environmental security entails keeping the environment safe because it is in the safety of the environment that the human life and human activities can be safe.

**Table 1: Six key interpretations of environmental security**

| Name | Entity to be secured | Major source of risk | Scale of concern |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ecological security | Natural environment | Human activity | Ecosystems |
| Common security | Nation state | Environmental change | Global/regional |
| Environmental Violence | Nation state | War | National |
| National security | Nation state | Environmental change | National |
| Greening defense | Armed forces | Green/peace groups | Organizational |
| Human security | Individuals | Environmental change | Local |

Source: Barnett (2010)

The nexus between environment and violence show that resource inequality can bred violence and thus insecurity. For example, there is the possibility of war between countries with shared water resources. Also, environmental change can weaken a country's economic base and ultimately its military capabilities. In many countries, natural resources and environmental services such as wildlife parks, forestry, fishing and mining, are important sources of internally generated incomes (IGRs) and employment. In some countries, if the natural capital base is affected, the long term capacity of its armed forces will also be affected since it depends on incomes from the environment to sustain its military. Sen (1999) also notes that because environmental change can undermine human development due to exposures to health risks, it becomes important for economic growth. Again, a change in the income of the environment can lead to weaken legitimacy and stability of governments because there will be a reduction in the income such a government gets from the environment and thus they fail in the provision of social services to its people. When people's welfare are not catered for, violence and militia groups with grievances may arose to fight the government. In other words, when the environment is sustain, national security is also sustained and vice versa.

### 3.3 Security in Weak and Strong States

Clarifying what a weak state is – based on the strength of a state - can be a difficult and controversial exercise as different measures have been used by scholars to describe it. To Thomas (1987) the strength or weakness of a state can be assessed by looking at its institutional capacity and in doing so, he identified two forms of state power: despotic state power and infrastructural state power. Despotic state powers means the state's use of coercion and force to command obedience from its citizens while infrastructural state power refers to the effectiveness and legitimacy of the institutions of the state. Thus, one may categorize a state as weak or strong based on the form of state power in operation. As a general rule, states whose emphasis is on despotic powers are seen as weak states while states with infrastructural powers are deemed strong states. This means that, the more a state exercises its despotic power, the more its displays its weakness and vice-versa.

Another scholar, Buzan (1991a) argues that states consist of three primary components: a physical base, institutional capacity and the 'idea of the state'. Buzan argues that, of these three components of the state, the weakness or strength of any state lies in its 'idea of the state' and the way society identifies with the state. According to Buzan, weak states

'either do not have, or have failed to create, a domestic political and social consensus of sufficient strength to eliminate the large-scale use of force as a major and continuing element in the domestic political life of the nation' (Buzan, 1983:67).

In his contribution to what a weak state is, Migdal (1988) notes that knowing what a strong state is would enable one know what a weak state is as a weak state is the opposite of a strong state. He defines a strong state in terms of the capacity of the state or what he describes as 'the ability of state leaders to use the agencies of the state to get people in the state to do what they want them to do (Migdal, 1988:17). From this angle, strong states are states that enjoy overwhelming support and consensus on the legitimacy of the state leaders. In opposite, weak states are states whose leaders do not enjoy overwhelming legitimacy and therefore cannot get people to do what they what them to do without coercion and force.

From the clarifications made by Thomas (1987), Buzan (1983 and 1991) and Migdal (1988) there are three (3) dimensions of the strength or weakness of a state. These are:

i. Infrastructural capacity of the state. This is measured in terms of the ability of the state institutions to perform its essential tasks and enact policies;
ii. Coercive capacity of the state. This is determined in terms of the state's ability and willingness to employ force against challenges to its authority; and
iii. National identity and social cohesion. This is in terms of the degree to which the people in a state accepts and identifies with the leaders and respects its legitimacy and authority over their lives.

From the discussions, it can be seen that most Third World countries – especially countries in Africa are deficient in all one or all three of these dimensions. African states can be described, with many examples, as weak states as they do not often enjoy overwhelming support from their populations and usually resort to the use of force of its own citizens to make them obey its laws and policies. They also lack infrastructural capacity in the business of the state. Consequent on this, weak states display all or many of the following characteristics:

i. Institutional weakness and an inability to enact national policy or perform basic state functions such as tax collection and providing law and order;
ii. Political instability as evidenced by coups, plots, rebellions, and frequent violent changes of government;
iii. Centralization of political power in a single individual or small elite who command the machinery of government to run the state in their own interest;
iv. Unconsolidated or non-existent democracies;

v. Economic crisis and structural weakness;
vi. Vulnerability to external actors and forces;
vii. Intense social divisions along class, religious, regional, urban-rural and ethnic lines;
viii. Lack of a cohesive or strong sense of national unity; and
ix. Crisis of legitimacy for both the government and institutions of the state (Jackson, 2010).

As it concerns security, a weak state is characterized by the inability of the state to establish and maintain a monopoly on the instruments of violence. In most weak states, violent disruptions based on different fault lines such as religion, ethnic, political, etc. are constant features and the state do not have the capacity to stop these occurrences. In weak states, security is often reactive instead of proactive. Security officials are called in to restore peace after violence has taken place instead of ensuring that the violence do not break out in the first place. This is not a complete surprise because for most weak states, the security agencies such as the military, the Secret Service, the police, etc. are ill-equipped, poorly managed and prone to divisions. Also, in weak states, there is the prevalence of private armies, criminal gangs, local militias and private security companies since the state cannot ensure the security of its citizens. Jackson (2010:189) notes that in weak states, 'even the most minimal requirement of statehood – the monopoly on the instruments of violence – is largely out of reach'. Most of the insecurity facing weak states are domestic and internal to such states. Some of these are the threat of violent transfer of power, insurgency, secession, genocide, rebellion and ultimately state collapse and anarchy. The Rwanda and Uzbekistan represents good examples of countries that have been consumed by domestic factors order than external influences.

On the other hand, and in total contrast with weak states, strong states are characterized by the following:

i. The willingness and ability to maintain social control;
ii. Ensure societal compliance with official laws;
iii. Act decisively and make effective policies;
iv. Maintain and preserve stability and cohesion;
v. Encourage societal participation in state institutions;
vi. Provide basic services to its citizens;
vii. Manage and control the national economy; and
viii. Enjoy and retain legitimacy (Dauvergne, 1998:2).

In addition and expanding some of fixtures of a strong state as identified by Dauvergne (1998), Jackson (2010) identifies other attributes of a strong state. They are:

i. High level of socio-political cohesion that is directly correlated with consolidated participatory democracy;
ii. Strong national identities; and
iii. Productive and highly developed economies;

Importantly, as Migdal (1998) cited in Jackson (2010:189) notes, the most important characteristic of a strong state is that it exists as a 'hegemonic idea' - an idea that has been accepted and naturalized in the minds of overwhelming majority of the citizens of such state and they 'consider the state as natural as the landscape around them (and) they cannot imagine their lives without it (the state)' (Migdal, 1998:12).

As it concerns security, in strong states, the state have the monopoly of the instrument of violence and its agencies are capable, well-equipped and properly managed to safeguard the state from both internal and external aggressors. In strong states, even where there are private armies, criminal gangs, local militias, etc., the state is capable of ensuring that these groups do not usurp the authority of the state. Members of such groups can be arrested and prosecuted because of high level of intelligence and the overwhelming support and legitimacy of the government.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

In this unit, we have learnt the meaning of security and differentiated between five categories of security: national security, economic security, human security, international security and internal security. The student is challenged into attempting his/her own definition of what security means. It is important for the student to also understand that once you fully understand what security means, you have also, albeit indirectly, understood the meaning of insecurity. Also, it is important to know that although there are many forms and categories of security, they do not operate in isolation. They altogether make a state secured. Speaking on a general term, all aspects of security – human, internal, environment, economic, etc. can be subsumed into national security because national security covers every aspect of the security of the state from military security to food security to resources security to border security, etc.

As change is the only thing that is constant in the world so also is the categorization of states as weak or strong. This means that this categorization is dynamic in that a weak state today can become strong tomorrow and a strong state today can become a weak

state tomorrow. Also, states can move back and forth along the lines of weakness and strength. Weak states can become strong by making significant changes in its institutions and by enjoying legitimacy while strong states can become weak when it is bedeviled by violence.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

There are different notions to what security means but one thing most scholars of security agree on is that security is the absence of fear, whether as an individual or country. Even though security is used mostly in a military sense (as we have employed it in this course), security also covers areas like national security where the primacy is not just defending the state from external attacks, but also ensuring that there is internal security through the provision of the needs of citizens. Thus, security has now assumed a human face, and not the militaristic notion it had prior to the Cold-War. We now talk of human security, economic security, energy security, etc. with all playing their parts in ensuring that the State is safe internally and externally.

The way security is treated in weak and strong state is different. While security in weak states is characterized by the states inability to enjoy monopoly of the instruments of violence, in strong states, the state have the monopoly of the use of violence.

## 6.0 TUTORED-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

i. What is security?

ii. What is the focus of the human approach to security?

iii. List and discuss the characteristics of weak states.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Alan, C. (2010), Contemporary Security Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Alkiri, S. (2004): 'A Vital Core that must be treated with the Same Gravitas as Traditional Security Threats'. *Security Dialogue.* Vol. 35, No. 3.

Ayoob, M. (1995): *The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Barnett, J. (2010): "Environmental Security" in Alan, C. (Ed.) Contemporary Security Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baylis, J; Wirtz, J J; Gray, C S. (2010), Strategy in the Contemporary World.

Biddle, S. (2004), Military Power: Explaining Victory and defeat in Modern Battle.

Human Security Center (2005a): *Human Security Report* 2005. www.list@ubc.ca

Jackson, R. (2010): "Regime Security" in Alan, C (Ed) Contemporary Security Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Luciani, G. (1989): 'The Economic Content of Security'. *Journal of Public Policy.* Vol. 8. No. 2

Sheehan, M. (2010): "Military Securiy" in Alan, C (Ed) Contemporary Security Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stremlau, J. (1994): 'Clinton Dollar Diplomacy'. *Foreign Policy.* 97, 18 – 35.

Thakur, R. (2004a): 'A Political Worldview'. *Security Dialogue*. Vol. 35, No. 3.

Ullman, R. (1983): 'Redefining Security'. *International Security.* Vol. 8, No.1

## UNIT 4: THE NEXUS BETWEEN SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA



### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Attention to the 'security-development nexus' has become commonplace in national and global policy-making, and yet the exact nature of the relationship remains unclear to some. After the devastations of the First and Second World Wars, it became increasingly clear that war and insecurity are anti-development. This was the reason why after the

Second World War, the Marshall Plan (officially known as the European Recovery Program, ERP) was launched to revamp the economies of Europe. The Marshall Plan was an American initiative where America gave over $13 billion (nearly $140 billion in current dollar value) to countries in Western Europe as economic assistance to help rebuild Western European economies after the end of World War II. The plan was in operation for four years beginning on April 8, 1948. The goals of the United States funded Marshall Plan were to rebuild war-torn Western Europe, remove trade barriers, modernize industry, make Europe prosperous once more, and prevent the spread of Communism. The Marshall Plan required a lessening of interstate barriers, a dropping of many regulations, and encouraged an increase in productivity, trade union membership, as well as the adoption of modern business procedures.

Development and security are like Siamese twins – they are conjoined and one cannot do without the other because for development to take place, there has to be security and when there is security, developmental activities can take place unhindered. Today, many of the developmental challenges confronting Africa has their root/foundation in insecurity. The plethora of violent conflicts in the continent is one of the reasons why many African countries are underdeveloped or experiencing very slow motions towards development. The nexus between development and security can be better appreciated when one note that after every violent conflict or war, governments often launch economic recovery programmes. This is done because during times of war and insecurity, development is the first casualty. For instance, after the Nigerian Civil War that last for almost three (3) years, the military government of General Yakubu Gowon launched the three Rs: Reconstruction, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation. In this three pronged approach to life after the war, two – Reconstruction and Rehabilitation – are development centered. In this module, we will discuss the relationship (nexus) between development and security. Particular attention is paid to studies of conflict and peace, with a focus upon the linkage between these subjects and the topic of the nexus itself**.**

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

i. To show the relationship between development and security;
ii. To identify the various perspectives to this relationship;
iii. Be able to explain how the nature and character of African countries is affecting security and development in Africa.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 Development in Africa

According to Ake (1981), to understand the nature and character of security and development in any society, the departure point must be from understanding how material wealth is created and how the created wealth is distributed. He went further to argue that to understand society's laws, religious system, its politics and even its mode of thoughts, a clear understanding of how the society produces goods to meet its material needs and how the produced goods are distributed and the type of social relations that arises from the organization of production must be established and understood. Thus, from the arguments of Ake, to understand the nature of security in Africa, it is important to understand, first, the nature of development in Africa.

From almost all data available, it would not be far-fetched to say that Africa is under-developed, especially when compared to the countries of the North as Rodney (1972) notes that development and under-development makes sense when looked at from a comparative basis since no society is stagnant in its development. But for Africa, one wonders if this is true because since the introduction of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) after the failed decades of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs), the continent has not achieved the much development instead the domestic economy at macro and micro sector levels remain fraught with wide range of problems.

The report from the African Development Initiative (ADI 2007:133) underlined the extent of the continents' socio-economic condition. The report showed that, in developmental terms, the combined economies of Africa actually shrank by 0.2% in 2006 while other regions in the world outperformed Africa. In the same vein, the 2006 report of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) also shows that while the average Gross National Product (GNP) per capital for countries who are members of the organization was $28,086 that of Africa was $528. These figures clearly show that industrialized countries are about fifty one times wealthier than most, if not all, African countries, in terms of GDP. Poku (2008) therefore argues that the outcome of Africa's poor economic condition is an increase in poverty were four out of every ten persons in Africa lives in what the World Bank classify as 'a condition of absolute poverty'. The implication of this is that the Human Development Index (HDI) in most African countries is lowest when compared to those of countries outside Africa.

*Table 3: Comparative HDI of the bottom five African countries from 1990 - 2007*

| 1990 Country Ranking | 1995 Country Ranking | 2000 Country Ranking | 2005 Country Ranking | 2007 Country Ranking |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **170-Chad** | 170-Afganistan | 170-Burundi | 173-Chad | 173-Mali |
| **171-Sierra Leone** | 171-Ethiopia | 171-Ethiopia | 174-Mali | 174-Niger |
| **172-Burkina Faso** | 172-Mali | 172-Burkina Faso | 175 Burkina Faso | 175-Guinea Bissau |
| **173-Mali** | 173-Sierra Leone | 173-Niger | 176-Sierra Leone | 176-Burkina Faso |
| **174-Niger** | 174-Niger | 174-Sierra-Leone | 177-Niger | 177-Sierra Leone |

Source: UNDP Human Development Report for the periods.

From the above data, we can deduce that it is the intensity of poverty in African countries that made the G8 to agree in 2010 to double the development assistance to the continent from $25 billion in 2004 to $50 billion in 2010. Apart from the low HDI, the poverty condition of Africa is also noticeable in the volume of the debt profile of African countries. The 2011 HDI index of 197 countries showed that, Africa and sub- Saharan Africa in particular occupy the bottom five in terms of inequality and discriminated poverty. The table below show the level of inequality and discriminated poverty in African states within the period mentioned.

***Table 4: Bottom Five African Countries in inequality and discriminated poverty.***

| S/No | Income Inequality | Gender Inequality | Multidimensional Poverty |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | Chad | Chad | Niger |
| **2** | Congo DR | Niger | Burundi |
| **3** | Liberia | Mali | Sierra Leone |
| **4** | Liberia | Congo DR | Central Africa Republic |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **5** | Sierra Leone | Sierra Leone | Guinea |

Source: UNDP Human Development Report (2011)

The table above shows that African nations particularly those in sub Saharan Africa suffer from inequality ranging from inadequate income, limited schooling opportunities and life expectancy far below world averages. These problems are also compounded by the prevalence of preventable and treatable diseases such as malaria and AIDS. In fact, the multidimensional poverty indices in the above table shows that African countries not only suffer from the above mentioned problems, but issues such as pollution, water challenges, hunger and famine are part and parcel of the multidimensional African poverty condition. In the area of gender equality or gender representation, the table shows that in most African countries, there is high gender inequality in terms of reproductive health, years of schooling, parliamentary and executive representation and participation in politics and in the labor market. On the world scale, the presentation below show the position of Africa when it comes to continental ranking in terms of Human Development Index.

***Table 5: World HDI by Country 2011-2012***

| **Region or Group** | **2011 estimates for 2011 HDI**[6] | **2011 estimates for 2010 HDI**[6] |
|---|---|---|
| **Very high human development** | | |
| *Very High Human Development* | 0.889 ▲ | 0.888 |
| *OECD* | 0.873 ▲ | 0.871 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **High human development** | | |
| *Europe and Central Asia* | 0.751 ▲ | 0.748 |
| *High Human Development* | 0.741 ▲ | 0.739 |
| *Latin America and the Caribbean* | 0.731 ▲ | 0.728 |
| **Medium human development** | | |
| ***World*** | 0.682 ▲ | 0.679 |
| *East Asia and the Pacific* | 0.671 ▲ | 0.666 |
| *Arab states* | 0.641 ▲ | 0.639 |
| *Small Island Developing States* | 0.640 ▲ | 0.638 |
| *Medium Human Development* | 0.630 ▲ | 0.625 |
| *South Asia* | 0.548 ▲ | 0.545 |
| **Low human development** | | |
| *Sub-Saharan Africa* | 0.463 ▲ | 0.460 |
| *Low Human Development* | 0.456 ▲ | 0.453 |
| *Least Developed countries* | 0.439 ▲ | 0.435 |

Source: UNDP Human Development Report for 2011.

The above table shows that African countries dominate the low HDI countries and are therefore considered as the poorest in the world. This condition has led African countries and governments to high borrowing to sustain government budgets. These borrowings have turned African economics into service economies who earn money from their resources only to service their ever increasing debt profile and its attendant interest. The table below shows the level of African debt profile from 1970 - 2006.

*Table 6: Africa's External Debt Profile 1970 – 2006 (US$ Billions)*

| | 1970-1979 | 1980-1989 | 1990-1996 | 1997-1999 | 2000-2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total debt stocks** | 39.3 | 180.5 | 297.2 | 317.3 | 303.6 |
| **Principal arrears** | 0.7 | 9.1 | 31.6 | 40.5 | 26.3 |
| **Total debt service paid** | 3.3 | 18.6 | 25.7 | 26.1 | 23.7 |
| **Total debt stock/XGS** | 91.0 | 195.2 | 242.8 | 217.6 | 168.6 |
| **Debt service paid/XGS** | 7.8 | 20.1 | 21.0 | 17.9 | 13.7 |
| **Total debt paid/GDP** | 24.2 | 51.7 | 67.0 | 61.8 | 54.6 |

Source: UNCTAD secretariat computation as cited by Poku (2008:109).

Note: XGS= export of goods and services %.

The table above shows that, in 2006, sub-Saharan Africa's external debt stood at US$303.6 billion, equivalent to US$958 per person compared to the regions average income per person of $470. The implication of the above table is that, African states borrow money from foreign countries but the incoming cash usually fuels the problem of capital flight and capital flight leaves deprivation and death in its wake for millions of the people across the continent. Ndikumana and Boyce (2011) had argued that African foreign assets remain private and hidden while its foreign debts are public, owned by the people of Africa through their governments. According to them, borrowed money by African states goes back into private accounts of the government staff and officials of the banks that provided it. Meanwhile, debt service payments continue to drain the resources of Africa.

The implication of the above is that, Africa has witnessed low level of development in terms of infrastructural development and the development of productive forces. This is because debt service burden has mitigated service delivery as the burden has caused a

reduction in the availability of resources for investment into the critical sectors of the economy that are supposed to stimulate the overall development and growth of the economy, a condition that generates and spread poverty.

From the above, it is pertinent to observe that, African states are peripheral capitalist states that according to Egwu (1999) have continued to retain their neo-patrimonial character, based on construction of a network of patron-clientele relationship that ensures uneven distribution of resources and rewards among the different social groups and constituent units. Since these states are capitalist oriented, and capitalism entails the expansion of inequality and exploitation, its calculations in terms of security and development are conditioned within the context of elite class domination of the masses. Democratization in these societies is therefore limited to enthroning a class that can accumulate for itself and its masters within the state and outside the shore in form of contributions to transnational organizations or through the adoption of foreign sponsored ideologies that promote the exploitation of the weak states.

It is therefore apt to argue that, the state in Africa lack autonomy and as such, its social formations cannot disassociate itself from the weakness of performing its core duties of mobilizing, utilizing and managing effectively the resources of the land to galvanize development and secure the society from the contradictions of underdevelopment manifesting in the high level of injustice, corruption, poverty, inequality, ethnicity and violence. This is because; a substantial majority of the current states in Africa have not completed the process of state formation. Jackson (1990) therefore argues that, almost all African states are still quasi-states, enjoying external recognition but not yet having succeeded in establishing internal sovereignty and capacity to run their economies. He argues further that, their bureaucracies still bear important traces of their colonial origins as well as their official language and the structure of their government mercenary.

### 3.2 Nexus between Security and Development in Africa

From the analysis, one can see that the development indices of Africa and the nature of African security can be contextualized within the core problems that face them. In other words, the problems of security and development in Africa can be viewed from the nature of its economic production which was imposed on her with structures and values which themselves were problematic. Eze (1998) argues that the capitalist mode of production and the form of liberal democracy that is based on Euro-American experience adopted by Africans has denigrated Africans local and traditional institutions and has also impeded economic development in Africa. Viewed from the Marxist argument which insists that it

is the material condition of man that shapes his consciousness, the insecurity crisis in Africa can therefore be located at the foundation of the substructure (the economy) which affects the superstructures (politics, culture, religion, law, etc.) that are thus weaken and as such cannot perform the task of reinforcing the strength of the base (economy). The consequence of this is that, the state in Africa lack the capacity to perform its tasks of social provision.

The decline in the role of the state in providing the material needs of the people and the deconstruction of democratic principles supported by capitalist exploitation of the minority class by the majority have made individuals and groups within Africa to seek alternative means of providing for their needs. This condition has made rubbish the idea of the state been a social contract entered by the people so as to protect their interests. Instead of organizing itself towards fulfilling its part of the contract with the people; freedom, justice, security and development, the state in Africa strictly operates the capitalist mode of production through which it oppresses and represses its peoples. The capitalist in Africa therefore pays the African worker a wage that can only keep him alive for continued exploitation. One of the implications of this is that it disconnects the people from infrastructure, a condition that impoverishes the peasants and empowers the foreign capitalist.

It is therefore worthy to argue that many African states operates around what Mazrui (2004) called *ethnocracy*. Mazrui defines ethnocracy as a situation where one or more ethnic groups monopolizes and control state power for the exclusive benefit of such an ethnic group or groups. This condition has led to many ethnic groups in African societies struggling to control state power and resources thereby leading to the crisis of political succession in Africa. This struggle for ethnic power acquisition as Jinadu (2005) argues, is usually with the feeling of exclusiveness which usually cause ethnic split by differentiating citizens into first, second and third class stratified behavior whose major character is conflict. When ethnic groups are classified, a barrier is created between those considered as royals and capable of ruling and those considered as non- royal and incapable of ruling. This barrier is also extended in the sharing of the largess of the society in terms of allocation of resources and appointments into government positions. The political class utilizes its power base on ethnic loyalty to loot for their selfish interest but uses ethnic coloration to justify their action. This is why Ake (1989) argues that the emergence of the state as the source of wealth created a vast bureaucracy and a vast state of dependent parasitic political class which have become so burdensome that both the economy and the state are in danger of collapse.

In today's globalizing world, the unequal wealth distribution between the North and the South increases injustice and forceful imposition of development agendas on African countries through the Bretton woods institutions, the World Bank and IMF, in the name of trade liberalization, commercialization, privatization. The devastating effects of these policies on the lives of the people have continued to cause conflicts in African societies. For instance, globalization has moved Africans from being a communitarian people to individualistic people as exemplified in the process of primitive accumulation and a character of an in-group benefit as against the out group benefits typical of traditional African societies. Globalization has also increased the activities of transnational criminal groups such as the proliferation of arms and drugs and human trafficking as well as money laundering. Pirates in Somalia, oil bunkerers in Nigeria, gold smugglers in Angola, etc. have continued to destabilize the continent in terms of increasing the levels of insecurity which ultimately affects development.

As a result of this, African societies have become 'markertized'. The *marketisation* of the African society and the adoption of Euro-American ideologies of development which has manifested in the politics of privatization, liberalization, subsidization and deregulation of African economies have crippled the local production process of these societies. This system has widened the gap between development and peace in Africa. As the people are economically disempowered, so they are democratically ostracized, as they are democratically ostracized, so they are socially and culturally oppressed and humiliated. The consequences of this is the reverse to the pseudo type of the Hobbesian state of nature in search for survival. In this state, process, conflict, violence and crisis have become what people use to achieve self-survival and growth.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

Although policymakers and practitioners alike have enthusiastically embraced the idea that security and development are interdependent, the precise nature and implications of the dynamic interplay between the two phenomena have been far from clear. This module realistically assessed the promise and shortcomings of integrated security-development policies as a strategy for conflict prevention. Addressing cross-cutting issues and also presenting detailed country case studies, they move beyond rhetoric and generalization to make an important contribution to the international conflict prevention agenda. Perhaps, nowhere in the world is the nexus between development and security mutually dependent like in Africa. This is not suggesting that insecurity – as it affects development – is only expressed in Africa. No. The point is that in Africa, the relationship between the two is

most visible. In all parts of the world, insecurity is underdevelopment and security is development.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

In this module, we have seen that the security crisis in Africa is the foundation of the substructure (the economy) which affects the superstructures (politics, culture, religion, law, recreation, procreation, etc.) that are thus weaken and as such cannot perform the task of reinforcing the strength of the base (economy). The consequence of this is that, the state in Africa lack the capacity to perform its tasks of social provision and welfare for its citizens. The decline in the role of the State in Africa to providing the material needs of the people and the deconstruction of democratic principles supported by capitalist exploitation of the minority class by the majority have made individuals and groups within Africa to seek alternative means of providing for their needs. This is why the level of insecurity occasioned by constant violence on the African continent is on the increase. When a man is hungry, poor or unemployed, he is more susceptible to be a willing tool in the hands of mischief makers. As the inability for people to meet their needs increases, their capacity to engage in violent activities also increase. For instance, the herders and farmers clashes in Nigeria is a product of the crisis of development and security – because conflicts begin when the livelihood of individuals or groups are threatened.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSESSMENT

i. Development and security are like Siamese twins. True or false? Discuss with examples.
ii. Underdevelopment is not necessarily the absence of security. Discuss with examples.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Ashok Swain, JoakimOjendal& Ramses Amer. (2012). The Security-Development Nexus: Peace, Conflict and Development. Anthem Press.

DubravkaŽarkov& Helen M. Hintjens (2014). Conflict, Peace, Security and Development: Theories and Methodologies. Taylor & Francis.

Duffield, Mark, R. (2007). Development, Security and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples. Polity Press.

Duffield, Mark, R. (2014). Global governance and the new wars. Zed Books.

Francesco Mancini, NeclâYongaçoğluTschirgi, & Lund, M.S. (eds.) (2010). Security and Development: Searching for Critical Connections. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Jon Harald Sande Lie (ed.) (2010). Security and Development. Berghahn Books.

Spear, Joanna & Williams, Paul, D. (2012). Security and Development in Global Politics: A Critical Comparison. Georgetown University Press.

## MODULE 2: SECURITY IN AFRICA

**Unit 1: Classifications of Regional and Global Security Arrangements**

**Unit 2: The Principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P)**

**Unit 3: Peace Operations: Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement**

**Unit 4: The African Union and Security in Africa**

## UNIT 1: CLASSIFICATIONS OF REGIONAL AND GLOBAL SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS

### CONTENTS



### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

During the Hobbesian hypothetical "state of nature", there was the functional principle of segmentarism where anarchy reigned and every one was a professional self-help. Humans depended on their strength for survival and there was unconstrained freedom. During this acclaimed state of nature, Hobbes argues that, life was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. The major task that has confronted humanity over the years till date is the desire to maintain peace and security in the society. Humans were to discover that the major means for lasting peace is a collective one. People also discovered that, despite their individual strengths, no man is an island and because of this, no man or nation, no matter how powerful, can survive on its own and as such sort to collectively co-operate with others to provide for their needs and also form military blocs and alliances with the aim of protecting themselves from threats. International security cooperation emanated from this thinking.

One method of acquiring military security is to become a member of a security institution. States seek membership of these institutions if they believe that their own resources are inadequate to maintain sovereignty and security, and therefore seek to make common cause with states that share their goals, or at least perceive similar threats. It will be time consumption to discuss all the different classifications of security arrangement prevalent in the world today as it concerns the protection of States from external threats

(and sometimes, internal aggression). In this unit, we shall identify and discuss five (5) classifications of security arrangements.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this lecture, the student should know the four (4) main classifications of regional and global security arrangements and be able to identify the differences between them.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 Alliances

Alliances are one of the oldest forms of regional and global security cooperation designed for both defense and attack (typically by military means) against a common external, or even internal, threat or opponent. Simply put, it is a relationship among people, groups or States that have joined together for mutual benefit or to achieve some common purpose – in this case, security of members of the alliance. That is, members of an alliance support each other in case of a crisis that has not been identified in advance. Countries in alliance use cooperation as a means to an end rather than a good in itself, and an alliance's membership necessarily excludes the enemy (or enemies). The obvious motivation in States engaging in alliances is to protect themselves against threats from other countries. States also enter into alliances to improve ties with a particular nation or to manage conflict with a particular nation.

An alliance should at least reduce the likelihood of war between its members by promoting confidence, encouraging dispute avoidance and resolution, and perhaps triggering cooperation in other non-security areas. Both Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) may be seen as examples of alliances anchored on a regional basis. States in alliance are called allies.

### 3.1.1 Types of Alliances

There are three (3) types of alliances: defense pacts, non-aggression pacts and ententes.

**(i) Defense Pacts**

Defense pact is a military alliance where the signatories to the treaty promise to jointly defend each other against a common threat. Under this type of alliance, the signatories point out the threats in the treaty and concretely prepare to respond to these threats together. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), also called the North Atlantic Alliance, an intergovernmental military alliance between twenty-eight (28) countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom and twenty-six other smaller countries is an example of contemporary defense pacts. The NATO constitutes a system of collective defense whereby twenty-eight states agreed to mutual defense in response to an attack by any external party (non-member of NATO). Its membership cuts across North America and Europe, with the newest members being Albania and Croatia who both joined the alliance in 2009. Other examples of defense pact include the 1992 Collective Security Treaty Organization with Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan as members, the 1951 Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and Philippines and the Warsaw Pact of 1955 between Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Russia.

**(ii) Non-aggression Pact** or **Neutrality Pact**

Non-aggression pact is a military alliance where two or more countries agree not to engage in military action against each other. This kind of alliance include the promise not to attack the other signatory and neutrality includes the promise to avoid any support against the other signatory. This type of alliance was very popular in the 1920s and 1930s during international agreements but since the end of the Second World War, it has largely fallen out of use or favor. An example of a non-aggression or neutrality pact is the 1939 Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany which lasted until the 1941 German invasion of the Soviet Union in Operation Barbarossa (Krause and Singer, 2001). Some other examples of this type of alliance include the German - Turkish Non-Aggression Pact of June 18, 1941, British – Thai Non-Aggression Pact of June 12, 1940, German – British Non-Aggression Pact of September 30, 1938 and Soviet – Yugoslav Non-Aggression Pact of April 6, 1941.

**(iii) Entente**

Entente, meaning ‘diplomatic understanding’ is a military alliance where two or more countries agree to follow the same course of action, especially during war. The most

popular example of the entente is what is referred to as Triple Entente which was the understanding linking Russian Empire, the French Third Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. All three members of this alliance executed the First World War as Allies against the Central Powers of Germany and Austria-Hungary.

Key points to remember under alliance is that:

i. States join alliances to compensate for their own relative military weakness.
ii. Alliances vary significantly in terms of their membership, objectives and obligations; and
iii. Some states have historically preferred to remain neutral than join alliances. For example, during the Cold War era, most of the developing countries, particularly African, Asian and Latin American countries decided to form the NAM – Non-align Movement, deciding not to any of NATO and Warsaw Pact.

### 3.2 Coalitions

A coalition is a pact or treaty among two or more countries in which they cooperate in a joint action, each in their own self-interest, joining forces together for a common cause. Coalitions are a kind of alliance, and as such it may be temporary or a matter of convenience. Coalitions are ad hoc in nature as nations become united for a specific purpose. Sometimes, such groups are diverse and characterized by some degree of commonalities. At other times, the degree of commonalities would lead some to perceive the group's bond as being ordinarily unlikely; here it can indicate the fact that the historical ties may no longer be in operation and coalition members, instead are joined by a new intention, not necessarily prior bonds. It is important to note that there are different types of coalitions; economic coalitions, political coalitions, social coalitions, etc. but the type of coalition we are concerned with in this course is military or security coalitions.

The most common reason why coalitions are formed by countries is to combat a common threat or to take advantage of a certain opportunity; hence, the often-temporary nature of this kind of relationship. According to Sidney Barrow, four (4) elements are necessary to maintain a coalition:

i. Members must frame the issues that brings them together with a common interest;
ii. Members trust in each other and believe that their peers have a credible commitment to the common issues and goals;

iii. The coalition must have a mechanism(s) to manage differences in language, orientation, tactics, culture, ideology, etc. between and among the different members; and
iv. The shared incentive to participate and, consequently, benefit.

Some examples of military coalition is the Coalition of the Gulf War assembled by former American President, George H.W. Bush during the Persian Gulf War. Another example is the "Coalition of the Willing", an assemblage of countries who supported the United States' war in Iraq in 2003. Also, the United Nations Coalition that intervened in the 2011 Libyan civil war against the autocratic government of Colonel Muammar Gaddafi is also an example of coalition.

### 3.3 Collective Security

The concept of collective security emerged in the 20th century in response to the ambivalent effects of older-style balance-of-power politics and alliances. First attempted in the framework of the League of Nations and again in the United Nations (UN), a collective security system aims to prevent or contain war by assuring a response to any act of aggression or threat to peace among its members. Collective security is a machinery for joint action in order to prevent or counter an attack against established international order and collective means dealing with threats to peace. It is based on mutual self-preservation and quest for development that makes States to unite against any threats to the interdependence and territorial integrity of Member States. It is a collectivism of States based on ideological, economic, political and historical conditions which make them feel that their survival and growth will be secured under the auspices of the collective that truly motivates collective security efforts throughout the world.

According to Trevoy (2002:67) the concept of collective security simply means an attempt whereby the governments of all states would come together to prevent any of their members from using coercion to gain advantage, especially to conquer or insecure one another. Gordenkor and Weiss (1993:89), collective security assumes that no government could with impunity undertake forceful policies that would fundamentally disturb peace and security – emphasizing that an attempt to do this will be treated by the committee of nations as an attack on each of them and will be summarily death with.

The core principle behind the doctrine of collective security is that, aggression by any state will be met by "all against one" - that is, by the combined power of the rest of the world to cut short the disturbances of that state to peace. Collective security creates a set of legal connotations that gives obligations to members. It represents deterrence to

unacceptable coercive behaviors, it postulate collective mobilization of resources and force against peace breakers. Arguing for the currency of collective security in sustaining global peace, Bull (1977:98) posits that:

> International order should rest not on a balance of power, but on a preponderance of power wielded by a contribution of states acting as the agents of international society as a whole that will deter challenges to the system or deal with them if occur.

Hoffman (1992:102) pointed out that, the notion of collective security is one in which all or most states will come to the rescue of a state that is a victim of aggression and punish the wrongdoer(s) or aggressor(s) through sanctions or even force. Thus, collective security ideologically means a situation where all nations could be secured if all were guaranteed their territorial integrity and existing political independence against external aggression by any state or states. Onoja (1996:60) made some important observations on collective security. First, he notes that in all conflicts, all nations have to agree, from the beginning, on which party in the conflict is the aggressor so as to prevent escalated damages. Secondly, all states are interested in halting aggressor irrespective of its source and thirdly, that a combined force of the collective will override that of the aggressor state.

Bull (2004:70) argues that collective security consist of four elements:

i. The exercise of preponderance of power
ii. by a combination of states
iii. acting as agents of international society
iv. in order to maintain international order.

In essence, following Bull's arguments, the idea of collective security encapsulates the legitimate enforcement of the will of international community by coercion where necessary against recalcitrant state(s).

Contributing to collective security, Adeniran (1983:198) clarifies that collective security:

> …is not a situation whereby individuals pursue individual interests. Collective security implies some degree of universality such as we find in UN provisions or regional organizations like the Arab league. Usually, the provisions of collective security entails voluntary system of regulation and non-use of sanctions or other measures for the prevention of aggression or for the purpose of ending aggressive behavior by a particular nation.

Adeniran (1983) arguments is that the doctrine of collective security do not seek the interests of individual states but the interest of the group because an attack to one is seen as an attack to all because of the contagious effects of conflicts across international borders.

From the above, it is clear that, collective security is a machinery for joint action in order to prevent or counter an attack against established international order and international law. It is a doctrine based on mutual preservation and development which make states to unite under a common umbrella against any threats; real or imagined, to the survival of member states. .

To work as intended, any such system must include all States in a region or the world, and it directs its attention inwardly at their actions. Apart from the global United Nations (UN), some larger regional entities such as the African Union (AU), the Organization of American States (OAS), may be viewed as institutions that explicitly or implicitly aim at, or at least partially produce, collective security. Regrettably, however, no such system has ever worked perfectly because of the evident problem, which is more difficult for those with larger membership in arriving at a common judgment and common will to act against offenders. Experience shows that this approach works well when there is consensus among the major powers but fails when faced with the largest dangers, including when the major powers come into conflict.

### 3.4 Security Regimes

Regimes are common phenomenon especially in such non-security dimensions of international relations as the regulation of international trade and transport. They define norms—of a cooperative and generally positive nature—for States' behavior and often provide ways to implement, support and verify these norms. A security-related regime may cover broad prescripts for behavior such as the non-use of force, limiting arms races, and respect for existing international borders, or may more concretely regulate certain types and uses of weapons or activities like military movements and transparency.

Several regional constructs, notably the OSCE and some Latin American initiatives, may be understood as security regimes, as many regional arms control measures such as nuclear weapon-free zones or the 1990 Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty. The value of all such constructs depends on how well their norms are respected, and there is much debate on what features, in terms of internal power patterns, institutionalization, incentives and penalties are needed to ensure observance. It should be noted that regimes with functional security goals may not need, or lend themselves to, a

geographically contiguous membership. Indeed, some would argue that using limited groups to handle tasks like export control has zero-sum overtones and that certain regimes work best when fully global.

Amitav Acharya in his book '*Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia*' identified three (3) characteristics of security regimes:

i. The existence of principles, rules and norms that regulate state behavior;
ii. The arms race continues and contingency planning for war frequently continue. Some mechanisms may be adopted to limit the arms race; and
iii. The peace within the community is not permanent and is due to factors that are transient or it may be an inability to go to war due to balance of power, deterrent or weakness within parties.

An example of security regime is the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union where peace at the time was not due to a fundamental commitment to peace but due to mutual deterrence and relative weakness among the two main actors.

### 3.5 Security Communities

The concept of security community was developed by Karl Deutsch in the 1950s to reflect the particularly far-reaching goals of post-World War II European integration, which in turn placed Europe in a larger security community of the world's industrialized democracies. In his 1957 work 'Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the light of Historical Experience, Deutsch defined security community as "a group of people believing that they have come to agreement on at least this one point, that is the inescapable fact that common social problems must and can be resolved by processes of peaceful change. According to Deutsch (1957), states may form security communities if the state of the international system increases "unattractiveness and improbability of war among the political units concerned".

A security community is defined as a group of States among which there is a real assurance that the members of that community will not fight each other physically, but will settle their disputes in some other ways. A security community implies more intense, sustained and comprehensive interaction than alliances, collective security and security regimes. Starting by removing the risk of conflict within the group, it can develop strengths that are greater than the sum of its parts for security tasks going well beyond the prevention of specific ills. People in this community are bound by a sense of mutual sympathy, trust and common interests. In his assessment of what a security community

means, Andrej (2007) sees security community as a region in which a large-scale use of violence (such as war) has become very unlikely or even unthinkable.

Ambitions to build such communities have recently been displayed also in several non-European regions, but the nature and effects of regional integration in the security domain remain poorly understood. The tendency of security communities to weaken internal frontiers potentially means that they can be more quickly affected by 'transnational' threats (e.g., terrorism, criminal traffic and disease). Their open-ended agendas tend to lead them to confront new security challenges as soon as old ones are settled and, in particular, to feel an impulse to start 'exporting' their surplus of security to others, notably in the form of peace missions.

### 3.5.1 Types of Security Communities

Karl Deutsch identified two types of security communities: amalgamated security community and pluralistic security community.

#### 3.5.1.1 Amalgamated Security Community

According to Deutsch, amalgamated security communities are created when two or more previously independent countries form a common government. Even though this type of security community is rare in history, an example is the United States of America after the original thirteen colonies ceded much of their governing powers to the federal government. This type of security community is not always successful and can be overturned. An example of a failed amalgamated security community is the failed union between Sweden and Norway.

Karl Deutsch identified eight (8) conditions that should be satisfied if amalgamation is to succeed:

i. The mutual compatibility of main values;
ii. A distinctive way of life;
iii. Capabilities and processes of cross-cutting communication;
iv. High geographic and social mobility;
v. Multiplicity and balance of transactions;
vi. A significant frequency of some interchange in group roles;
vii. A broadening of the political elite;
viii. High political and administrative capabilities

In addition to these eight (8) conditions, the population of both countries should be willing to accept and support common governmental institutions, remain loyal to them, and operate a common institution with mutual attention to the messages and needs of all participating units (Deutsch, 1957).

### 3.5.1.2 Pluralistic Security Community

According to Deutsch, under a pluralistic security community, both countries are politically independent but they do not expect to have future military confrontations in spite of having had some in the past. Karl Deutsch argued that the pluralistic security communities are easier to establish and maintain than the amalgamated type. The United States and Canada is an example of a pluralistic security community. Also, security concerns led the United States and Mexico to form a pluralistic security community in anticipation of the Second World War.

Deutsch identified two conditions that should facilitate the formation of a pluralistic community:

i. The capacity of the participating political units or governments to respond to each other's needs, messages, and actions quickly, adequately, and without resort to violence; and
ii. The compatibility of major values relevant to political decision-making. For example political ideology.

In her contribution, Weaver (2011) argued that for security communities to arise and endure, no matter the type been practiced, the agreements need to be based on balanced multi-polarity.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

The international system is chaotic and this by no way suggests that States are always at each other's neck or do not conduct themselves in an orderly manner. Due to the absence of a single authority in the international system (and the existence of hegemons), bigger nations sometimes oppress and subjugate smaller nations. It is the fear of this domination, which necessitated the signing of security treaties and the forming of institutions to protect States and to also foster friendly relations between States. At this juncture, it is important to note that most of the these security arrangements were first military-styled but as States soon discover, especially after the Cold-War, that human security, is also very important to the survival of States. Following from this, other bodies or institutions were birthed to look after the socio-political needs of States. For example, even though

the United Nations (UN) is first and foremost an international institution established to ensure peace and security in the world following the devastations of the Second World War, it has produced other institutions such as United Nations International Children Fund (UNICEF) and the International Labor Organization (ILO). These institutions protect the interests of children and workers all over the world.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have discussed the different classifications of security arrangements. Although there are many classifications of security arrangements, we specifically looked into the five (5) major classifications namely; alliances, coalitions, collective security, security regimes and security communities. These different security arrangements are entered into by nations, whether on a regional or global basis, to promote peace, security and development. Though this classifications are mainly military agreements, they have also produced other bodies or institutions which are catering for the political cum socioeconomic needs of States.

Even though alliances and coalitions tend to mean the same, it is important to note that they are different. While coalitions are formed for a crisis that is already known, alliances are usually established to confront other blocs politically or militarily as exemplified by NATO and Warsaw Pacts. Also, it is important to mention that collective security is different from alliance building, which provides security to member states from threats emanating from sources outside particular alliance system.

## 6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT

i. What is the difference between Defense Pacts and Non-Aggression Pacts?
ii. Are governments correct in prioritizing military security over other types of security?
iii. What are the different classifications of security arrangements? Discuss any two.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Andrej, T. (2007): "Security Communities and Their Values: Taking Masses Seriously" International Political Review. Vol. 28, No. 4.

Buzan, B. (1991), People, State and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era, 2nd Edition, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner

Deutsch, K. (1957): Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Thomas, C. (1987), In Search of Security: The Third World in International Relations. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner

Weaver, C. (2011): "Black Seas Regional Security: Present Multi-polarity and Future Possibilities". European Security. Vol. 20, No. 1

## UNIT 2: THE PRINCIPLE OF THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT (R2P)

## CONTENTS



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

One of the inventions in the study of security and which is now becoming important in international relations is the principle of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). It is a principle that followed massive outcries by the international community following the Rwandan Genocide, the Srebrenica Massacre and the NATO bombings of Yugoslavia in the era of Slobodan Milosevic. The principle of R2P is based on the belief that sovereignty entails a responsibility to protect all peoples from human rights abuses and mass atrocities. This lecture discusses this principle as it relates to global and regional security. For the student to understand international and regional security and how it is influenced by sovereignty, it is important to understand the R2P.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

The objective of this lecture is that the student should understand;

i. The meaning and scope of the principle of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P);
ii. To appreciate why the R2P was introduced and how it has helped protect abused populations around the world, especially in Africa.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 Meaning of the Responsibility to Protect

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P or RtoP) is an international political, security and human right agreement unanimously entered into and endorsed by all members of the United Nations during the 2005 World Summit in order to prevent war crimes, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and genocide. The R2P is a reaction by the international community following the tragedies of the 1994 Rwandan Genocide, the Srebrenica Massacre the following year and when NATO bombed the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to coerce its leader, Slobodan Milosevic, into ceasing the ethnic cleansing of Kosovar Albanians. The principle of R2P is based on the premise of total respect for international norms, international law, peace and security. The principle of R2P underlies the belief that sovereignty entails a responsibility to protect all peoples from insecurity, human rights violations and mass atrocities. The main idea of the R2P is to protect populations from war crimes and human right violations and one in which another party can intervene. R2P is to be employed as a last resort and the authority to employ the use of force under the agreement rests solely with the Security Council of the United Nations.

The R2P principle is contained in paragraphs 138 – 139 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document. Paragraph 38 states that:

> Each individual State has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement, through appropriate and necessary means. We accept that responsibility and will act in accordance with it. The international community should, as appropriate, encourage and help States to exercise this responsibility and support the United Nations in establishing an early warning capability.

While Paragraph 39 states that:

> The international community, through the United Nations, also has the responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter, to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In this context, we are prepared to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, including Chapter VIII, on a case-by-case basis and in cooperation with relevant regional organizations as appropriate, should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities manifestly fail to protect their populations from genocide, war

> crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. We Stress the need for the General Assembly to continue consideration of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and its implications, bearing in mind the principles of the Charter and international law. We also intend to commit ourselves, as necessary and appropriate, to helping States build capacity to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and to assisting those which are under stress before crises and conflicts breaks out.

From the above, one can see that the basic idea of the R2P is to safeguard citizens of States from authoritarian leaders who flagrantly abuse their offices by allowing the United Nations to intervene and stop such abuses wherever they are been committed. Central to the principle of R2P is that it is a shift from state-centeredness to the interests of citizens by focusing not on the right of states to intervene but on a responsibility to protect people who are at risk. The principle sees sovereignty as emphasizing 'responsibility' to one's own citizens and the general international community.

### 3.2 Scope of the Responsibility to Protect

As contained in Paragraphs 138 and 139 of the 2005 Outcome Document of the World Summit of 2005, the scope of the principle of R2P covers four (4) specified crimes and violations. These crimes are: genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

Thus, the scope of the principle of the R2P has been dubbed "a narrow but deep approach'. This means that even though the principle of R2P is narrowed to four (4) crimes, it has a deep approach in the response to these crimes by employing wide array of prevention and protection instruments available to Member States, the United Nations System, regional and sub-regional organizations and the civil society.

### 3.3 Pillars of the Responsibility to Protect

The R2P consists of three (3) very important pillars:

Pillar I: The protection responsibilities of the state;

Pillar II: International assistance and capacity-building; and

Pillar III: Timely and decisive response.

Pillar I rests on the agreement that each State has the responsibility to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. Pillar II rests on international assistance and capacity-building. This for instance, happens when the international community sends help to people in times of need before further crises breaks out. Pillar III is anchored on the delivery of timely and decisive response to any or all of the four (4) crimes covered by the principle of R2P, especially when the State where they are been committed has failed in protecting its population.

These pillars of the R2P are not numbered according to importance or sequence, rather they are like the three stones used in cooking and are all of equal importance and without all three, the principle would be incomplete. It is important for the student to understand that the pillars are not intended to undermine State sovereignty. Instead, the pillars are made to support and reinforce State sovereignty. Thus, R2P seeks to strengthen sovereignty and not weaken it. Conclusively, the central idea behind the R2P is that it seeks to strengthen sovereignty and not to weaken it, to help States succeed and not to react when they fail.

### 3.4 Africa and the Responsibility to Protect

The Rwandan Genocide of 1994, a tribal war between the Tutsi and the Hutu that lasted for three months, was a turning point in the history of respecting sovereignty of States in the international community. Following the devastations that occurred in Rwanda, the African Union (AU) became the egghead that championed the idea of Pillar III: the delivery of timely and decisive response to any or all four (4) crimes whenever and wherever they are been carried out, if a State is unwilling or unable to protect its people.

The R2P was internationally accepted in 2005 by the United Nations during the World Submit of that year, the African Union (AU) had, as at 2000, incorporated the right to intervene in a Member State in Article 4(h) of its *Constitutive Act*. The AU's Constitutive Act declared that the African Union has the right to intervene in any member State in times of war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity. A position that was accented to by the Assembly, which is the highest organ of the African Union. In pursuant of this, the AU unanimously adopted the *Ezulwini Consensus* in 2005 which welcomed the R2P as a tool for the prevention of mass atrocities. The African Union has at several times invoked the doctrine of R2P on the continent.

It is also important to note that the *Constitutive Act* supports non-indifference, that is, Member States cannot be indifferent and 'wrongly' respect sovereignty when crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, war crimes and genocide are being perpetrated within

the boundaries of any Member State. This goes contrary to the position of its predecessor, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which supported the non-interference in the affairs of Member States by another Member State or the OAU as an institution. The AU, unlike its predecessor, has demonstrated a willingness to be actively involved in continental security issues, having suspended nine member governments for constitutional violations, applied sanctions against six member governments and authorized several peace support operations in the last decade.

South Africa was one of the key proponents of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine when it was adopted at the 2005 World Summit. With the accent on 'sovereignty as responsibility', the R2P doctrine reflected what had been adopted in the Article 4(h) of the AU Charter in 2002. A number of other African States embraced the concept, including Benin, Rwanda and Tanzania, while others such as Algeria, Egypt and Sudan did not. However, the focus on R2P as military intervention, which sometimes overshadows the doctrine's fuller mandate, has fueled perceptions among some African States (and others in the developing South) that the doctrine is another way for former 'colonial' or 'imperial' powers to intervene in the domestic affairs of African States. Thus, there is a valid concern about the possibility of inconsistent application – that R2P will be applied against the weak and powerless in the international realm or that some powers may want to invoke it extremely broadly. For example, French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner wanted to invoke R2P in the case of Hurricane Nargis in Myanmar, but South Africa and other States opposed his proposal. Unlike humanitarian intervention, R2P is narrower in scope but broader in the instruments at its disposal.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

The principle of R2P is critical in discussions on international security. The R2P is an attempt to reconfigure the relationship between sovereignty and human rights. The principle of the R2P was a brainchild of African eggheads, particularly Francis Deng a former Sudanese diplomat and Kofi Annan, a former Secretary General of the United Nations, who were left pained by the killings and destructions of the 1991 Somalian Massacre and the 1994 Rwandan Genocide coupled with the inability of the international community, especially the Organization of African Unity (OAU) now the African Union, to protect the populations of both countries due to its principle of non-interference. However, with the rebranding of the OAU into the African Union (AU) and the attendant Constitutive Act that canceled the principle of non-interference into one of non-indifference, a third State, whenever war crimes such as genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing is occurring in any Member State, can intervene in

order to save the populations of that State, especially when the government is unwilling or unable to stop it. Therefore, the major idea behind the principle of the R2P is to safeguard citizens of States from authoritarian leaders by allowing the United Nations or any of such organization, to intervene and stop humanitarian abuses wherever and whenever they are been committed.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have discussed the principle of the Responsibility to Protect often referred to as R2P or RtoP. The R2P holds that protecting citizens from crimes such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and war crimes is not just a matter of charity by Governments but it is a matter of responsibility. It is an idea that rose out of the need to protect citizens of States where their human rights is being abused under the guise of state sovereignty and non-interference. The R2P rests on three (3) pillars, namely: The protection responsibilities of the state, international assistance and capacity-building and timely and decisive response. The challenge, as must ideas, is to translate the R2P from words to deeds.

## 6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT

i. What do you understand by R2P?
ii. What are the basic pillars of R2P?
iii. How will R2P ensure peace and security in Africa?

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Bellamy, A.J. (2009), Responsibility to Protect: The Global Effort to End Genocide and Mass Atrocities. Cambridge Polity Press

Chesterman, S. (2001), Just War or Just Peace? Humanitarian Intervention and International Law. Oxford University Press

http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

Morten, Jerven (2013). Poor numbers: How we are misled by African development statistics and what to do about it. Cornell University Press.

Peake, Gordon (2013). Beloved land: Stories, struggles and secrets from Timor-Leste. Scribe.

Weiss, T.G. (2007), Humanitarian Intervention: Ideas into Action, Cambridge: Polity Press

## UNIT 3: PEACE OPERATIONS: PEACEKEEPING AND PEACE ENFORCEMENT

**CONTENT**



### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Following the devastations of the First and Second World Wars, and the inability of the League of Nations to prevent them, the United Nations, after it replaced the League, decided to engage in peacekeeping missions in any troubled part of the world in order to stop rising violence and its spread into other countries which, if not stopped, may ultimately lead to another world war. Thus, as the name suggests, peacekeeping missions are sent to places of conflict to maintain peace and security by interfacing with the parties in conflict – usually within State borders.

The United Nations began its peacekeeping operations in 1948 when it authorized the deployment of UN military observers to the Middle East to monitor the Armistice Agreement between Israel and its Arab neighbors. This first peacekeeping mission by UN became known as the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO). Since then, 69 peacekeeping missions have been deployed by the UN, 56 of them since 1988.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this lecture, the student should understand the meaning of peacekeeping – and the types of peacekeeping missions, peace enforcement and the link between peacekeeping and peace enforcement.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 What is Peace-keeping?

Defining what peacekeeping means is a difficult task especially as it was not mentioned in the United Nations Charter and has never been guided by any theory. Several attempts at defining it has been bedeviled by its peculiar nature, especially as it relates with the use of force. However, traditionally, peacekeeping may be defined as missions, especially by the United Nations, involving military personnel (and civilians, too), to restore international peace and security in areas of conflict. Boutros-Ghali, a former Secretary General of the United Nations defines peacekeeping as 'the deployment of a United Nations presence in the field, hitherto with the consent of all parties concerned, normally involving United Nations military and/or police personnel and frequently civilians as well'.

Momah (1995:39) sees peace-keeping as 'a conflict-controlling and tension-diffusing operation, carefully designed to provide the belligerents, a stabilized situation and a conducive environment for the peaceful resolution of dispute or conflict. That is, peacekeeping is meant to ameliorate the feud between parties in conflict and then put them on the track to attaining lasting peace. On his part, Aja-Akpuru (2007:52) notes that peacekeeping encompasses a variety of interventions which places high premium on the exercise of constraints on the use of force than is applicable in pure peace enforcement. According to him, peacekeeping discharges the function of maintenance of ceasefire and separation of forces by providing '*breathing space*' so as for hostilities to cease. It provides preventive deployment, protection of humanitarian operation to reduce the level of civilian casualties and implementation of a comprehensive peace settlement.

There are three characteristics of peacekeeping:

i. The more or less voluntary consent of all parties to the presence and activities of the mission,
ii. Peacekeepers impartiality in their relationships with the parties, and
iii. The minimum use of force, only as a last resort and only in self-defense.

From these characteristics, the student can see that essentially, peacekeeping is a tool for maintaining international peace around the world. Peacekeeping seeks to prevent conflict,

manage conflict and resolve conflicts. That is, conflict prevention, conflict management and conflict resolution in any troubled part of the world. Peacekeepers are not to be bias by overtly or covertly supporting any of the parties in conflict especially as they are to be, unless necessary, peace enablers and not peace enforcers. Peacekeeping missions are carried out with the 'no victor, no vanquish' mentality because peacekeepers do not set out to win the conflict for any of the feuding parties. A United Nation Department of Peace-Keeping Operations (DPKO) official, Shashi Tharoor, described impartiality as the 'oxygen of peacekeeping'. He notes that the only way peacekeepers can work is by being trusted by the warring parties and keeping communication open between them (peacekeepers) and the parties in conflict.

Another key feature of peacekeeping is that peacekeepers are to be lightly armed for self-defense because it is assumed that when they are not heavily armed, they can sustain their impartiality that allows them to move freely and negotiate without bias. A former United Nations Secretary-General for Special Political Tasks, Sir Brian Urquhart, underscored this point when he was quoted as saying that: "The real strength of a peacekeeping force lies not in its capacity to use force, but precisely in its not using force and thereby remaining above the conflict and preserving its unique position and prestige".

### 3.2 Types of Peacekeeping

Essentially, there are two types of peacekeeping: traditional peacekeeping and expanded peacekeeping. The type notwithstanding, the main objective of peace-keeping missions is that relative peace must be established in the affected areas for peace to keep (Momah, 1995).

#### 3.2.1 Traditional Peacekeeping

Traditional peacekeeping means peacekeeping missions that are mainly military centered. That is, they are missions that entails the deployment of military contingents to monitor, supervise and verify compliance with agreements entered into by warring parties. These type of missions ensure that agreements relating to ceasefires, withdrawals, buffer zones and any related military agreements are obeyed by the parties in conflict. Thus, traditional peacekeeping is strictly a military mission to restore law and order, peace and security in troubled zones. However, in carrying out this function, peacekeepers are not allowed to alter the political or military setups in their mission areas.

Some notable examples of traditional peacekeeping missions include the United Nations Aouzou Strip Observer Group (UNASOG) and the United Nation Mission of Observers

in Prevlaka (UNMOP). The UNASOG's mission was to observe and monitor the handover of a border area from Libya to Chad in 1994 while the UNMOP observed the ceasefire agreement between Croatia and Yugoslavia.

### 3.2.2 Expanded Peacekeeping

Expanded peacekeeping has a bigger scope than traditional peacekeeping. This type of peacekeeping covers more areas than the traditional peacekeeping which is militarily centered. Under expanded peacekeeping, the goal of the mission is multifunctional and covers a wide variety of areas such as finding out the root causes of conflicts and providing solutions that will ensure lasting peace and security. Thus, under expanded peacekeeping, peacekeepers seek to promote the practice of democracy, accountability, good governance, strong economies and infrastructural development, among others. This became important because after the Cold War, the international community learnt that military might alone cannot keep nations safe and peaceful. It therefore became important to pay attention to other areas such as politics and the economy of States.

Under the expanded peacekeeping, it is the UN Civil Police (CivPols) that are usually deployed instead of the military (though sometimes the military are called upon) to manage issues such as observing elections and safeguarding human rights. Some notable examples of expanded peacekeeping include the UN Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), the UN Mission in Haiti (UNMIH), the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in former Yugoslavia, the UN Mission in Mozambique (ONUMOZ) and the UN Mission in Somalia II (UNOSOM II).

As operated by the United Nations, peace-keeping is of two types: Observer Missions and Force-Only-In-Self-Defense (FOISD) (Momah, 1995).

**Observer Missions:** Observer Missions are composed only of officers who do not carry arms and as such cannot use force, even when it is in self-defense. Some example of this type of peacekeeping include UNGOMAP in Afghanistan and Pakistan, UNAVEM in Angola and UNIIMOG in Iran and Iraq.

**Force-Only-In-Self-Defense (FOISD):** This type of peace mission include more personnel of the United Nations and often comprises of officers and also soldiers. They are lightly armed and can use force only in self-defense or in defense of the mandate or vital equipment (Momah, 1995)

### 3.3 Peace Enforcement

Peace-keeping could translate into peace enforcement when one or more parties to a dispute or conflict puts the peace-keeping mission in total jeopardy and if not neutralized, could result to carnage and genocide (Momah, 1995). Peace enforcement is using force or the threat of force to ensure that warring parties adhere to agreements previously entered into. It is an extension of the expanded peacekeeping typology. The intention of peace enforcement is not to defeat a warring party militarily rather it is aimed at using coercion or the threat of using coercion to make warring parties comply with previously agreed commitments and the will of the international community. Peace enforcement missions have the objective of 'enforcing peace' between warring parties. Peace enforcers, like peacekeepers, are impartial to the warring parties but can use force or threat of the use of force when one or both of the warring parties refuse to comply with agreements reached during the peacekeeping stage. This goes to show that peace enforcement is usually deployed after peacekeeping efforts have failed.

Also, like the expanded peacekeeping, peace enforcement covers other activities such as humanitarian assistance, promoting democracy, protecting human rights, assisting in economic policies, etc. Thus, peace enforcers do not only wield the big stick, they also give the 'carrots' to cooperating parties – that is, unlike peacekeepers who deploy only carrots, peace enforcers use the carrot and stick approach in their missions. Some examples of missions where peace had to be enforced include United Mission in Somalia II (UNOSOM II), UN Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) and UN Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET). In these missions, parties to the conflict were forced militarily to enter into negotiations that lead to the resolution of those conflicts.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

Peacekeeping and peace enforcement are deployed whenever there is rising break down of law and order so as to maintain international peace and security. The United Nation Security Council, which is the most powerful organ of the UN is tasked with the responsibility of approving the deployment of peacekeepers to troubled zones around the world. The peacekeeping force is made up of contingents of States who willingly offer part of its military and civilian manpower to such missions. This is so because the UN do not have a standing army to carry out peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

Peacekeeping is a peaceful mission, usually engaged in by multinational institutions such as the United Nations or the African Union, to restore international peace and security in troubled parts of the world or Africa. In doing this, peacekeepers are to be impartial and are armed with light weapons to ensure neutrality. During peacekeeping missions, the use of force is discouraged but it can be used as a last resort for personal security. There are two types of peacekeeping: traditional peacekeeping and expanded peacekeeping. While traditional peacekeeping is strictly military deployments to restore international peace and security, expanded peacekeeping is multifunctional – it not only includes military deployments, but also seek to tackle the causes of conflicts, promoting good governance, democratic ethos, etc.

Peace enforcement on the other hand means the use of force or the threat of the use of force to ensure that peace is restored and maintained between warring parties. Peace enforcement is usually deployed after peacekeeping measures have failed to restore peace and security and it is usually carried out to coerce warring parties into abiding with previously entered agreements at the peacekeeping stage.

Generally, whether in peacekeeping or peace enforcement, the troops that are deployed are contingents of Member States who voluntarily send its troops for such missions as recommended by the UN Security Council because the United Nations do not have a standing army.

## 6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS

i. When does peacekeeping becomes peace enforcement?
ii. Discuss the different types of peacekeeping operations?
iii. To what extent does international security depend on the UN Charter's rules on the non-use of force and non-interference in the domestic affairs of sovereigns?

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Anderson, Mary & Wallace Marshall (2012). Opting out of war: Strategies to prevent violent conflict. Lynne Rienner.

Bellamy, A.J, and Williams, P.D. (2009), Understanding Peacekeeping, 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Polity Press

Boulden, Jane (ed.) (2006). Dealing with conflict in Africa. The United Nations and Regional Organizations. Palgrave Macmillan US

Dennis, C. Jeff (1999). Why peacekeeping fails.

Findlay Trevor (2002), The Use of Force in UN Peace Operations.

Momah, S. (1995): Global Disorders & the New World Order. Surulere, Lagos: Generation Press Limited

Morten, Jerven (2013). Poor numbers: How we are misled by African development statistics and what to do about it. Cornell University Press.

Peake, Gordon (2013). Beloved land: Stories, struggles and secrets from Timor-Leste. Scribe.

Wheeler, N.J. (2000), Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## UNIT 4: THE AFRICAN UNION (AU) AND SECURITY IN AFRICA

## CONTENT



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The trend towards regionalism and regional security arrangements has now become the central idea of world politics. This development sprout from the collective necessity for pooling national resources to ensure national protection in a divided and war threatened world, especially after the devastations of wars like the Thirty Years War, the First World War and the Second World War. According to Lippmann (1949:653), a regional organization may be primarily a military alliance; however, it may also provide for some collaboration in the other areas of common interest to the members. The Charter of the UN gave the idea of regional organization great impetus by not only allowing the idea to grow but giving it full backing in the resolution of crisis affecting them. Thus, the Charter states in Article 33 (1) among other things that,

> Parties to a dispute to which, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security shall, first of all seek resolution by

> negotiation… resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their choice.

The Security Council whose principal function is to maintain international peace and security also gave its overwhelming support to the operations of regional organizations when it stated in Article 52 (3) that;

> The Security Council shall encourage the development of specific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from Security Council.

In the overall interest of international peace, there are some issues that the immediate members of the community understands better and are in the best position to tackle them. This thinking led to the establishment of regional security institutions in Africa. The African Union (AU) oversees the security of the entire African continent while each regional within the continent have their own regional security institutions saddled with ensuring peace, security and development. This module discusses these institutions and the security roles they are playing.

Also, the unit discusses the African Union (AU) and its role in security in Africa. The predecessor of the AU, the Organization of African Union (OAU) was not able to intervene in the Somalian crises in 1991 and the Rwandan Genocide in 1994 because of its stance on the non-interference in the affairs of Member States and its strict respect of Members sovereignty. Following these sad events, the OAU was rebranded and became AU and the AU drew up a Constitutive Act that changed the principle of non-interference into one of non-indifference, allowing the Union to intervene in any Member State where crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, genocide and war crimes are been perpetrated. This is a breakthrough in international law, an idea the United Nations has since adopted to promote international peace and security.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this lecture, you should:

i. Have a good understanding of the African Union (AU);
ii. Understand the principle of non-indifference as contained in the Union's Constitutive Act;
iii. Know the different regional security institutions in Africa;
iv. Have a good understanding of the African security environment and the Africa Union's efforts through the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) in promoting peace and security in Africa.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 The African Union (AU)

The African Union (AU) (or *Union Africaine*in French) is a continental union with 54 Member States in Africa. It replaced the Organization of African Unity (OAU). The AU was established on 26th May 2001 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, but was officially launched on 9th July 2002 in South Africa. The AU is made up of both political and administrative bodies and the highest decision-making organ is the Assembly of Heads of State and Government. The main administrative capital of the AU is in Addis Ababa, the Ethiopian capital.

The objectives of the AU are:

i. To achieve greater unity and solidarity between African countries and Africans;
ii. To defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of its Member States;
iii. To accelerate political and socio-economic integration of the continent;
iv. To promote and defend African common positions on issues of interest to the continent and its peoples;
v. To encourage international cooperation, taking due account of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
vi. To promote peace, security, and stability on the continent;

vii. To promote democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance;
viii. To promote and protect human and peoples' rights in accordance with the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and other relevant human rights instruments;
ix. To establish the necessary conditions which will enable the continent to play its rightful role in the global economy and in international negotiations;
x. To promote sustainable development at the economic, social and cultural levels as well as the integration of African economies;
xi. To promote cooperation in all fields of human activity to raise the living standards of African peoples;
xii. To coordinate and harmonize the policies between the existing and future Regional Economic Communities for the gradual attainment of the objectives of the Union;
xiii. To advance the development of the continent by promoting research in all fields, in particular science and technology;
xiv. To work with relevant international partners in the eradication of preventable diseases and the promotion of good health on the continent.

To achieve these objectives, the AU has the mandate to intervene in the affairs of Member States under its principle of non-indifference. The AU's first military intervention in a Member State was in May 2003 when a peacekeeping force comprising of soldiers from Ethiopia, South Africa and Mozambique were deployed to Burundi to oversee the implementation of agreements. AU troops have also been deployed to Sudan for peacekeeping missions in the Darfur Region and in Somalia, with most of the soldiers used in that mission coming from Uganda and Burundi. The only country in Africa that is not a member of the AU is Morocco who left the Union in 1984 (when it was still the OAU) due to the AU's recognition of the Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic as a Member State. However, Morocco has a special status within the AU and benefits from the services available to all AU states.

## 3.2 Organs of the African Union

### 3.2.1 The Assembly (AU-AHSG)

The Assembly of the African Union is formally known as the African Union Assembly of Heads of State and Government (AU-AHSG). The AU-AHSG came into existence on May 25th 1963 and it consists of all Heads of State and Government of all its 54 members. The Assembly meets once a year at the AU Submit. The AU-AHSG performs nine (9) basic functions:

i. Set policies of the Union;
ii. Decide on what action to take after consideration of reports and recommendations from the other organs of the Union;
iii. Consider membership requests into the Union;
iv. Create bodies for the Union;
v. Monitor the implementation of policies and decisions of the Union as well as ensure compliance by all Member States;
vi. Create a budget of the Union;
vii. Provide direction to the Executive Council on conflicts, war and other emergency situations and the restoration of peace;
viii. Select judges for and withdraw judges of the Court of Justice; and
ix. Appoint the Chairman of the Commission, Commissioners of the Commission, all respective deputies and determine how long they will serve and what duties they will perform.

The AU-AHSG make its decisions by consensus or a two-third majority of votes by Member States.

### 3.2.2 The Economic, Social and Cultural Council (ECOSOCC)

The ECOSOCC is an advisory body of the AU designed to give civil society organizations a voice within the AU. Thus, the ECOSOCC comprises of civil society organizations from a wide range of sectors such as business and professional bodies, service providers, policy think tanks and labor – both within Africa and African bodies in the diaspora.

### 3.2.3 The AU Commission

The AU Commission is the secretariat of the AU. It is made up of a number of Commissioners dealing with different areas of policy. The AU Commission is headquartered in Addis Ababa and the current head of the Commission, since 2012, is a South African and ex-wife of South Africa's President, NkosazanaDlamini-Zuma, who replaced Jean Ping, a Gabonese, in July of 2012. The AU Commission is made up of ten (10) Directorates: Directorate of Conference Management and Publications; Directorate of Peace and Security; Directorate of Political Affairs, Directorate of Infrastructure and Energy; Directorate of Social Affairs; Directorate of Resources, Science and Technology; Directorate of Trade and Industry; Directorate of Economy and Agriculture; Directorate of Economic Affairs; and the Office of the Legal Counsel.

### 3.2.4 The Executive Council

The Executive Council of the African Union is made up of ministers designated by the governments of Member countries. They discuss issues of concern and prepare material for the AU-AHSG, to whom they are responsible. The Executive Council is empowered to make decisions on five (5) different topics: Foreign trade, social security, food, agriculture and communications. The Executive Council makes its decisions by consensus or by a two-thirds majority of the Member States.

### 3.2.5 The Pan African Parliament (PAP)

The PAP is the legislative body of the AU and it held its very first session in March 2004. The PAP is made up of three (3) main bodies and ten permanent committees that exercises oversight functions and has advisory and consultative powers. The PAP comprises of 235 representatives that are elected by the legislatures of 47 of the 54 AU Member States. During its sessions, each Member State is expected to send a delegation of five parliamentarians with at least one female parliamentarian. Some of the objectives of the PAP includes: to implement the policies and objectives of the AU; to cultivate human rights and democracy in Africa; to make sure Member States adhere to good governance, transparency and accountability; to engender peace, security and stability in Africa, amongst others.

### 3.3 The African Security Environment

The nature of African security problems and the various attempts to resolve them have been constant features of the post-colonial period, shaping relations among African states, their societies and the international community. At the heart of this situation is the condition of the African state and its weaknesses, variously diagnosed as rooted in the structural legacies of colonialism and neocolonial cleavages. As a result, African security was conceived and addressed by independence leaders whose focus was on strategies aimed at dismantling colonial rule, engaging in post-colonial nation-building that was primarily given expression through the strengthening of authoritarian rule, and finding ways of accommodating foreign influence that were mostly framed within the terms of the exigencies of the Cold War.

With the end of the Cold War and the wave of democratization spreading across the African continent, starting in Benin in 1991 and winding its way across much of Africa, a new security agenda for the continent began to take shape. It was primarily oriented towards managing these potentially volatile transitions away from authoritarianism and conflict and, as such, emphasized peacekeeping and the building of liberal institutions. African leaders, led by Salim Salim, at the Organization for African Unity (OAU), attempted to revitalize the regional approach to security on the continent in the early 1990s, laying the basis of many of the normative changes through the Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Cooperation in Africa.

A turning point in the African security environment was finally reached with the massive failure of the international community and its African partners to stem the tide of instability, destruction and genocide in countries such as Somalia, Rwanda, Liberia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). These “new wars”, said to be motivated by “greed and grievance”, exposed the severe deficiencies of some African states in managing complex claims to legitimacy and the effective allocation of national resources – deficiencies variously rooted in ethnicity, chronic deprivation and administrative corruption or failure. The result was to spur on an expanded discourse that diagnosed the sources of African insecurity as rooted in governance failures and aimed to address these through a range of policy prescriptions that included external intervention on humanitarian grounds and built on past precedents of the comprehensive restructuring of the continent’s economic and governance institutions. Collectively characterized as “liberal peace” and given expression through processes that led to the UN Summit on the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and the establishment of the Commission on Peacebuilding in 2005, these plans were realized in UN sanctioned interventions in the DRC and Sudan.

For Africa, these enhanced efforts at tackling security were integrated into the transformation of the OAU into the AU, a process that culminated in 2002 with the passage of the Constitutive Act. The African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) that emerged from this process was a five-pronged system composed of the Peace and Security Council (PSC), the Early Warning System (EWS), the African Standby Force (ASF), the Panel of the Wise, the Peace Fund and the eight designated regional economic communities (RECs) – although only five presently lead in this area. Notably, the AU provisions for intervention as described in Article 4 went well beyond the OAU's defensive posture on sovereignty to one predicated on "non-indifference", calling outright for intervention in cases of genocide, ethnic cleansing and other forms of conflict where the state had abrogated its responsibilities to its citizens. Coupled to this was a more robust endorsement of peacebuilding, democratic governance and institutional development through the issuing of the Common African Defense and Security Policy in 2004 and the Declaration on Unconstitutional Changes of Government in 2009.

Despite these changes to formal policy and greater international activism, improvements in African security still remain distressingly episodic, with regional leadership seen in peace support operations in West African conflicts and UN involvement limited to selective involvement in peacekeeping and monitoring operations in Somalia, the DRC and the Sudans. Given the low levels of development in Africa, which is characterized by states saddled with spiraling debt burdens that are incapable of providing domestic revenue and channeling investment into the public sector, and a foreign investment community that rarely looks beyond the extractive sector, the dire conditions in Africa seemed fixed in a cycle of insecurity.

### 3.3.1 The African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA)

The APSA evolved in the late 1990s when the continent was hit with several conflicts and crises such as the Somalian Civil War in 1991 and the Rwandan Genocide in 1994. The APSA needed to be drawn because the provisions of the OAU – the noninterference in the affairs of Member States - did not allow for intervention by other African States into the affairs of other States, even when in conflict. In the new APSA provisions, and the regional body now African Union (AU), the Constitutive Act was added that provided for non-indifference by Member States and which marked a turning point in African relations.

The Constitutive Act thus allowed African States to intervene in a third State even against the will of the respective government in case of crimes against humanity, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and genocide. This agreement is a landmark one as it is the first of its

kind under international law which includes the right to militarily intervene in a third state base on humanitarian reasons, a term now known as humanitarian intervention. The key driver of the emergence and evolution of the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) is the understanding that ensuring peace and order is a prerequisite for the promotion of peace, development and the improvement of Africans' livelihoods.

Overall, the APSA exists because of a convergence of interests shared by most AU member states in pursuing common interests. The AU's security architecture is based on collective and human security issues to be operationalized by several institutional processes, including the Continental Early Warning System (CEWS), the African Standby Force (ASF), the Panel of the Wise and the Peace Fund. Overseeing these processes is the Peace and Security Council (PSC). The powers of the PSC are extensive in that it is mandated to deal with 'hard' and 'soft' security issues ranging from peacemaking to peace-building and humanitarian assistance.

The APSA is driven by two main organs; the Peace and Security Council (PSC) and the African Standby Force (ASF). These two organs are saddled with the responsibilities of implementing the provisions and decisions of the APSA as agreed by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the African Union. We discuss these two organs next.

### 3.3.2 The Peace and Security Council (PSC)

The Peace and Security Council (PSC) of the African Union (AU) is the successor to the OAU's Central Organ of the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution and is the standing organ for the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts. The PSC is a very important organ in the APSA. The PSC was primarily established to be a collective security arrangement that has the ability to timely intervene in conflict and cases of insecurity on the continent. The main function of the PSC is to carry out early warning and preventive diplomacy, facilitate peacekeeping, establish peace-support operations, and when necessary, intervene in Member States to restore peace and security. Thus, the main function of the PSC under the APSA is to foster peace and security in Africa.

The PSC has a 15 member structure that are elected by the AU Executive Council and endorsed by the Assembly with Central Africa having three seats, Eastern Africa having three seats, Northern Africa having two seats, Southern Africa three seats and Western Africa with four seats. Five members are elected for three (3) years and ten members for two years. Members are elected according to the principle of equitable regional representation.

According to Article 20 of the Constitutive Act as outlined in the AU's website, www.au.int/en/organs/psc, the PSC has the following core responsibilities:

i. Anticipate and prevent disputes and conflicts, as well as policies which may lead to genocide and crimes against humanity;
ii. Undertake peace-making, peace-building and peace-support missions;
iii. Recommend intervention in a Member State in respect of grave circumstances such as war crimes, genocides, and crimes against humanity;
iv. Implement the AU's common defense policy;
v. Ensure implementation of key conventions and instrument to combat international terrorism;
vi. Promote coordination between regional mechanisms and the AU regarding peace, security and stability in Africa;
vii. Follow-up promotion of democratic practices, good governance, the rule of law, protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for the sanctity of human life and international humanitarian law;
viii. Promote and encourage the implementation of conventions and treaties on arms control and disarmament;
ix. Examine and take action in situations where the national independence and sovereignty of Member State is threatened by acts of aggression, including by mercenaries;
x. Support and facilitate humanitarian action in situations of armed conflicts or major natural disasters.

### 3.3.3 The African Standby Force (ASF)

When it comes to conflict management, the African Standby Force is arguably the key intervention mechanism in the AU's security architecture. When operational, it will consist of standby multidisciplinary contingents stationed in their respective countries of origin and ready for rapid deployment as soon as required. The mandate of the standby force covers a wide range of actions, from observation and monitoring missions, humanitarian assistance, to more complex peace support missions, intervention in a Member State in grave circumstances, or at the request of a Member State, to the restoration of peace and security, preventive deployment and peace building. The ASF is also a key organ of the APSA.

The PSC Protocol (Article 13(1) and (2)) envisages that the ASF will be deployed where the PSC decides on a peace-support mission or where intervention is authorized by the

AU Assembly. Article 13 of the PSC Protocol outlined the following as the mandate of the ASF:

i. Observation and monitoring missions;
ii. Intervention in a Member State in respect of grave circumstances or at the request of a Member State in order to restore peace and security;
iii. Prevention of a dispute or conflict escalating;
iv. Peace-building including post-conflict disarmament and demobilization;
v. Humanitarian assistance;
vi. Any other functions mandated by the Peace and Security Council (PSC) or AU Assembly.

The ASF is divided into five (5) regional groupings: The Central African Standby Force (CASF), Eastern Africa Standby Force (EASF), North African Regional Capability (NARC), Southern Africa Standby Force (SASF), and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Standby Force (ESF). Since 2003, eight (8) AU-led Support Operations (PSOs) have been deployed. Some of these deployments are the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM), African Union-United Nations Mission in Darfur (UNAMID), African Union led International Support Mission in Central African Republic (MISCA), African Union led International Support Mission in Mali (AFISMA), African Union Mission for Support to the Elections in Comoros (AMISEC), African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS), African Union Mission in Burundi (AMIB).

### *3.5 Some African Regional Organizations and Groups with Security Functions*

| Organization | Year Founded | No of States | Website |
|---|---|---|---|
| African Union (AU) | 2001 | 54 | www.africa-union.org |
| Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) | 1994 | 20 | www.comesa.int |
| Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CEN-SAD) | 1998 | 25 | www.cen-sad.org |
| East African Community (EAC) | 1999 | 6 | www.eac.int |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) | 1975 | 15 | www.ecowas.int |
| Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) | 1996 | 7 | www.igad.org |
| Southern African Development Community (SADC) | 1992 | 14 | www.sadc.int |
| Mano River Union | 1973 | 3 | - |

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

The main objective of the African Union is the promotion of peace, security and stability in Africa, the organization is also concerned with issues like the economy, politics, culture and the environment. Although, cases of insecurity is still pervasive in almost all parts of Africa, the African Union (AU) has fared better than its predecessor, the OAU, since its emergence in 2002, especially because of its doctrine of non-indifference as contained in its Constitutive Act. The AU, unlike its predecessor, has demonstrated a willingness to be actively involved in continental security issues, having suspended nine member governments for constitutional violations, applied sanctions against six member governments and authorized several peace support operations in the last decade.

The contemporary world is far more complex and Africa is not immune to the security threats that many countries around the world now face. But it is not all bad news. Africa is actually doing better in terms of the security of its citizenry. Today, and despite a few egregious exceptions, armed conflict is actually a smaller risk to most Africans than traffic accidents and the continent's growth rate in the last fifteen years has been between 5 and 6 percent. As a result of this, extreme poverty in Africa has fallen by 40% since 1990. However, progress remains uneven, and the dangers today are both internal and external. Rebel groups have flourished in the impoverished parts of weak states that feel hard-done by their governments, where the population is often abused by the security forces, or where they do not trust the courts to deliver justice while external forces takes advantage of these shortcomings.

Africa cannot ignore that from Mauritania in the west to Somalia in the east, the flag of Jihad is being raised. More than a dozen sub-Saharan countries are concerned, and tens of thousands have already died as a result. Boko Haram actually killed more people last year than the Islamic State in Syria and Iraq did.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

The African Union (AU) was established in 2002 to replace the Organization of African Unity (OAU) with objectives such as: achieve greater unity and solidarity between African countries and Africans, to promote peace, security, and stability in Africa, to promote and defend African common positions on issues of interest to the continent and its peoples, to encourage international cooperation - taking due account of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, etc. In order to effectively carry out its objectives, the African Union (AU) is has different organs; administrative and political, who together work for the attainment of the organization's objectives. Some of these organs are the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, the AU Commission, the Pan African Parliament (PAP), the Executive Council and the Economic, Social and Cultural Council (ECOSOCC).

This unit has discussed issues surrounding security in Africa particularly by looking at the activities of the African Union and its organs such as the Peace and Security Council and the African Standby Force, together making up the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA). Even though much of Africa is still enmeshed in crisis and conflicts, the continent has made some positive improvements in securing citizens of Africa, an achievement that has reduced extreme poverty. Since 2003, the AU has successfully intervened in conflicts in eight (8) African States and one would not like to imagine what the situation in those countries would have been without the intervention of the Union.

## 6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT

i. Name the organs of the African Union (AU) and discuss the functions of two of them.
ii. How has the African Union (AU) fared in ensuring peace and security in Africa?
iii. Why is the Constitutive Act a breakthrough for peace and security in Africa?
iv. What are the functions of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the AU?

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING


Adebayo, A. (2014). Africa's peacemakers: Nobel peace laureates of African descent. Zed Books.

Aning, E, K. (n.d). Managing Regional Security in West Africa: Ecowas, Ecomog, and Liberia. Center for Development Research. Indiana University.

Boulden, J. (ed.) (2003). Dealing with conflict in Africa. The United Nations and Regional Organizations. Palgrave Macmillan US.

Jaye, T &Garuba, D. (eds.) (2011). ECOWAS and the Dynamics of Conflict and Peace-building. CODESRIA Senegal.

Macmillan, M. (2013). The war that ended peace: How Europe abandoned peace for the First World War. Profile Books.

Nyangoni, W. (1985). Africa in the United Nations System. Fairleigh Dickinson.

Souari, I. (2006). Africa in the United Nations System (1945 – 2005). Adonis & Abbey Publishers

White, H. (2013). The China Choice; Why we should share power. Oxford University Press

## MODULE 3: REGIONAL SECURITY IN POST-COLONIAL AFRICA

**Unit 1: The ECOWAS and Security in Western Africa**

**Unit 2: The Southern African Development Community and Security in Southern Africa**

**Unit 3: The East African Community and Security in Eastern Africa**

**Unit 4: The Community of Sahel-Saharan States and Security in Northern Africa.**

## UNIT 1: THE ECOWAS AND SECURITY IN WESTERN AFRICA



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) (known in French as *Communauteeconomique des Etats de I'Afrique de I'Ouest (CEDEAO))* is a regional organization comprising of fifteen (15) West African countries. The body was founded on 28th May 1975 in Lagos, Nigeria, with a mission to promote economic integration across the West African sub-region. Contained in the *Treaty of Lagos* that heralded the body, the ECOWAS was founded to achieve collective self-sufficiency for West African countries by creating a single large trading bloc through an economic and trading union. The body is also to serve as a peacekeeping force in the sub-region. The organization operates in three languages: English, French and Portuguese. A monitoring Group, (ECOMOG) – the military arm of the ECOWAS was established with the mandate of maintaining peace and security in the sub-region as this is critical to the achievement of the goals of the ECOWAS. Between 1990 and 2002, ECOMOG engaged in peacekeeping and peace enforcement missions first in Liberia and then Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau, and Cote d' Ivoire.

This lecture discusses the ECOMOG and security in Africa: its origin/establishment, its peace operations in the sub-region and its challenges and prospects.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

This lectures sets out to introduce the student to the ECOMOG. At the end of the lecture, the student should appreciate the role of ECOWAS and its sister body, the ECOMOG, in promoting security and democracy in West Africa.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 Origin and Establishment of the ECOMOG

The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) or *Communauteeconomique des Etats de I'Afrique de I'Ouest*was created on 23 May 1975 by the Treaty of Lagos in Nigeria. The regional organization comprising of all countries in Western Africa was created to promote economic trade, national cooperation, and monetary union for the growth and development of the region. Another treaty was signed on July 24 1993 which was an improvement of the Lagos Treaty. Under this revised treaty, it sets out the goals of a common economic market, a single currency, the creation of a West African Parliament. Economic and social councils, and a court of Justice – which will interpret and mediates over disputes and also investigate alleged human rights abuses in member countries.

The founding members of the ECOWAS are: Benin, Burkina Faso (joined the organization as Upper Volta), Cote d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritius (left the ECOWAS in 2002), Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo and Cape Verde (joined in 1977). Currently, there are fifteen (15) member countries in ECOWAS. They are: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo. The official languages for the organization is English, French and Portuguese. The total population of ECOWAS according to a 2013 estimate is three hundred and forty million (340,000,000).

The structure of the ECOWAS has changed several times over the years. Currently, the organization has seven (7) active organs. These key organs of the ECOWAS are: The Authority of Heads of State and Government, the Council of Ministers, the Executive Commission (this is further subdivided into 16 departments), the ECOWAS Parliament, the ECOWAS Court of Justice, a body of Specialized Technical Committees, and the ECOWAS Bank for Investment and Development (EBID). The Authority of Heads of State and Government is the highest decision-making organ of the ECOWAS. The Lagos

Treaty of 1975 also created an organ – the Economic and Social Council to carry out advisory functions but currently, ECOWAS do not list it as part of its structure. In addition to these seven organs, ECOWAS also has six specialized institutions/agencies: the West African Health Organization (WAHO), the West African Monetary Agency (WAMA), the Intergovernmental Action Group against Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing in West Africa, the ECOWAS Gender and Development Center, ECOWAS Youths and Sport Development Center and ECOWAS Water Resources Coordination Center.

The ECOWAS treaty also lays the burden of settling disputes and conflicts within the region on members. ECOWAS nations signed a non-aggression protocol in 1990 along with two earlier agreements in 1978 and 1981. They also signed a Protocol on Mutual Defense Assistance in Freetown, Sierra Leone in May 1981 that provided for the establishment of an Allied Armed Force of the Community (This objective gave birth to the ECOWAS ceasefire Monitoring Group known as ECOMOG. The ECOMOG was created to ensure the prosperity and development of West Africa and the wellbeing of its populations but it knows that development cannot be achieved in environments of violence and conflicts. The ECOMOG was particularly created as a peacekeeping force for the civil wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone and was disbanded at their cessation. The ECOWAS, even though with the creation of the ECOMOG, do not have a standing force. Each force is raised when the need arises and it is named by the mission for which it is created.

The ECOMOG was first deployed in Liberia when the Charles Taylor led National Patriotic Front (NPFL) attacked Liberia In December 1989 due to its opposition of the Samuel Doe's government in that country. The following year, that is in 1990, ECOWAS initiated peace moves between Samuel Doe and Charles Taylor's that saw the landing of an ECOMOG contingent – with troops from Nigeria, Ghana and Gambia, in Monrovia, the Liberian capital, deployed under the directives of the ECOWAS Authority of Heads of States.

The ECOMOG is involved in three main aspects; intervention, peacekeeping and peace enforcement. The intervention missions are carried out when Member States invites the ECOMOG to help them in fighting attacks from domestic rebels in order to forestall the collapse of law and order in such countries. The aim of ECOMOG intervention initiative is to create a conducive atmosphere for negotiation/discussions and to protect non-combatants i.e. members of the public not involved in the fighting. In 1998, ECOMOG, with strong backing from Nigeria and her Head of State; General Sani Abacha,

successfully restored and reinstated the elected government of TejjanKabbah in Sierra Leone.

As a military body, ECOMOG first utilizes its intervention strategy and when that is not enough to restore the peace, it embarks on peacekeeping. Where peacekeeping fails, it engages in peace enforcement by deploying the use of force or the threat of the use of force on one or both of the warring parties to force them to comply with peace agreements.

## 3.2 ECOMOG Security and Peace Interventions in West Africa

This section will discuss ECOMOG's security and peace interventions using three West African countries as the case studies: Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea Bissau.

### 3.2.1 Liberia

Liberia, officially known as the Republic of Liberia is a West African country. The country derived its name from Latin which means "Land of the Free". Liberia is bordered by Sierra Leone to its west, Guinea to its north and Ivory Coast to its east. The country covers an area of 111,369 square kilometers and has a population of 4,503,000 (World Bank Country Page for Liberia, 2015). The country has over 20 indigenous languages but its official language is English and Monrovia its capital and largest city. Liberia is Africa's first and oldest republic and was never colonized by another nation. Government in Liberia combines unitary constitutionality and representative democracy. The President serves as head of government, head of state and the commander-in-chief of the Armed Forces of Liberia (CIA: The World Factbook). The Liberian economy is dependent heavily on foreign aid, foreign direct investment and the export of natural resources such as iron ore, rubber and timber (Bateman, Egan, Gold and Gardner, 2000)

Liberia is the first beneficiary of the ECOMOG peace operation mission during the supremacy conflict between Samuel Doe's government and the NPFL rebels led by Charles Taylor in 1990. The ECOMOG Mission in Liberia comprised of contingents from eleven (11) Member States of ECOWAS. These countries were Nigeria, Ghana, Togo, Gambia, Burkina Faso, Sierra Leone, Mali, Guinea Bissau, Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast), Niger and Senegal.

The National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL), a rebel group led by Charles Taylor launched an insurrection in December 1989 against the government of Samuel Doe and triggered the first Liberian civil war. The Liberian civil war has been described as one of Africa's bloodiest wars claiming the lives of more than 200,000 Liberians and displacing

a million others in neighboring countries. Samuel Doe had become the President of Liberia when he led a military coup in April 1980 against President William R. Tolbert, Jr. Doe killed the President along with majority of his cabinet members. An ally of the West, Samuel Doe received significant financial banking from the United States (Duva, 2002). The Charles Taylor's led NPFL insurrection against the Doe's government had the backing of neighboring countries such as Burkina Faso and Ivory Coast. By September 1990, troops loyal to Samuel Doe controlled only a small area just outside Monrovia and Doe was captured and executed by the NPFL rebels. As is often typical with rebels, the NPFL soon split into various factions and began fighting one another. Due to the escalating violence, the ECOMOG organized a military task force to intervene in the crisis.

The peacekeeping mission of the ECOMOG forces was changed to peace enforcement after ECOMOG troops were attacked by Charles Taylor's NPFL outside Monrovia, the Liberian capital, in October 1992. This attack came after the NPFL had succeeded in taking over all other parts of the country (including the Robertville International Airport in Monrovia), except Monrovia, which is the capital city and the seat of government, and which was under the protection of the ECOMOG troops. However, in January 1993, the ECOMOG troops successfully defeated the NPFL from all the cities under its control, took over the Robertville International Airport, the Buchanan Seaport and the Firestone Rubber plantation. On the whole, the ECOMOG mission in Liberia included operations involving peacekeeping, peace enforcement, mediation and disarmament. ECOMOG's operations in Liberia officially ended in February 1990 following the restoration of peace and the instalment of Charles Taylor as Liberia's President in 1997.

It is important to note that two other African countries who are not members of the ECOWAS; Tanzania and Uganda, also sent its troops to Liberia to support the efforts of the ECOMOG in that country.

### 3.2.2 Guinea-Bissau

Guinea-Bissau, officially known as the Republic of Guinea-Bissau is a West African country. It covers 36,125 square kilometers with an estimated population of 1,704,000. The country's official language is Portuguese even though only 14% of its population speak the language. Guinea-Bissau has a history of political instability since its independence in 1974, no elected president has successfully served a full five-year term in office. While the president is the head of state, the prime minister is the head of government. The country's per-capita gross domestic product (GDP) is one of the lowest

in the world. The name of its capital and largest city; Bissau, was added to the country's name making it Guinea-Bissau so as to differentiate it from Guinea which is also another country in Western Africa.

Conflict erupted in Guinea Bissau when a section of about 400 troops loyal to the former Chief of Defense Staff, General Asunmane Mane launched a rebellion against the administration of President Joao Benardo "Nino" Vieira in June 1998. General Mane had been suspended by the President following allegations about his involvement in the smuggling of illegal arms into the country. President Vieira had himself come into power after leading a relatively bloodless coup after independence President Luis Cabral. General Mane captured the Bra Military Barracks Complex and the country's airport in the capital city of Bissau. General Mane proclaimed himself head of an interim military council, the Military Junta, and called for fresh and transparent elections.

The immediate reaction was for the troops loyal to President Vieira to counter-attack Mane's troops. The conflict assumed an international dimension when, three days after the conflict had begun, Senegal and Guinea dispatched 1,300 and 500 troops respectively to fight on the part of the government. These unilateral efforts of Senegal and Guinea did not do much as they were matched by the rebel troops of General Mane.

The international community, under the auspices of the United Nations, European Union and the African Union all condemned the rebel activities and began a series of diplomatic moves to resolve the crisis. Eventually, the mantle fell on ECOWAS and a number of mediation committees undertook a series of talks to resolve the crisis. In June 1998 the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) used the ECOWAS Ceasefire Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) to intervene in Guinea-Bissau. ECOMOG repulsed the rebellion by General Asunmane Mane and restored President Vieira back to power as the legitimate president of the country. This ECOMOG intervention operation was in response to a legitimate request by President Vieira.

In November of 1998, under the auspices of ECOWAS, the two main gladiators in the conflict, President Vieira and General Mane signed the Abuja Agreement. The Agreement required the formation of a government of national unity including members of the Junta, a legislative and presidential elections to be monitored by ECOWAS and the international community, and the replacement of Senegalese and Guinean troops by ECOMOG troops. The ECOMOG contingent comprised of troops from Togo, Niger and Benin Republic. The express plan of the ECOMOG mission was to supervise and control ceasefire agreements between the warring parties. However, in spite of ECOMOG's

intervention, in May 1999, the government of President Vieira was toppled by a rebellion led by the Military Junta.

### 3.2.3 Sierra Leone

Sierra Leone, officially called the Republic of Sierra Leone, is a country in Western Africa. It is bordered by Guinea to the north, Liberia to the southeast and the Atlantic Ocean to the southwest. The total area of the country is 71,740 $km^2$. Based on the 2015 national census, the country's population is 7,075,641. The country became independent in 1961 and is divided into four regions: Northern Province, Eastern Province, Southern Province and Western Province with Freetown as its capital. English is the official language though the Creole language is the most widely spoken language in the country. Even though the country is dominated by Muslims, the country's Christian minority are influential. Sierra Leone is regarded as one of the most religiously tolerant nations in the world because Muslims and Christians collaborate and interact with each other peacefully. Its major earnings comes from diamond, gold, rutile, titanium and bauxite.

The brutal civil war raging in Liberia, a neighboring country to Sierra Leone, played a significant role in the outbreak of fighting in Sierra Leone as Charles Taylor, the Leader of the National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) in Liberia helped the FodaySankoh led Revolutionary United Front (RUF) in Sierra Leone. Charles Taylor's aim was to use the RUF to attack the ECOMOG peacekeeping troops in Sierra Leone who were also on ground in Liberia and who were opposed to his rebel movement in Liberia.

On 25 May 1997, seventeen soldiers in the Sierra Leone army loyal to the detained Major General Johnny Paul Koroma and led by Corporal TambaGborie, launched a military coup and sent President Kabbah into exile in Guinea. They established the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC), released Koroma from detention and installed him as the chairman of the AFRC and the Head of State of Sierra Leone. General Koroma suspended the constitution, banned demonstrations, shut own all private radio stations in the country and invited FodaySankoh to be the vice-chairman of the new AFRC-RUF coalition Junta government.

After nine months in office, the AFRC-RUF junta was overthrown by the ECOMOG and President Kabbah was reinstated in February 1998. At the peak of its operations in the country, ECOMOG deployed up to 13,000 soldiers from Nigeria, Ghana, Guinea and Mali who performed interventionist, peacekeeping and peace enforcement roles. The ECOMOG mission in Sierra Leone was deployed in 1997, with a final release in 2000, two years before the declaration of peace. ECOMOG troops largely made up of

contingents from Nigeria fought against the Revolutionary United Front (RUF). They played a critical role in saving lives, and the mission is best remembered for its role in the siege of Freetown on 6 January. Such as in Liberia, they established the stability that has created a humanitarian corridor and a stable environment that later allowed the UN to intervene. Although there were challenges, ECOMOG mission played a critical role in the introduction of peace and stability in Sierra Leone. In furtherance of its mission, ECOMOG led the warring parties in signing a peace agreement in Lome, the capital of Togo, in September 1999.

### 3.3 Challenges and Prospects of the ECOMOG

In carrying out its operations, whether interventions, peacekeeping or peace enforcement, the ECOMOG has faced a lot of challenges – military, political, financial and diplomatic challenges. In the case of its mission to Liberia, which was its very first mission, the ECOMOG troops suffered challenges in military hardware and in language. With regards to military challenges, troops lacked weapons, adequate supplies of boats and uniforms. Also, each participating State sought to get its command from their home governments instead of the Commander of the ECOMOG mission in Liberia. On the language front, there was the absence of adequate communication between troops because they spoke different languages, especially French and English. To address these challenges, it is important that ECOWAS Member States contribute finances on a periodical basis to the ECOMOG and for the missions to include soldiers who are linguists who have a good understanding of French and English to serve as interpreters or as unit commanders and staff officers.

Another challenge that have bedeviled the successful operations of the ECOMOG is inadequacy of air power. This is a challenge because much of the physical terrain of West Africa is forests and thus conducive for habitation by insurgent combatants and guerillas. When the ECOMOG is empowered with air power by the provision of more helicopters, it can better engage these insurgents.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

Wherever crises occur, it never occurs in isolation and this goes to show that what happens in one country affects other countries. West African countries have been enmeshed in diverse conflicts and challenges such as increasing population, extreme

poverty, rising rates of unemployment, political instabilities, chronic water shortages, lack of education, poor healthcare, corruption, dearth of infrastructures, coups, inequality, religious and ethnic clashes, food insecurity, poor governance, kidnappings, HIV/AIDS, militancy, terrorism, amongst others. Almost no West African country is spared and these issues have security implications in regional and global basis. Challenges to the achievement of durable peace and security in West Africa need to be seen in context, as they feed off each other and create a complex security environment.

However, the story of West Africa is not all gloom as, especially since 2010, much has been achieved by most countries in the region. For example, some intractable conflicts in West Africa have ended, standards of living of both infant and maternal mortality have improved; HIV/AIDS infection has begun to be reduced, levels of education is increasing, and many West Africans now have access to portable drinking water. However, even with this achievements, it has become important for countries in the sub-region, individually or collectively, to develop a multilateral system to meet the challenges, particularly the challenge of terrorism, which many countries in the region, especially countries in the Chad Basin, such as Nigeria, Cameroun and Chad, continue to face. Thus, there is the need for more strategic coherence with stronger analytical capacity across regions, more effective communication among regions, and strategic partnerships with the international community.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

The ECOMOG was established as the military arm of the ECOWAS to ensure peace, security and development in the West-African sub-region. Through the instrumentality of the ECOMOG, the ECOWAS has successfully carried out interventionist, peacekeeping and peace enforcement missions in West African States such as Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea Bissau. The intervention missions are carried out when Member States invites the ECOMOG to help them in fighting attacks from domestic rebels in order to forestall the continued collapse of law and order in these countries. The aim of ECOMOG intervention initiative is to create a conducive atmosphere for negotiation/discussions and to protect non-combatants i.e. members of the public not involved in the fighting.

## 6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS

1. Discuss the ECOMOG peacekeeping intervention in any country of your choice.
2. What are the challenges confronting ECOMOG in its quest to ensure security and democracy in Western Africa?

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Adeyeri, J. O. (2016), Sub-Regional Leadership and Collective Security in West Africa: ECOMOG Military Operations, 1990 – 2002

Aning, E, K. (nd). Managing Regional Security in West Africa: Ecowas, Ecomog, and Liberia. Center for Development Research. Indiana University.

Bateman, G; Egan, V; Gold, F; and Gardner, P. (2000): Encyclopedia of World Geography. New York: Barnes & Noble Books.

Boulden, J. (ed.) (2003). Dealing with conflict in Africa. The United Nations and Regional Organizations. Palgrave Macmillan US.

Duva, A.M. (2002): "Liberia and the United States: A Complex Relationship".

Economic Community of West African States. (Official website, 2016)

Jaye, T &Garuba, D. (eds.) (2011). ECOWAS and the Dynamics of Conflict and Peace-building. CODESRIA Senegal.

Nyangoni, Wellington. (1985). Africa in the United Nations System. Fairleigh Dickinson.

Souari, Issaka. (2006). Africa in the United Nations System (1945 – 2005). Adonis & Abbey Publishers.

## UNIT 2: THE SOUTHERN AFRICA DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY (SADC) AND SECURITY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

## CONTENT



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Africa's regional economic communities (RECs) are playing an increasingly important role in peace and security. Originally, these RECs were established with economic goals and objectives such as trade, integrating African economies and enabling development. However, following the realization that all these cannot be achieved with security and peace – especially as there are many conflicts in Africa – these RECs added peace and security to their objectives. The Southern African Development Community is one of these RECs that more recently added peace and security to its agenda. Established in 1992, the was established under Article 2 of the SADC Treaty by SADC Member States represented by their respective Heads of State and Government, or duly authorized representatives, to spearhead economic integration of Southern Africa. This unit discusses the SADC and its role in regional peace and security in Southern Africa.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, the student is expected to understand the working and operations of the South African Development Community and its role in the development and security of countries in southern Africa.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 The Transformation from SADCC to SADC

The formation of SADC was the result of a long process of consultation by the leaders of Southern Africa as described below:

- From 1977, active consultations were undertaken by representatives of Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Swaziland, United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia, working together as Frontline States, culminating in a meeting of Foreign Ministries of the Frontline States in Gaborone, Botswana, in May 1979, which called for a meeting of ministers responsible for economic development.
- That meeting was subsequently convened in Arusha, Tanzania, in July 1979. The Arusha meeting led to the birth of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) a year later.
- SADCC was officially formed on 1st April, 1980 comprising of all the majority ruled states of Southern Africa, Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The Heads of States and government of the Frontline States and representatives of the governments of Lesotho, Malawi, and Swaziland signed the Lusaka Declaration "Towards Economic Liberation" in Lusaka, Zambia and thus SADCC was born.
- The SADCC was subsequently formalized by means of a Memorandum of Understanding on the Institutions of the Southern African Development Coordination Conference dated 20th July 1981.
- In 1989, the Summit of Heads of State or Government, meeting in Harare, Zimbabwe, decided that SADCC should be formalized to "*give it an appropriate legal status … to replace the Memorandum of Understanding with an Agreement, Charter or Treaty*."
- On August 17 1992, at a Summit held in Windhoek, Namibia, the Heads of State and Government signed the SADC Declaration and Treaty that effectively

transformed the Southern African Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) into the Southern African Development Community (SADC). SADC was established under Article 2 of the SADC Treaty by SADC Member States represented by their respective Heads of State and Government, or duly authorized representatives, to spearhead economic integration of Southern Africa. The objective also shifted to include economic integration following the independence of the rest of the Southern African countries.

- On 14 August 2001, in Blantyre, Malawi, the SADC Heads of State and Government signed an Agreement Amending the 1992 SADC Treaty to establish the Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan.

### 3.1.2 The SADC Treaty

The SADC Treaty was signed to establish SADC as the successor to the Southern African Coordinating Conference (SADCC). This Treaty sets out the main objectives of SADC - to achieve development and economic growth, alleviate poverty, enhance the standard and quality of life of the peoples of Southern Africa and support the socially disadvantaged through regional integration. These objectives are to be achieved through increased regional integration, built on democratic principles, and equitable and sustainable development.

The SADC Treaty established a series of Institutional Mechanisms, including the following:

- Summit of Heads of State or Government,
- Council of Ministers,
- Standing Committee of Officials,
- A Secretariat; and
- A Tribunal.

### 3.1.3 Amendment of the SADC Treaty

Following the establishment of the SADC Treaty, SADC undertook an exercise to restructure its institutions and at an Extra-ordinary Summit on March 9, 2001 in Windhoek, Namibia, the SADC Treaty Amendment(2001) was adopted. This restructuring was part of institutional reform necessitated by a number of difficulties and

constraints encountered in the transition from a coordinating **Conference** into a **Community.** These reforms established eight (8) institutions, under the guidance of Article 9 of the Treaty Amendment, including the following:

- Summit of Heads of State or Government;
- Organ on Politics, Defense and Security Co-operation;
- Council of Ministers;
- A Secretariat;
- A Tribunal;
- The Troika;
- Standing Committee of Officials; and
- SADC National Committees.

The SADC Treaty was also amended with an **Agreement** that established the Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP). This plan, based on the strategic priorities of SADC and the Common Agenda, is designed to provide strategic direction with respect to SADC projects, programmes and activities.

SADC also forms part of the AU's African Peace and Security Architecture (ASPA), and in this capacity it has established one of the five proposed regional brigades, SADCBRIG. This consists of a small planning element at SADC headquarters in Gaborone, and earmarked military units based in the various SADC member states, as well as a civilian and a police component. Various training exercises have been carried out to test the brigade's effectiveness, most recently Exercise Golfino held mostly in South Africa in September 2009. The brigade aims to deploy on peacekeeping operations, eventually including enforcement tasks and carrying out complex multifunctional peace support operations. However, SADCBRIG does not have a dedicated conflict resolution capacity.

SADC is technically a subsidiary body of the AU, which in turn derives a security mandate from Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, which gives (unspecified) regional organizations the right to carry out activities in terms of both Chapter VI and Chapter VII of the Charter, in other words including the right to utilize force in the resolution of conflicts, although only subject to mandate by the UN Security Council. As well as the regional brigades, of which SADCBRIG is one of the most advanced, the AU has established quite an elaborate set of structures responsible for peace and security (Cawthra, 2010).

### 3.2 SADC Conflict Resolution Instruments and Machinery

At its formation in 1980 in Lusaka, Zambia, the Southern African Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) aimed to advance the cause of liberating southern Africa and reducing its dependence on the then-apartheid South Africa. The transformation of SADCC into SADC in 1992, upon the signing of the SADC Treaty and Declaration at the Windhoek Summit in Namibia, was later followed by the landmark amendment of the SADC Treaty in Mach 2001. This amendment established institutional mechanisms that were key in the delivery of the organization's mandate. Among these mechanisms were the SADC Organ on Politics, Defense and Security Cooperation (OPDSC) and the related Troika (Article 9A and Article 10A, SADC, 2001).

The OPDSC, as provided for under Article 2 of the SADC Protocol on Politics, Defense and Security Cooperation and signed by the SADC member states in Blantyre, Malawi in August 2001, seeks to "promote peace and security in the Region", and one of its specific objectives is to "prevent, contain and resolve inter and intra-state conflict by peaceful means" (Article 2(2) (e) and Article 2(1) of the SADC Protocol on Politics, Defense and Security). The OPDSC presents a framework upon which member states coordinate peace, defense and security issues, and comprises two committees that make key decisions – the Inter-State Defense and Security Committee (ISDSC) and the Inter-State Politics and Diplomacy Committee (IPDC).

SADC therefore always strives to resolve emerging conflicts peacefully within and between member states through preventive diplomacy, negotiation, conciliation, good offices, adjudication, mediation or arbitration. Other than the latest efforts in Lesotho, SADC has historically been involved in interventions to resolve conflicts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Madagascar and Zimbabwe, with military interventions backed by member state armies in the DRC (1997) and Lesotho (1998). The success of SADC interventions in resolving conflicts has been varied, given the challenges presented by the conflicts, as they were different in terms of nature, causes, dynamics and level of complexity.

### 3.3 SADC Security and Peace Interventions in Southern Africa

While security scholars have been more likely to focus on the role of regional organizations in military peacekeeping, these organizations can and do play a role in non-military peacemaking and peacebuilding efforts, which remains the subject of fewer academic inquiries and intergovernmental strategies. This section explores the role of the SADC in the non-military functions of peace and security, including preventative diplomacy, peacemaking, and mediation. This section will discuss the SADC security and peace interventions using three Southern African countries as case studies: Lesotho, Zimbabwe and Madagascar.

#### 3.3.1 Lesotho

Lesotho or the Kingdom of Lesotho is one of the countries in Southern Africa. It is an enclaved and landlocked country surrounded by South Africa with a size of just over 30,000 $km^2$ (11,583 sq. mi) with its population slightly over two million (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2009). Its capital and largest city is Maseru. About 40% of the people of Lesotho lives below the international poverty line of US $1.25 a day (Human Development Indices, 2009). The economy of Lesotho is based on agriculture, livestock, manufacturing and mining, and depends heavily on inflows of workers' remittances and receipts from the Southern African Customs Union (SACU). Majority of its households survive on subsistence farming of food and animal. The country is among the "Low Human Development" countries and its ranks 160 of 187 countries on the Human Development Index as classified by the UNDP (CIA World book, 2009).

The conflict in Lesotho can be understood with a sufficient exposition of the country's historical context. The country has a long history of political instability and has experienced "high levels of factionalism, political tension, and violent conflict especially during and after elections" since its independence in October 1966 (Matlosa, 2007:2). The outcome of the first Lesotho elections in 1966, which were won by the Basotho National Party (BNP), was largely disputed and was followed by post-election violence. The next elections, in 1970, were declared null and void by the ruling BNP because it feared that the opposition political party, the Basutoland Congress Party (BCP) would win in that election (Matlosa, 2006). The outcome of the cancelation of the poll by the ruling BNP led to massive protests, violence and instability.

According to Motsamai (2015), in 1986, a coup ousted the BNP-led government and established a seven-year military rule. After the disputed elections in 1993, which were won by the BCP, an army-backed 'palace' coup took place in August 1994. This was

preceded by the assassination of the deputy Prime Minister, SelometsiBaholo, and a mutiny within the national army and police (Ngwawi, 2014). King Letsie III subsequently dissolved the democratically elected BCP government and Parliament, and replaced it with the Provisional Council of State (PCS). This action again, provoked widespread protests in the country.

Three countries in Southern Africa: Botswana, South Africa and Zimbabwe jointly facilitated a peace process in 1994. A process that led to the return to office of the BCP-led government. The 1998 elections were won by the Lesotho Congress for Democracy (LCD) – but again there were allegations of electoral fraud, which led to violent protests and political tension (Likoti, 2007).Upon invitation from the government and opposition parties in Lesotho, South Africa set up a commission of enquiry – comprising South Africa, Botswana and Zimbabwe – to audit the elections. The findings of the commission were questioned on the basis of credibility and reliability, leading to a string of events that ended in army mutinies and an attempted *coup d'état*. In September 1998, SADC intervened militarily through Operation Boleas, led by South African National Defense Force (SANDF) and Botswana Defense Force (BDF) troops with its main goal being to "prevent anarchy and restore order" (Neethling, 1999).

At the end of the 2007 elections won by the LCD, there were also post-electoral contestations, violence, assassinations and attempted assassinations. The opposition alleged electoral manipulation. SADC Troika facilitators mediated dialogue between the key stakeholders in the Lesotho conflict – the government, the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) of Lesotho, the ruling party and the opposition parties. The outcome was an agreement to amend electoral laws, and constitutional amendments paving the way for the 2012 elections.

In early September 2014, shortly after an attempted coup, the SADC Troika on Defense, Politics and Security – made up of Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe – met to map the way forward. This was followed by a meeting between LDF Commander TlaliKamoli and regional military officers from the SANDF, Zimbabwe Defense Forces (ZDF) and Namibia Defense Forces (NDF), to allow the return of the prime minister and guarantee national security.

The SADC swiftly responded to the Lesotho conflict. The Chairperson of the OPDSC, South African president Jacob Zuma, led the talks between Thabane, Metsing and the Lesotho Minister of Gender and Sports, MorenaMaseribane. This diplomatic offensive – which SADC prudently opted for rather than a military offensive – procured results.

Thabane returned safely to Maseru on 3 September 2014 after SADC agreed on a low-key security mission to accompany him, with an assessment mission from South Africa having been dispatched to Lesotho ahead of him for reconnaissance.

SADC appointed a mediator, South African Deputy President Cyril Ramaphosa, to facilitate dialogue between the disputing political parties and the protagonists at the center of the power struggle. An agreement was reached to dissolve Parliament and hold a snap National Assembly election on 28 February 2015, instead of waiting for 2017 as had initially been set by law. The February elections did not result in an outright winner, due to Lesotho's electoral system of mixed-member proportional representation (MMPR). Out of the 80 constituencies, Thabane's ABC won 40 seats, Mosisili's DC won 37 seats and Metsing's LCD won two seats, whilst TheseleMaseribane's BNP won a single seat (Independent Electoral Commission of Lesotho, 2015).However, the MMPR electoral model meant that 80 seats are allocated based on constituency votes, whilst the remaining 40 seats are allocated to reflect the share of the national vote along an 80:40 ratio (Independent Electoral Commission of Lesotho, 2015).As a result, Mosisili, who had been prime minister from 1998 to 2012, once again became prime minister, whilst the incumbent deputy prime minister, Metsing, retained his position after the DC and ABC entered into a coalition.

In this election, the SADC Electoral Observation Mission (SEOM) and the AU Electoral Observation Mission (AUEOM) agreed that the elections conducted by the Lesotho Independent Electoral Commission were free and fair. The Commonwealth of Nations Election Observer Group, headed by former Botswana president Festus Mogae, endorsed the elections as conducted in a "peaceful and orderly manner", whilst the SADC Parliamentary Forum Election Observation Mission reported that the Lesotho elections were "free, fair, transparent, credible and democratic" (The Commonwealth, 2015).

The reported fleeing of the main opposition leaders, including former Prime Minister Thabane, from Lesotho, allegedly for personal security reasons, and later the reported assassination of former LDF army chief, Brigadier Mahao, just outside Maseru on 25 June 2015, raised the concern of SADC leaders and SADC promptly organized and hosted an Extraordinary Summit of the Double Troika on 3 July 2015 in Pretoria, South Africa to discuss the way forward. This summit was convened to consider reports from the SADC facilitator to Lesotho, Ramaphosa, and the report of the SADC Ministerial Organ Troika Fact Finding Mission, sent to assess the political and security developments in Lesotho. The Double Troika Summit, attended by Zimbabwe, South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and Malawi, endorsed the report and recommendations of the SADC

facilitator. It also approved the establishment of an oversight committee as an early warning mechanism in the event of signs of instability in Lesotho and to intervene as appropriate, in consultation with the SADC facilitator (SADC, 2015). Another outcome of the summit was the establishment and immediate deployment of an independent commission of inquiry to investigate the circumstances surrounding the death of Brigadier Mahao. The summit also agreed to send an independent pathologist to conduct an examination within a period of 72 hours, as requested by the prime minister of Lesotho. In addition, the summit urged the Government of Lesotho to create a conducive environment for the return of opposition leaders to the country.

### 3.3.2 Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe, officially known as the Republic of Zimbabwe is a landlocked country in Southern Africa. The country runs a presidential system of government. The country is located between the Zambezi and Limpopo rivers. It borders South Africa to the south, Botswana to the west, Zambia to the northwest, and Mozambique to the east and northeast. Its capital and largest city is Harare and the population of the country is about 13 million people. Zimbabwe has 16 official languages but English, Shona and Ndebele are the three most commonly used in the country. Mineral exports, gold, agriculture, and tourism are the main foreign currency earners for Zimbabwe. However, the mining sector is the most lucrative in the economy. Zimbabwe was formerly known as Rhodesia.

Zimbabwe's independence in 1980 was the result of historical compromises made at the Lancaster House Conference (Cawthra, 2010). One of the unresolved issues from the conference was the question of land with 6,000 white farmers being left in possession of 40 per cent of all agricultural land, being responsible for three quarters of agricultural output and employing a third of the wage-earning labor force (Meredith 2005: 618). This situation was left almost unchanged until the early 1990s, when the ZANU-PF government began a process of land redistribution. This was initially supported by British aid but the assistance was cut off after evidence of corruption in the process.

The first decade of Zimbabwe's independence was marked by economic growth and rapidly improving delivery of education, health and other social services. However, in the 1990s the country was persuaded to enter into a structural adjustment agreement with the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the economic effects of which led to growing alienation of workers and poor Zimbabweans and increasing unemployment, while the War Veterans became increasingly insistent in the their demands for redress. In 1997

Mugabe capitulated to their demands, which cost the country an estimated US$400 million (off budget), causing a currency collapse and plunging the economy into a crisis from which it has never recovered. The economic crisis was exacerbated by Zimbabwe's military intervention in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 1998 to support the regime of Laurent Kabila which was under threat from Uganda and Rwanda. This operation, dubbed 'Sovereign Legitimacy', was enormously costly (press reports estimated it at US$3 million per day) and was funded off budget (Cawthra, 2010).

By the end of the 1990s, the economic crisis had intensified, and an increasingly militant labor movement (the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions) which had been supportive of ZANU-PF until the end of the 1980s, began to exert an independent political voice, eventually to form the opposition MDC. In short, multiple political crises during the 1990s placed extreme stresses on the economy and in turn led to the rise of a 'social movement' based on organized labor, in the form of the MDC. The government responded to these challenges by raising the tempo of its nationalist rhetoric, using increasingly repressive tactics to try to assert control, and rapidly speeding up land redistribution, partly in the hope of regaining popularity (although it should be noted that the MDC also supported land redistribution). All this in turn led to international pressure from Western countries on issues of human rights in particular, and declining inward investment, while Zimbabwe's defaulting on its debt servicing to the IMF led to the disengagement of international financial institutions, further deepening the economic crisis.

While ZANU-PF likes to focus on the land issue and western pressures as the source of Zimbabwe's woes, it is clear that failures of economic management and of governance, leading to social alienation and dislocation, are at the root of the problems. In essence, there is now a political struggle for power between the MDC-T, which is built on the trade union movement, and ZANU-PF, the victor of the liberation war and the first independence elections. There is a strong demographic element to this divide, with ZANU-PF maintaining support mostly in rural areas and from the older generation who have strong memories of settler colonialism and the liberation struggle. The MDC-T has a clear power base in the urban centers but is making more and more headway in the rural areas where it defeated ZANU-PF in many constituencies in the 2008 elections. Time is therefore not on ZANU-PF's side as the voting population gets progressively younger. It is also increasingly unable to exploit the land issue, as redistribution has been virtually completed. On the other hand, ZANU-PF has the enormous advantages of incumbency and as a result of the politicization of the state and the security services is able and

willing to wield these instruments against the opposition, and to use patronage networks within the state to gain support (Cawthra, 2010).

SADC's position for many years with regard to the Zimbabwe crisis was to agree with President Mugabe that it was primarily a land question, and to issue regular statements from SADC summits congratulating the Zimbabwe government on the successes in its land redistribution. It remained publicly silent on issues of human rights, and although it did encourage the promotion of free and fair elections, it failed to exercise any criticism of electoral processes, congratulating the 'people of Zimbabwe' and the government after each election. During the early period of the crisis SADC did not give itself any mediation role, and it was only when the matter of Zimbabwe was referred to the AU at its Sharmel-Sheik summit in June 2008, that the AU directed that SADC be put in charge of mediating a solution to the crisis. SADC's mandate thus came directly from the AU. In turn, at its 2008 Dares-Salaam conference, SADC appointed then South African president Thabo Mbeki as chief mediator. The appointment of Mbeki proved to be controversial, with the MDC-T arguing that he was pro ZANU-PF.

The AU's role in the subsequent negotiations has been minimal: it is best seen a playing an oversight role over SADC, and rubber-stamping its decisions. However, the AU is much more clearly divided over the crisis, with many countries openly supporting the MDC-T and condemning the ZANU-PF regime as undemocratic and as violating human rights. These divisions are one of the reasons that the AU has been unable or unwilling to take the lead on Zimbabwe: the other has been the principle of 'subsidiarity' in which it delegates sub-regional conflict resolution to SADC.

SADC has generally presented a united front, which most observers have interpreted as being in support of the incumbent regime, and it has been widely criticized internationally for failing to take a public stand against human rights violations, breaches of the rule of law and repression. As a successor to the Front-Line States grouping, which was for many years led by Mugabe, SADC was seen in the early stages of the crisis as acting as if the Zimbabwean liberation struggle was still under way. Solidarity was the keyword, and public statements against the government of Zimbabwe were not made. This was reinforced by the culture of consensus, closing of ranks and secretiveness necessitated by the FLS struggle against the apartheid regime, and continued to a significant extent in the OPDSC, the political and security arm of SADC.

But there are serious and growing rifts within SADC over Zimbabwe. President Ian Khama of Botswana openly broke ranks after the fiasco of the 2008 presidential elections, condemning Mugabe as repressive and calling for internationally-supervised

elections, and Zambia and Tanzania are also increasingly willing to speak out against Mugabe/ZANU-PF and support positions taken by the Movement for Democratic Change – Tsvangirai (MDC-T). On the other hand, the dominant trend within SADC is the continuation of the liberation solidarity of the FLS period, with the former liberation movements, SWAPO, MPLA, FRELIMO and ANC lining up in solidarity. They are joined by the DRC, the government of which owes its very survival to the 'SADC allies' who intervened in 1977/8 (Angola, Namibia and Zimbabwe), by authoritarian Swaziland and Malawi. However, this 'liberation alliance plus', is under some pressure, with South Africa and Mozambique's position gradually changing as they lose patience with ZANU-PF.

There has also been a slight shift in position since Jacob Zuma took over as president of South Africa, and in particular since Zuma was formally appointed as mediator. A team consisting of Zuma's international advisor, Lindiwe Zulu, and two former cabinet ministers, Charles Nqakula and Mac Maharaj, was appointed. The media often presents South African solidarity with Zimbabwe as a result of an alliance between ZANU-PF and the ANC. Historically, there was no such alliance – the ANC supported ZAPU. However, after Zimbabwe's independence the ANC needed struggle facilities in Zimbabwe and Mbeki was a major go-between between the two parties, establishing a modus vivendi whereby the ANC was allowed political offices but not military bases in the country. According to some informants, Mbeki thus has a visceral sympathy for ZANU-PF. It is certainly true that during his presidency he pursued an Africanist agenda, which, while it stressed good governance, also implied solidarity with African countries, particularly in the international arena. Above all, South Africa was not – and is not – willing to act unilaterally in African affairs. It will always hide behind what some might call the figleaf of sovereignty. It is very conscious of the limitations of its political and military power and its rather fragile diplomatic credibility on the continent. It is also argued that Mbeki, in his stand-off against South Africa's major trade union movement, the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) feared that the South African union movement might follow the MDC's example and become the basis of a new opposition movement.

SADC is a fundamentally conservative organization, working by consensus and operating on the 'lowest common denominator' principle of decision-making. As a weak organization, with little to hold it in common, consensus is a vital principle of survival. It also fears to show its hand publicly. Behind closed doors, however, informants in this study indicated that SADC has taken much stronger positions against the Zimbabwean government than it has admitted to publicly. This has particularly been the case under the Zuma presidency in South Africa, but Mozambique under President Armando Guebuza

has also been to some extent been breaking ranks with the 'liberation alliance'. The November 2009 emergency SADC summit in Maputo is seen by many as a turning-point. Informants in this study indicated that Mugabe was privately told in Maputo that he had to make the IG government work and move towards free and fair elections. This pressure was increased in early December 2009 when the 30-day deadline for the resolution of outstanding IG issues set in Maputo expired without significant progress, although Mugabe appeared to make concessions on some of the issues related to senior government appointments. However, Mugabe has long proved a master of political manipulation when it comes to SADC, promising changes but failing to deliver.

Reasons given for Zuma's differing position to Mbeki include that he is closer to COSATU and its ally the South African Communist Party, and indeed to a large extent owes his presidency to their support. He is also seen as being considerably less rigid than Mbeki and a better listener, open to alternative viewpoints. Whatever the case, it is evident that opinion within SADC is shifting against Mugabe and ZANU-PF, although the interests of 'regime solidarity' may in the end hold out.

### 3.3.3 Madagascar

There is general consensus amongst many people that the long-term causes of the conflict can be traced back to the post-independence history of Madagascar, which saw long periods of autocratic and authoritarian rule, periodic crises involving military intervention in politics (in 1971, 1991 and 2001/2) and a failure to establish a consolidated democracy or effective governance. The general conditions of poverty and marginalization were also identified as factors and this was seen to have worsened under President Ravalomanana's rule. According Cawthra (2010), respondents he interviewed were not willing to identify ethnic or regional divisions as underlying causes, although some pointed to tensions between the coastal region and the highlands, especially Antananarivo, and that to some extent this corresponded to ethnic differences between the minority Merina population, based in the highlands, and the Cotiers, those of predominately African origin and mostly resident in the coastal areas. However, these divisions were not generally seen as the cause of the crisis.

The more immediate cause was widely perceived – including by some former Ravalomanana supporters – to be failures of governance by the Ravalomanana administration, perceptions that he had used his position as president to benefit his extensive business interests (through control of regulations, contracts etc. and by monopolization) and by an essentially authoritarian and capricious management style.

Certainly Ravalomanana seemed to have alienated many of his senior colleagues and little room was left for political dissent, with parliament marginalized and decisions increasingly taken in a centralized manner by the presidency. This was not helped by the fact that widespread perceptions remained that his presidency was not legitimate in the first place.

A second important factor was the alienation of the military and the security structures as a whole. When the CAPSAT mutiny took place, although it was carried out by only one unit (consisting of 500-600 personnel out of a total security establishment of around 25, 000), is it noticeable that neither the military, nor the police, nor the gendarmerie were willing to intervene in support of Ravalomanana. Some of the factors given for this alienation included Ravalomanana's perceived favoritism in senior promotions and his disdainful treatment of senior officers; his attempts to reign in military privileges; attempts at security sector reform which were driven by a senior German advisor with little concern about local sensitivities (for example downgrading the navy to a coastguard and merging the powerful gendarmerie into the police); the failure to address chronic problems in the military including a lack of facilities such as accommodation and the top-heavy structure of the armed forces; the use of the security forces to physically protect Ravalomanana's business interests; and simmering resentments arising from the 2001/2 crisis, which had resulted in the imprisonment of some military personnel from outside the capital.

Perhaps the most important immediate cause, however, was simply personal animosity between Rajoelina and Ravalomanana, and a struggle for power between the two – although most respondents Cawthra (2010) interviewed indicated that they did not believe that Rajoelina had expected to be able to seize power and did not have a master-plan for this: he simply grabbed the opportunity when it arose as a result of a chain of circumstances. Nevertheless, as mayor of Antananarivo, Rajoelina had orchestrated a challenge to the central government, precipitated by the closure of his television station, which included two months of street protests. Many observers also believed that the competition between the two men was fueled by their competing business interests, and the advantage that they could gain by fusing political power with business.

While not a cause, there was an international dimension to the crisis. France has traditionally been the major international influence in Madagascar. Ravalomanana, who has extensive business interests in Southern Africa, was seen as steering the country away from the French sphere, emphasizing stronger links with the USA, South Africa, and the East. According to Cawthra (2010), while no one believed that the French orchestrated the events of 17 March 2009, it is evident that the French government was quick to work

with Rajoelina and gave him some protection at crucial periods leading up to and immediately after the coup. Although France does not officially recognize Rajoelina's de facto government and is publicly even-handed, most Madagascans - from all sides of the spectrum - believed that France has played a behind-the-scenes role in support of Rajoelina (Ravalomanana has gone further by labelling him a 'puppet' of France). This may have been motivated by the belief that it was the best solution to prevent the country from sliding into chaos and civil war but most Madagascans also thought that the intention was to restore and shore up French influence and business interests in the country.

The SADC countries - with the exception of South Africa - have few interests in Madagascar and there is only very limited diplomatic representation. At the same time, there is an almost complete lack of knowledge within Madagascar about SADC, and the Rajoelina camp likes to project the country's involvement in the regional community as a personal project of Ravalomanana, carried out for business reasons (with some justification). Despite this, SADC was involved at an early stage in the crisis, although it took it some time to make any sustained interventions.

The foreign minister of Swaziland, LuftoDlamini, visited Madagascar in February 2009 as the crisis began to unfold but had nothing much to show for it. The day after the unconstitutional change of government on 17 March, Zambia called for Madagascar's suspension from the SADC while the OPDSC met on 19 March and took a position of refusing to recognize Rajoelina indicating that it would consider imposing sanctions if the constitutional order was not restored. The following day, the African Union's PSC followed suit. According to the chair of the Council, Bruno Nongoma Zidouemba, the Burkina Faso ambassador: "what occurred in Madagascar is an unconstitutional change of government … very quickly, we will consider taking sanctions against the authorities of Madagascar. It can be interpreted as a coup". (Mail and Guardian 20.3.2009).

At the extraordinary summit of the OPDSC held on 31 March, Madagascar was suspended from membership, with the executive secretary of SADC, ThomazSalamao, urging Rajoelina 'to vacate the office of the president as a matter of urgency, paving the way for unconditional reinstatement of President Ravalomanana' (Mail and Guardian 31.3.2009). Sanctions were again threatened, and more controversially, the option of a military intervention using SADCBRIG was mooted by King Mswati, and logistics, such as the provision of transport aircraft by Angola were discussed. This came as something of a shock to most Madagascans, and was exploited by Rajoelina who whipped up nationalist fervor around the issue. Indeed, military respondents, according to Cawthra (2010), divulged that the armed forces were actively preparing to fight back against any

SADCBRIG intervention – certainly the consequences, both politically and militarily, would have been disastrous for SADC, although in reality SADCBRIG was never in a position to carry out such an operation and there was no political authorization for it. The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) also supported the option of military intervention to restore democracy in a statement adopted at a summit held in Zimbabwe and chaired by King Mswati III of Swaziland. The irony of the authoritarian regime of Mswati adopting such a position, and in crisis-ridden Zimbabwe, appeared to be lost on the participants (Cawthra, 2010).

Ravalomanana also descended on Swaziland, to lobby for support, military or otherwise, and at the end of March, a summit of SADC itself affirmed its earlier position of supporting his reinstatement and suspending Madagascar from membership. Rajoelina responded to these developments by announcing that Madagascar would quit SADC. The former prime minister of Swaziland, Absalom ThembaDlamini, arrived in Madagascar on 11 May to convey SADC's position to Rajoelina. However, mediation was under way under auspices of the UN and the AU, and Dlamini realized that SADC's position was both untenable in terms of realities on the ground and out of phase with that of other international actors and he returned to Swaziland on 29 May, apparently urging a rethink. A further delegation, representing the Organ Troika visited Madagascar at the end of April. In the meantime, the ICG had been formally constituted, involving SADC but under the formal leadership of the AU.

On 20 June SADC held another extraordinary summit at heads of state level to consider what to do about Madagascar. Here it moderated its original strong position, and appointed Joaquim Chissano, assisted by a team of mediators, to try to reach a compromise position leading to new elections. The emphasis thus moved away from the restoration of Ravalomanana towards an approach of all-party dialogue within the framework of the ICG. This eventually led to the convening of the Maputo meeting from 5 to 8 August where the framework for elaborate transitional arrangements, leading to elections in 15 months' time were agreed by the four Madagascan 'movements'. It was really only after this that the specter of a SADC 'invasion' was laid to rest and that SADC was perceived by most actors as being even-handed and in line with the ICG as a whole.

As more than one informant in Cawthra (2010) study puts it, the appointment of Chissano 'changed everything' and SADC was perceived to be acting more even-handedly – and King Mswati played an increasingly less important role as Mozambique began to prepare for its chairing of the OPDSC through the annual process of rotation (which took place at the SADC summit in early September). Most respondents indicated to Cawthra (2010)

that subsequent to Chissano's appointment they could detect little difference between the positions adopted by SADC and that of the other actors in the ICG. Most accepted that SADC had a leading role to play given the chief mediator function of Chissano, even if the AU was officially the lead agency. However, a further crisis broke out when SADC states, acting as a bloc, prevented Rajoelina from addressing the UN General Assembly at the end of September 2009. This sparked an angry threat by the Rajoelina government to refuse visas to officials from SADC States.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

The SADC is playing an important role in the development and security of southern Africa countries although this role is skewed/biased towards some countries. For instance, the SADC countries - with the exception of South Africa - have few interests in Madagascar and there is only very limited diplomatic representation. At the same time, there is an almost complete lack of knowledge within Madagascar about SADC, and the Rajoelina camp likes to project the country's involvement in the regional community as a personal project of Ravalomanana, carried out for business reasons. Despite this, SADC was involved at an early stage in the Madagascan crisis, although it took it some time to make any sustained interventions. However, in the Democratic Republic of Congo, (DRC), SADC allies helped restore normalcy in the country.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

The transformation of SADCC into SADC in 1992, upon the signing of the SADC Treaty and Declaration at the Windhoek Summit in Namibia, was followed by the landmark amendment of the SADC Treaty in Mach 2001. This amendment established institutional mechanisms that were key in the delivery of the organization's mandate. Among these mechanisms were the SADC Organ on Politics, Defense and Security Cooperation (OPDSC) and the related Troika (Article 9A and Article 10A, SADC, 2001).

Since 1992, the SADC has being involved in the settling of disputes and seeking peaceful resolution in southern Africa countries as can be seen from the three countries – Lesotho, Zimbabwe and Madagascar – used as case studies. In the case of Zimbabwe, the SADC's involvement was divided and there was growing rifts within the organization. President Ian Khama of Botswana openly broke ranks after the fiasco of the 2008 Zimbabwean presidential elections when he condemned Robert Mugabe as being repressive and called for internationally-supervised elections. Zambia and Tanzania also spoke against

Mugabe/ZANU-PF and supported positions taken by the Movement for Democratic Change – Tsvangirai (MDC-T). On the other hand, the dominant trend within SADC was the continuation of the liberation solidarity of the FLS period, with the former liberation movements, SWAPO, MPLA, FRELIMO and ANC lining up in solidarity. They were joined by the DRC - the government of which owes its very survival to the 'SADC allies' who intervened in 1977/8 (Angola, Namibia and Zimbabwe), by authoritarian Swaziland and Malawi. However, this 'liberation alliance plus', is under some pressure, with South Africa and Mozambique's position gradually changing as they lose patience with ZANU-PF.

## 6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSESSMENT

i. With Zimbabwe as a case study, how has the SADC being effective in peace and conflict management in southern Africa**?**
ii. List and explain the major challenges comforting the SADC as an organization.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Article 2(2)() (e) and Article 2(1) of the Southern African Development Community Protocol on Politics, Defence and Security Co-operation.

Article 9A and Article 10A, Southern African Development Community (2001) 'Agreement Amending the Treaty of the Southern African Development Community', 14 August, pp. 7–8, Available at: <http://www.sadc.int/files/3413/5410/3897/Agreement_Amending_the_Treaty_-_2001.pdf> [Accessed 18 August 20186].

Cawthra, G. (2010): The Role of SADC in Managing Political Crisis and Conflict. The Cases of Madagascar and Zimbabwe. Maputo: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Independent Electoral Commission of Lesotho (2015) 'National Assembly Election 2015 – Results', Available at: <http://www.iec.org.ls/> [Accessed 29 July 20186].

Independent Electoral Commission of Lesotho (2015) 'National Assembly Elections 2015 Fact Sheets', p. 9, Available at: <http://www.iec.org.ls/images/iecdocs/facts_sheets.pdf> [Accessed 2 August 2016].

Likoti, J. F. (2007) The 1998 Military Intervention in Lesotho: SADC Peace Mission or Resource War? *International Peacekeeping*, 14 (2), pp. 251–252.

Matlosa, K. (2006) Electoral System Design and Conflict Mitigation: The Case of Lesotho. In Austin, Reginald et al. *Democracy, Conflict and Human Security: Further Readings*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), pp. 96.

Matlosa, K. (2007) Managing Post-election Conflict in Lesotho. *Global Insight*, 70.

Meredith, M. (2005) The State of Africa: A History of Fifty Years of Independence. Johannesburg and Cape Town: Jonathan Ball.

Motsamai, D. (2015) Elections in a Time of Instability: Challenges for Lesotho beyond the 2015 Poll. *Southern Africa Report* (Institute for Security Studies), 3 (April 2015), pp. 2–3.

Neethling, T. (1999) 'Military Intervention in Lesotho: Perspectives on Operation Boleas and Beyond', *The Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution*, 2.2, p. 1, Available at: <http://www.operationspaix.net/DATA/DOCUMENT/6107~v~Military_Intervention_in_Lesotho__Perspectives_on_Operation_Boleas_and_Beyond.pdf> [Accessed 17 August 20186].

Ngwawi, J. (2014) A Historical Perspective of Lesotho's Political Crisis. *Southern African News Features (SANF)*, 14 (48) (September).

Southern African Development Community (2015) 'Communiqué: Extraordinary Summit of the Double Troika', 3 July, Pretoria, Available at: <http://www.sadc.int/files/8114/3598/7203/Draft_Communique_on_3_July__2135hrs_corrected.pdf> [Accessed 16 July 2016].

The Commonwealth (2015) 'Lesotho Election Observer Group Interim Statement', 2 March, Available at: <http://thecommonwealth.org/media/news/lesotho-election-commonwealth-observer-group-interim-statement> [Accessed 15 July 2016]; and SADC Parliamentary Forum (2015) 'Interim Mission Statement by the SADC Parliamentary Forum Election Observation Mission to the 2015 Lesotho National Assembly Elections', Delivered by HonourableElifasDingara, Mission Leader, Lesotho Sun Hotel, Maseru, Lesotho, 2 March, p. 9, Available at: <http://sadcpf.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=126&Itemid=117> [Accessed 15 July 2016].

## UNIT 3: EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY (EAC) AND SECURITY IN EASTERN AFRICA

## CONTENTS



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The East African Community (EAC) is an intergovernmental organization composed of six countries in the African Great Lakes region in eastern Africa: Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda. John Magufuli, the President of Tanzania, is the EAC's chairman. The organization was founded in 1967, collapsed in 1977, and was revived on 7 July 2000. In 2008, after negotiations with the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the EAC agreed to an expanded free trade area including the member states of all three organizations. The EAC is an integral part of the African Economic Community.

In this unit, we discuss the ECA detailing its background and history, the politics within the organization and how it ensures security within eastern Africa, particularly through

the instrumentality one of its key organs – the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, IGAD.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this lecture, you should:

i. Have a good understanding of the East African Community (ECA);
ii. Understand the organs of the organization and the roles they play in the organization;
iii. Have a good understanding of the EAC and how it is challenging insecurity in Eastern Africa.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 Background and Brief History of the Organization

The EAC is a potential precursor to the establishment of the East African Federation, a proposed federation of its members into a single sovereign state. In 2010, the EAC launched its own common market for goods, labor, and capital within the region, with the goal of creating a common currency and eventually a full political federation. In 2013, a protocol was signed outlining their plans for launching a monetary union within 10 years. Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda have cooperated with each other since the early 20th century. The customs union between Kenya and Uganda in 1917, which Tanganyika joined in 1927, was followed by the East African High Commission (EAHC) from 1948 to 1961, the East African Common Services Organization (EACSO) from 1961 to 1967, and the 1967 to 1977 EAC. Burundi and Rwanda joined the EAC on 6 July 2009. Inter-territorial co-operation between the Kenya Colony, the Uganda Protectorate, and the Tanganyika Territory was formalized in 1948 by the EAHC. This provided a customs union, a common external tariff, currency, and postage. It also dealt with common services in transport and communications, research, and education. Following independence, these integrated activities were reconstituted and the EAHC was replaced by the EACSO, which many observers thought would lead to a political federation between the three territories. The new organization ran into difficulties because of the lack of joint planning and fiscal policy, separate political policies, and Kenya's dominant economic position. In 1967, the EACSO was superseded by the EAC. This body aimed to strengthen the ties between the members through a common market, a common customs tariff, and a range of public services to achieve balanced economic growth within the region.

In 1977, the EAC collapsed. The causes of the collapse included demands by Kenya for more seats than Uganda and Tanzania in decision-making organs, disagreements with Ugandan dictator Idi Amin who demanded that Tanzania as a member state of the EAC should not harbor forces fighting to topple the government of another member state, and the disparate economic systems of socialism in Tanzania and capitalism in Kenya. The three member states lost over sixty years of co-operation and the benefits of economies of scale, although some Kenyan government officials celebrated the collapse with champagne. Presidents Daniel ArapMoi of Kenya, Ali Hassan Mwinyi of Tanzania, and YoweriKaguta Museveni of Uganda signed the Treaty for East African Co-operation in Kampala on 30 November 1993 and established a Tri-partite Commission for Co-operation. A process of re-integration was embarked on involving tripartite programmes of co-operation in political, economic, social and cultural fields, research and technology, defence, security, and legal and judicial affairs. The EAC was revived on 30 November 1999, when the treaty for its re-establishment was signed. It came into force on 7 July 2000, 23 years after the collapse of the previous community and its organs. A customs union was signed in March 2004, which commenced on 1 January 2005. Kenya, the region's largest exporter, continued to pay duties on goods entering the other four countries on a declining scale until 2010. A common system of tariffs will apply to goods imported from third-party countries. On 30 November 2016 it was declared that the immediate aim would be confederation rather than federation.

As of July 2015, the combined population of all five EAC member states was 169,519,847. The EAC would have the ninth largest population in the world, if considered a single entity.

The EAC strives to achieve the following:

i. Promote peace, security, and stability within, and good neighborliness among the partner states;
ii. Resolve disputes peacefully;
iii. Ensure close defense cooperation;
iv. Establish a framework for cooperation;
v. Establish a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in defense.

## 3.2 Organs of the Organization

### (i) The Summit

The Summit comprising of Heads of Government of Partner States gives strategic direction towards the realization of the goals and objectives of the Community.

### (ii) The Council of Ministers

The Council of Ministers is the central decision-making and governing organ of the EAC. It is constituted by Ministers or Cabinet Secretaries from the Partner States whose dockets are responsible for regional cooperation. Every year, the Council meets twice; one meeting is held immediately preceding a meeting of the Summit. The Council meetings assist in maintaining a link between the political decisions taken at the Summits and the day-to-day functioning of the Community.

### (iii) The Coordinating Committee

Under the Council, the Coordinating Committee has the primary responsibility for regional cooperation and coordinates the activities of the Sectoral Committees. It draws its membership from Permanent / Principal Secretaries responsible for regional cooperation from the Partner States.

### (iv) Sectoral Committees

Sectoral Committees conceptualize programs and monitor their implementation. The Council establishes such Sectoral Committees on recommendation of the Coordinating Committee. The Sectoral Committees meet as often as necessary for the proper discharge of their functions.

### (v) The East African Court of Justice

The East African Court of Justice is the principal judicial Organ of the Community and ensures adherence to the law in the interpretation and application of compliance with the EAC Treaty. It was established under Article 9 of the Treaty for the Establishment of the East African Community. The Court is currently composed of ten judges, appointed by the Summit from among sitting judges of any Partner State court of judicature or from jurists of recognized competence, and the Registrar who is appointed by the Council of Ministers. The Court has two divisions: an Appellate division and a First Instance division.

### (vi) The East African Legislative Assembly

The East African Legislative Assembly (EALA) is the Legislative Organ of the Community and has a cardinal function to further EAC objectives, through its

Legislative, Representative and Oversight mandate. It was established under Article 9 of the Treaty for the Establishment of the East African Community.

The Assembly has a membership comprising of 45 elected members (nine from each Partner State), and 7 ex-officio members consisting of the Minister or Cabinet Secretary responsible for EAC Affairs from each Partner State, the Secretary General and the Counsel to the. The Assembly currently has six Standing Committees to execute its mandate.

**(vii) The Secretariat**

The Secretariat is the executive organ of the Community. As the guardian of the Treaty, it ensures that regulations and directives adopted by the Council are properly implemented. In service of the Community, the Secretariat comprises the Secretary-General, 4 Deputy Secretaries-General, the Counsel to the Community and hundreds of EAC staff members who carry out the day-to-day work of the EAC as mandated by the Council.

The Secretary-General is the principal executive and accounting officer of the Community, the head of the Secretariat and the Secretary of the Summit; he/she is appointed by the Summit for a fixed five-year, non-renewable term. The Deputy Secretaries-General are appointed by the Summit on recommendations of the Council and on a rotational basis. They deputize the Secretary-General and each serves a three-year term, renewable once.

### 3.3 Politics within the Organization

It has been argued that the key drivers for Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania are that Kenya wishes to export surplus capital, Uganda seeks an outlet for its surplus labor, and Tanzania wants to realize a Pan-African vision. It has also been argued, however, that the commonalities go far deeper. Many of the national elites old enough to remember the former EAC often share memories and a sharp sense of loss at its eventual dissolution. More cynically, others have argued that this historical ambition provides politicians with the ability to present themselves as statesmen and representatives of a greater regional interest. Furthermore, EAC institutions bring significant new powers to dispose and depose to those who serve in them.

Some have questioned the extent to which the visions of a political union are shared outside the elite and the relatively elderly, arguing that the youthful mass of the population is not well informed about the process in any of the countries. Others have pointed to an enhanced sense of East African identity developing from modern communications. For these, the shared vision for a politically united East Africa is commendable and a potential driver for change. Commitment to the formal EAC idea is relatively narrow, in both social and generational terms, and thus many have questioned

the timetable for the project. Fast-tracking political union was first discussed in 2004 and enjoyed a consensus among the three presidents of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. Thus, a high-level committee headed by Amos Wako of Kenya was commissioned to investigate the possibility of speeding integration so as to achieve political federation sooner than previously visualized. Yet, there have been concerns that rapid changes would allow popular reactionary politics against the project. There has been an argument, however, that there are high costs that would be required at the beginning and that fast-tracking the project would allow the benefits to be seen earlier.

There remain significant political differences between the states. Museveni's success in obtaining his third-term amendment raised doubts in the other countries. The single-party dominance in the Tanzanian and Ugandan parliaments is unattractive to Kenyans, while Kenya's ethnic-politics remains absent in Tanzania. Rwanda has a distinctive political culture with a political elite committed to building a developmental state. Other problems involve states being reluctant to relinquish involvement in other regional groups, e.g., Tanzania's withdrawal from COMESA but staying within the SADC bloc for the Economic Partnership Agreement negotiations with the European Union. Many Tanzanians are also concerned because creating a common market means removing obstacles to the free movement of labor and capital. Free movement of labor may be perceived as highly desirable in Uganda and Kenya, and have important developmental benefits in Tanzania; however, in Tanzania there is widespread resistance to the idea of ceding land rights to foreigners, including citizens of Kenya and Uganda. Informal polls have indicate that most Tanzanians (80 percent) have an unfavorable view of the East African Federation. Tanzania has more land than all the other EAC nations combined (at least until the accession of South Sudan), and some Tanzanians fear land grabs by the current residents of the other EAC member nations.

### 3.3 The EAC and Security in Eastern Africa

The EAC has recognized that economic integration can succeed only if peace, stability and security are established throughout the region. It therefore focuses its efforts on crisis prevention, conflict resolution, small arms and light weapons control, and the promotion of good governance. These efforts are being hindered, however, by weak institutional structures within the EAC secretariat, including in particular, the lack of a Directorate for Peace and Security and inadequate implementation of regional strategies and standards within the partner countries.

### 3.3.1 Major Security Challenges Confronting the EAC

According to Adams Oloo, the following are the major security challenges confronting the six (6) countries of the EAC:

i. From Cold-War border disputes, ideologically inspired great power conflicts, inter-state and intra-state conflicts of the period;
ii. Kenya-since return to multi-partyism in 1992-ethnic violence in electoral years coupled with rise of criminal gangs-Mungiki, SLDF, MRC, numerous militias;
iii. Uganda rebels in the north;
iv. Rwandan genocide and the after effect;
v. Burundi's ethnic rivalries;
vi. South Sudan ethnic and leadership rivalries;
vii. Failed states and ungoverned spaces-including regional insecurity and conflicts stemming from failed states in the region, poorly governed regions and borderlands and countries in transition over central government authority; and
viii. General conflicts emanating from ethnicity, clannism, irredentism and secessionism.

### 3.3.2 Tackling Security in Eastern Africa through IGAD

In the mid-1990s, IGAD (Intergovernmental Authority of Development, an organ of the EAC) under Kenya's leadership mediated the Sudanese civil war, drawing international partners into a process that dragged on for almost eleven years before the signing of the CPA. IGAD also led the mediation initiatives that produced the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) in Somalia in 2004. Even before the fall of the Islamists in Mogadishu in December 2006, IGAD had been at the forefront of efforts to send a mission to stabilize the situation. In March 2005, IGAD proposed a Peace Support Mission to Somalia (IGASOM) involving 10,000 troops at a cost of $500 million in the first year, but the AU approved a smaller force of 8,000 in September 2006, at an estimated cost of $335 million for the first year.

With the momentum generated by Ethiopia's invasion of Somalia, the AU authorized the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) in January 2007 with the initial deployment of 1,500 troops from Uganda. There have been no other donors to IGASOM, particularly because of the worsening security situation in Mogadishu. Despite the presence of both IGASOM and the Ethiopian military, the TFG has faced considerable odds in restoring peace to Somalia. More critically, the resurgence of the Islamists under Eritrean guidance has added another layer of complexity to the regionalized civil war. Renamed the Alliance for the Re-liberation of Somalia (ARS), the Islamists and their military wing, Al-Shabab, have regained strength in Mogadishu to frustrate political

reconstruction. As a consequence of growing Islamist strength, the weak TFG, prodded by the United Nations, started negotiations in Djibouti in May 2008 to reach a political compromise.

The negotiations have, however, stalled because of the insistence of the ARS on the withdrawal of Ethiopian troops and failure to recognize the legitimacy of the TFG. The TFG has, for its part, pleaded with the UN Security Council to deploy a 28,000-strong international peacekeeping force to replace Ethiopian troops and IGASOM, a request that a fatigued international community may not be prepared to countenance. IGAD's roles in Sudan and Somalia have furnished it with the stature of an incipient security community with the potential to unite the region along developmental, environmental, and security lines. In one of its landmark efforts, IGAD has worked collaboratively with donors to evolve an early warning system in the region. The Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN) was established in January 2000 to serve as the region's mechanism to systematically anticipate and respond to violent conflicts in a timely and efficient manner. The core operational principle of CEWARN is to involve all major stakeholders - governments, NGOs, and other community organizations—for the collection of information pertaining to conflicts and conflict prevention. In this regard, CEWARN mechanisms at regional and national levels, work with civil society organizations in both its Early Warning and Early Response efforts. Although cognizant of the fact that eastern Africa is ravaged by interstate, intrastate, and communal conflicts, CEWARN has adopted an incremental approach to focus exclusively on cross-border pastoral conflicts.

IGAD's CEWARN has been recognized as the first comprehensive institutional framework on conflict early warning and response in Africa, drawing on the diverse resources of non-state actors. In other areas of engagement, IGAD has moved to harmonize political and cultural differences. At a ministerial meeting on the internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the IGAD sub-region in September 2003, the member states sought to intensify "efforts aimed at enhancing democracy, the rule of law, good governance, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and international humanitarian law in order to ensure stability and security in the sub-region." IGAD nonetheless has been stymied by the internecine Ethiopia-Eritrea conflict which has paralyzed its functions at the highest level. After a bitter feud over Somalia during an IGAD summit in Nairobi in April 2007, Eritrea suspended its membership in the organization, blaming Ethiopia and the US for interference in Somalia. More importantly, IGAD has had to compete for membership and attention with the revived East African Community (EAC) that includes Uganda. Kenya, Tanzania, Burundi, and Rwanda. While they remain core players in IGAD, Uganda and Kenya have increasingly turned their attention toward boosting trade and infrastructural ties that build on their historical linkages.

Through the Eastern African Standby Brigade (EASBRIG), the region forms one of the key props in the African Union's (AU) emerging peacekeeping architecture, the African Standby Force (ASF). There were debates, however, over the institutional home for EASBRIG given the desire to include a wide number of countries outside the IGAD sub-region. As Mulugeta has noted, while the AU envisaged Regional Economic Groups (RECs) as the anchors in the operationalization of sub-regional forces, in eastern Africa:

> …no regional block incorporates all putative members of EASBRIG. In [this region], the East African Community (EAC), the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), and IGAD can all claim to do the task… In the Eastern African region, neither EAC nor COMESA possesses a mandate or structure directly related to the issue of peace and security. Thus, a decision was made to assign such a role to IGAD, albeit on an interim basis. The debate regarding which sub-regional organization should lead in the operationalization of EASBRIG was rarely informed by the original intent of the AU.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

From the foregoing it is clear that threats to security in eastern Africa derive from manifold sources. Similarly, finding remedies to these threats is an ongoing exercise in experimentation with diverse policy instruments. The dominant pattern is that old security threats that affected the ability of states to be providers of order and prosperity have not diminished in the face of new ones. As a regional security complex, eastern Africa has been insecure primarily because its constituent units have found it difficult to manage the demands of statehood, nationhood, and resource and environmental constraints. As a result, the region could be accurately described as one in which states have existed precariously, as victims of their neighbor's insecurities, or conversely, as threats to their neighbors. The cycle of insecurities that defines eastern Africa has, however, coexisted with islands of stability and prosperity, but even these now seem under siege as demonstrated in Kenya's recent political convulsion.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

The East Africa Community (EAC) is a regional organization of six East Africa countries: Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Burundi, Rwanda and South Sudan. As an organization, the EAC strives to achieve the following: promote peace, security, and stability within, and good neighborliness among the partner states; resolve disputes peacefully; ensure close defense cooperation; establish a framework for cooperation and establish a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in defense. Specifically with security,

the EAC's IGAD is the most important organ of the regional association as IGAD's CEWARN has been recognized as the first comprehensive institutional framework on conflict early warning and response in Africa, drawing on the diverse resources of non-state actors. In other areas of engagement, IGAD has moved to harmonize political and cultural differences.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

i. IGAD is the most important organ of the East African Community. True or False? Discuss with empirical reasons to support your assertion.
ii. With your understanding of the major narratives in East Africa, how feasible is the ambition to form a federation of all countries in the sub-region?

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Bradbury, M. (2008). Becoming Somaliland. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Cheadle, D, and Prendergast, J. (2007). Not on Our Watch: The Mission to End Genocide in Darfur and Beyond. New York: Hyperion.

Ghalib, J. M. (1995). The Cost of Dictatorship: The Somali Experience. New York: Lilian Barber.

Gurdon, C. (ed.) (1994). The Horn of Africa. New York: St. Martin's.

Khadiagala, G.M. (2008). "Eastern Africa: Security and the Legacy of Fragility". Africa Program Working Paper Series. October.

Little, P. D. (2003). Somalia: Economy without a State. London: James Currey.

Waihenya, W. (2006). The Mediator: General Lazaro Sumbeiywo and the Southern Sudan Peace Process. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.

Young, J. (1997). Peasant Revolution in Ethiopia: The Tigray People's Liberation Front, 1975-1991. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

## UNIT 4: THE COMMUNITY OF SAHEL-SAHARAN STATES (CEN-SAD) AND SECURITY IN NORTHERN AFRICA



### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This unit discusses another security organization in Africa – the Community of Sahel-Saharan States otherwise referred to as CEN-SAD. The organization was established in 1998 after a conference in Libya. CEN-SAD is the biggest regional organization in Africa because its membership cuts across several regions on the continent. For example, Nigeria is in West Africa, and thus is a member of the ECOWAS as discussed earlier in this module, and the country is also a member of CEN-SAD being that parts of the country is in the Sahelian-Saharan region of Africa. Thus, this unit explains the organs of the CEN-SAD and how it is helping to improve security in the region.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, the student is expected to understand the workings and operations of the Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CEN-SAD), the peculiar situation in the MENA region, part of which is in Africa, and the role of CEN-SAD in the development and security of countries in the region.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1Background and Brief History of the Organization

The Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CEN-SAD) was established on 4 February 1998, following the Conference of Leaders and Heads of States held in Tripoli, Libya. CEN-SAD became a regional economic community during the thirty-sixth ordinary session of the Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held in Lomé, Togo, from 4 to 12 July 2000. CEN-SAD gained the observer status at the General Assembly under resolution 56/92, and thereafter, initiated cooperation agreements with numerous regional and international organizations with the purpose of consolidating collective work in the political, cultural, economic and social fields.

Since the extraordinary session of the Conference of Heads of State and Government held in N'Djamena, Chad in February 2013 whose main purpose was to endorse the restructuring and the revival of the Community, CEN-SAD approved a new Treaty prepared from the revision of the first Treaty that established the Community. The first Treaty, the Treaty Establishing the Community of Sahel-Saharan States, specified the following objectives:

(a) Establishment of a comprehensive Economic Union based on a strategy implemented in accordance with a developmental plan that would be integrated in the national development plans of the member States. It includes investment in the agricultural, industrial, social, cultural and energy fields.

(b) Elimination of all obstacles impeding the unity of its member States through adopting measures that would guarantee the following: facilitating the free movement of individuals, capital, and meeting the interest of member States citizens; freedom of residence, work, ownership and economic activity; freedom of the movement of national goods, merchandise and services; encouragement of foreign trade through drawing up and implementing an investment policy for member States; enhancement and improvement of land, air and sea transportation and telecommunications among member States through the implementation of joint projects; and, the consent of the community member States to give the citizens of member States the same rights and privileges provided for in the constitution of each member State.

(c) Coordination of pedagogical and educational systems at the various educational levels, as well as in the cultural, scientific and technical fields.

These objectives were given a new focus by the revised Treaty that emphasized two areas of deepened cooperation, namely:

i. Regional security, and
ii. Sustainable development.

The revised Treaty will enter into force, in accordance with article 53, after fifteen ratifications have been completed. To date, thirteen member States have ratified the Treaty. The organizational structure of CEN-SAD under the revised Treaty consists of the following organs and Institutions: The Conference of Heads of State/Government, The Executive Council, The permanent Peace and Security Council, The permanent Council in charge of Sustainable Development, The Committee of Ambassadors and Permanent Representatives, The General Secretariat, The Economic Social and Cultural Council (ESCC), The Sahel-Sharan Bank for Investment and Trade. The member States of CEN-SAD are: Benin, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, the Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, the Sudan, Togo and Tunisia.

## 3.2 Organs of the Organization

### (i) Conference of Heads of State

This is composed of Leaders and Heads of State of the Community. The conference is the supreme organ of the policy and decision making of the community in respect of the objectives of the constitutive Treaty. The Conference of Heads of the State meets once a year in ordinary session rotationally in the different capitals of member states. It can meet in an extraordinary session at the request of one Member State. The Country hosting the Summit presides over the Conference.

### (ii) The Executive Council

The Executive Council is responsible for the preparation of the programs of integration plans and the implementation of the decisions of the Conference of the Heads of States. It is composed of Secretary/Ministers in charge of the following departments:

i. External Relations and Cooperation.
ii. Economy, Finance and Planning.
iii. Interior and Public Security.

The Executive Council meets every six (6) months. It can hold extraordinary sessions at the request of the Chairman of the Conference of Heads of the State or at the request of one of the member states. The Council is chaired on a rotary basis.

**(iii) The General Secretariat**

The General Secretariat is the administrative and executive organ of the Community, responsible for the management of the daily work, the monitoring of the regular functioning of the institutions and the implementation of the objectives and policies defined by the Conference of Heads of States and Executives Council.

The General Secretariat is composed as follows:

i. The Secretary General.
ii. The Assistant Secretary General.
iii. The office of the Secretary General.
iv. The Administrative and Financial Affairs Directorate.
v. The Complementarily and Integration Directorate.
vi. The Research and Legal Affairs Directorate.

**(iv) The Sahel-Saharan Investment and Trade Bank**

The convention on establishment of the Sahel-Saharan Investment and Trade Bank was signed on 14/4/1999 in Syrte and the Statutes were signed on 15/11/1999 in Benghazi, Tunisia. The objective of the Bank is to exercise all banking, financial and commercial activities, including those relating to financing development projects and external trade. The Bank gives priority to projects executed in member states and carries out its activities within the framework of this convention and the Statutes. To achieve its objectives, the Bank can, upon the decision of its Board of Directors, open branches or offices within or outside the member countries. The head office of the Bank is in the Great Socialist People's Arab Libyan Jahamiriya.

**(v) Economic, Social and Cultural Council (ESCC)**

The ESCC is an advisory organ composed of ten (10) members designated by each member country, and mandated to assist the organs of CEN-SAD in the design and preparation of development, policies, plan and programs of economic, social and cultural nature of the member countries. The Council meets once a year in ordinary session. It can meet in an extraordinary session upon invitation of the Chairman of the CEN-SAD, its Chairman or a member state. The Headquarters of the Economic, social and Cultural Council is in Bamako, Mali.

### 3.4 Armed Violence and its Impact: The Case of the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Region

The Global Burden of Armed Violence report of 2011 notes that between 2004 and 2009, the MENA region, including African countries who are part of CEN-SAD, ranked 9thand 10$^{th}$out of 19 regions worldwide, in terms of the average rate of (conflict and non-conflict related) violent deaths and thus fell well behind certain regions with fewer weapons, such as the Caribbean, Central America, and Middle Africa (Geneva Declaration Secretariat, 2011, p. 60). Over this period, while embroiled in intense internal conflict, Iraq was the only MENA country in which violent death rates were so high as to match countries bearing the highest violent death rates globally, such as El Salvador and Jamaica (more than 50 per 100,000 population) (Geneva Declaration Secretariat, 2011, p. 53). Notwithstanding the underreporting that is acute in war-torn countries, the relatively low violent death rates crises.

The events of the Arab Spring have worsened the overall situation in the region. Syria has been afflicted by devastating civil war since 2011; and in Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia, the post-revolutionary period has been marked by disorganization of the state, political factionalism, armed violence, and the rise of radical Islamism. Armed violence has spilled over into Syria's neighbors, Iraq and Lebanon, where repeated clashes occur among Sunnis and Shias (and Alawites in Lebanon). In North Africa, the rampant spread of Libyan weapons released during the demise of the Qaddafi government, together with deteriorating living conditions, contribute to a rise in gun crime. Between 2011 and 2013, gun crime escalated by 250 per cent in Egypt (Daragahi, 2013). Conflicts that were rife before the Arab Spring are still thriving, between Hamas and Israel; among Yemen and secessionist insurgents in the south, Shia militants (Houthis) in the north, or al-Qaeda jihadists in the south and east of the country.Egypt has been destabilized by the Arab Spring and its unfolding consequences since 2011. These include the anti-Mubarak revolution of 2011 and the tribal or jihadist insurgency in the Sinai, and clashes between the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) and their opponents supported by the army, following the ousting of President Mohammed Morsi in July 2013. Generally, the number of fatalities linked to conflict or political strife has risen in almost all countries in the CEN-SAD bloc but especially in Libya and Nigeria, where the Boko Haram terror sect are running amok.

### 3.5 CEN-SAD and Security in the Sahel-Saharan Region of Africa

Over the past few years the Sahel/Sahara region has become a field of conflicts and source of multiple threats due to interwoven causes in which numerous factors operated. Prime among these is the wave of terrorism that threatens all societies and states without

exception or discrimination. CEN-SAD Community is the region where instability is the most endemic in Africa. The World Terrorism Index of 2014 reports that Africa experienced a marked surge in the number of terrorist attacks. It listed Boko Haram, the ShabaabMujahideen and Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) as the most dangerous terrorist organizations in Africa.Their attacks have killed thousands over the past two years. Boko Haram has emerged as a genuine regional threat, imperiling the security of Cameroon, Niger, Chad and Nigeria. In effect, due to its geographical positioning between Western Europe, the Sahel-Saharan space has long been subject to a strong migratory turbulence. In addition to this, it has become the place of most of intra-African conflicts and the sanctuary of all of the continent's jihadist movements. Thus, peace, security and stability have become essential topics within the Community.

Peace, security and stability in the Sahel-Saharan region is supported by the provisions of the CEN-SAD Security Charter (2000) and the Niamey Declaration that was adopted in May 2003. The maintenance of peace and stability is derived through a process of normalization of relations with countries affected by conflict. In the event of armed conflicts or political instabilities, the convention regulates that a number of procedures are followed: Protocol on Prevention Mechanism, Management and Resolution of Conflicts; Convention on Cooperation on security issues; and the realization of the Security Charter. The procedures are intended to function in cooperation with the United Nations protocols and the Peace and Security Council of the African Union.There were a number of conflicts where CEN-SAD member States have had difficulties fulfilling the protocols, including conflicts in the Central Africa Republic, South Sudan and the Sudan, post-conflict developments between Eritrea and Ethiopia, and the uprisings and aftermath of the Arab Spring (Bujra and Solomon, 2004). The latter conflicts have had a direct impact on the implementation of activities and programmes of the regional economic community – thus, hampering operational functions in general, and peace and security matters in particular, causing overall devaluation of CEN-SAD activities.

More recently however, at the fifth CEN-SAD Defence Ministers meeting, held on 25 March 2016, in Sharm-el-Sheikh, Egypt, delegates from CEN-SAD member States adopted the 2009 Sharm-el-Sheikh Declaration to reinforce cooperation in the field of anti-terrorism and security. It was decided that a regional counter-terrorism center had to be created for the member States with its headquarters in Egypt. The participants also approved a revised draft for a conflict prevention, management and resolution mechanism of CEN-SAD. A draft protocol for future establishment and operation of the Permanent Peace and Security Council of CEN-SAD was likewise agreed on (Nassar, 2016).The group is working to reformulate and restructure its organizational bodies and mechanisms to strengthen the economic, military and security capacities of its member states and bolster cooperation in the face of the challenges and threats posed by transboundary changes in the region and their repercussions on the security, stability and development

of these states. CEN-SAD members have rallied around a single priority: to create a collective framework for cooperation against terrorism, one based on a precise definition of the term, and the development of concrete mechanisms for combatting it.

In certain conflict and post-conflict regions, legal restrictions on weapon ownership and dealing have been accompanied by programmes to collect unlicensed firearms and by campaigns or rallies that call for a ban on firearms in towns and cities. Examples include Libya (2012), South Sudan (2012), the West Bank (as from 2007), and Yemen. Large-scale military operations have been conducted on weapons traffickers, organized criminals, and non-state militias across the MENA region, including in areas run byauthorities deemed to be internationally illegitimate, such as Hamas in the Gaza Strip and al-Shabaab in Somalia. To this end, in more stable countries, authorities may employ coercive measures (such as making punishment for illicit ownership of unlicensed firearms more severe, as in Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the UAE) and soft measures (such as an amnesty for those who surrender unlicensed arms and ammunition, as in Egypt in 2012.In war or post-war countries, only a very small proportion of the illegal weapons in circulation is likely to be collected, ultimately. In Libya, for instance, only a few hundred such weapons were collected, whereas the number of weapons in civilian hands is estimated to be high. A nationwide survey in 2013 indicated more than one-fifth of households possess one or more firearms (Florquin, Kartas, and Pavesi, 2014:6).

Some countries in the region have signed the Khartoum Declaration on the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons across the neighboring countries of Western Sudan aimed at strengthening cooperation and coordination efforts in order to control the spread, flow, misuse, and illegal circulation of small arms and light weapons within and across borders. The five signatory countries in 2012 were the Central African Republic, Chad, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Libya, and Sudan. International pressures are being exerted on Algeria and other Sahel countries, namely Libya, Mauritania, and Morocco, for them to better control arms proliferation in the region and set up an efficient coalition against ISIS (Islamic State). Numerous security summits have been held in Maghreb countries on pertinent topics, including the dissemination of Libyan arms, illegal immigration, and cooperation against terrorism (Magharebia, 2011; 2013). More coercively, the international community has placed pressure on Hezbollah and Palestinian groups to disarm themselves through UN Security Council resolutions, such as resolutions 1559 and 1701 (UNSC, 2004, 2006).Yet such steps have been relatively ineffective.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

Countries in the CEN-SAD (and MENA) region are suffering political instability and the severe toll of increased lethal violence. With the demise of former, traditional centers of power, new and different institutions and actors (such as tribal networks, armed groups, and jihadists) arose to seize the opportunity. Armed conflicts in the area are beset with a plethora of armed actors supporting divergent political ideologies and agendas. In a part of the world with a significant and growing youth bulge, such generations are growing up in an environment that is riddled with insecurity, violence, and armed conflict. The impact of ensuing, persistent armed conflict and violence extends beyond regional borders will be evident for years to come.Because numerous states in the region arehighly militarized, political turmoil prevails, and weapons are in abundant supply, these weapons carry consequences for armed violence in the region. The instability in many countries has affected the trade, availability, and demand for weapons through the Sahel-Saharan region and beyond. Soon after the initial political unrest, weapons from government stockpiles began to enter the market and, simultaneously, trafficking increased as border controls weakened.

Furthermore, several key factors need to be addressed to reduce armed violence and promote security sustainably. Above all, state institutions need improved capacity to provide security and justice and to stem the illicit proliferation of small arms and light weapons (SALWs). For efforts to be successful, they need to be integrated and cross-national. The impact of the wide availability of small arms in the region, compounded by political instability, appears to have raised awareness of other, related problems and consequently about the need for cooperation, to limit and better control the dissemination and trafficking of small arms and light weapons. Such much needed measures should be accompanied by additional steps in an integrated approach to tackle conflict and violence in the region.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

Having recognized how the proliferation of arms ultimately foments violence, several countries in the CEN-SAD (and MENA) region have begun to take measures against trafficking, to reduce the flow of weapons across borders, and to better control those firearms that are privately owned. These measures are likely thus to reduce the violence that is linked more typically with the trafficking and ownership of illicit weapons. However, several ongoing armed conflicts in the region will continue to attract the trafficking of arms and ammunitions.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

i. Of all the regions in Africa, the CEN-SAD faces the most security challenges. Why is this so? Discuss with clear examples.

ii. Is terrorism CEN-SAD's biggest security challenge? Discuss, if true or refute and state its biggest security challenge. Empiricism is important.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Bujra, A. and Solomon, H (2004). "Perspectives on the OAU/AU and Conflict Management in Africa" Edited (African Centre for Applied Research and Training in Social Development, CEN-SAD and Development Management Policy Forum, pp. 1 – 9).

Daragahi, B. (2013). 'Egyptians Become Victims of Soaring Crime Rate.' *Financial Times*. May 1st. http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/7ffac226-adab-11e2-a2c7-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2cnYLcgSl

Florquin, N, Kartas, M, and Pavesi, I. (2014). Searching for Stability: Perceptions of Security, Justice, and Firearms in Libya. Security Assessment in North Africa Issue Brief No. 1. Geneva: Small Arms Survey. http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/G-Issue-briefs/SAS-SANA-IB1-Searching-for-Stability-Libya.pdf

Magharebia. (2011). 'Sahel Security Summit Focuses on Libya Arms.' Sudan Vision. September 11. <http://news.sudanvision-daily.com/details.html?rsnpid=198942>

Nassar, G (2016). "CEN-SAD unites against terror", Al-Ahram Weekly, 31 March. Available from http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/News/15936/17/CEN-SAD-unites-against-terror.

## MODULE 4: AFRICA, THE UNITED NATIONS AND GLOBAL SECURITY

**Unit 1: International Aid, Neocolonialism and Security in Africa**

**Unit 2: Africa and AFRICOM**

**Unit 3: Africa and the United Nations**

**Unit 4: United Nations Peace and Security Missions in Africa**

**Unit 5: Africa's Contributions to Global and International Security**

## UNIT 1: INTERNATIONAL AID, NEOCOLONIALISM AND SECURITY IN AFRICA

### CONTENT



### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The world is a single and interconnected unit and so, events and situations in one part of the world affects another part or other parts. This means that in most cases, there are contagious effects of happenings in the world such that when one sneezes, another or others would catch cold. It is this systemic and interrelatedness of the world that has made security and insecurity the concern of every country. This is because a security concern in one country has the potential of spiraling into another country or other countries. For example, the season of coup d'état in Africa had a contagious effect as different African countries experienced it almost within the same period. It is because of this that the United Nations, and other international and regional organizations as we have discussed in Module 3 were formed to ensure that peace is maintained within countries, regions, continents and in the world. Following from this, this unit discusses Africa in international and global security by looking at how neo-colonialism and foreign aid impacts on security on the continent, the role of the United Nations in peace and security in Africa, why America established the AFRICOM, the role Africans played during the first and second World Wars, etc.

### 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, the student is expected to:

i. Understand the meanings of international aid and neocolonialism;
ii. Be able to see the relationship between international aid/neocolonialism and security in Africa.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

Apart from misconceiving the relationship between security and development, African leaders have also misconceived the ideological usage of foreign aid extended to them to resolve their development problems. African leaders often talk of utilizing a "Marshal Plan for Africa" that will, something akin to the Marshall Plan for Europe that helped resuscitate the economies of European countries after the devastations of the Second World War, assist the continent in its quest for development. According to Ayittey (2002), between 1960 and 1997, African countries have received about $400 billion in aids, almost the same amount European countries were given, but the continent have failed to utilize these aids as Europe did. He went further to assert that the problem of using aid to resolve Africa's development challenge can be situated within some economic calculations.

One of such calculations is that Western donors give out these aids for their economic and strategic concerns. For example, during the Cold War period, the Samuel Doe led government in Liberia received a lot of financial and non-financial aid from the United States of America so that he can continue to fight the communism, which was seeking inroads into the continent. Also, during the General Ibrahim Babangida military regime in Nigeria, the country received loans from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) that was, albeit surreptitiously, meant to open up the Nigerian oil sector for exploration (and exploitation) by Multinational oil corporations. Guest (2004) succinctly points out that many African countries were consciously sent foreign aid, through the IMF and the World Bank, so that they will adopt policies that impoverished them.

From the above, one can see that the Western idea that statist economies will stimulate growth in Africa became a problem as it prevented the market forces from regulating the economy. Eventually, the nationalization of companies and in some cases, the imposition of the cost of service by the government, led to the shutting down of productive ventures as production cost became higher than the cost of sales and as a result, African states use aid to subsidize material consumptions instead of investing in production. This was what happened in Zambia under Kenneth Kaunda and Frederick Chuluba, in Zimbabwe under Robert Mugabe, in Kenya under Daniel ArapMoi and in Nigeria under General Ibrahim Babangida. These countries, after receiving foreign aid, used it to service their various over bloated and corrupt bureaucracies. The consequence of this kind of practice, is increased poverty, insecurity and general under-development as resources from these aids meant to stimulate development are diverted through corrupt means.

It is also worthy to note that donor agencies, capitalizing on the failure of African leaders to stimulate development, designed strategies to control African resources by bankrolling African autocrats and tyrants. GnassingbeEyadema of Togo and Julius Nyerere of Tanzania are clear examples of leaders in Africa who were sponsored by capitalist agencies and used for their interests. Secondly, the incapability of utilizing foreign aid to stimulate development by Africa leaders creates room for western economies to manipulate their lending policies against African states. Roche (2004:49) citing Mohamed Dato Seri argues that:

> The rich countries give no more aid. They do not lend either. And all the time, the international agencies they control try to strangle the debt – laden poor countries which had been attacked by their greedy market manipulators …the rich want to squeeze out literally the last drop of blood from the powers.

The implication of the above statement can be viewed from many perspectives. First, it can be argued that due to the misapplication of foreign aid by African leaders, rich countries have refused to extend "free" aid for developmental issues in Africa. Secondly, the these rich countries continue to drain the economies of African countries through neocolonialist strategies by the conditions they put in place when giving these aids - conditions that have turned African countries into beggars. Thirdly, with the increase in global terrorism, rich Western nations, who are usually the senders of aids to Africa, have taken more security cautious strategies to ensure their security and this have left little room for resources to be sent to Africa, especially to those African countries where they do not have any economic interests. That is, instead of the usual 'Father Christmas' of sending aid to Africa, terrorism have made these countries to seek better ways to protect their nations and nationals by developing hi-tech technological weapons and gadgets and, through what they still dub as 'military aid', send old and obsolete weapons to Africa with the assurances that these weapons would help in safeguarding Africa.

On another front, Khor (2003) argues that developing countries, particularly those in Africa, have seen their independent policy making capacity eroded and have no choice than to adopt policies made by these donor countries, a position that has become detrimental to their economies. Also, the activities of TNC and MNC especially in an era of high technological development has resulted in a situation where the rich economies, especially of those of countries in Western Europe, China, Japan and the United States of America, have unchecked powers when operating within the territories of Africa. It is therefore apt to argue that American business interest in the Gambia, the Chinese interest in Sudan, the French interest in Ivory Coast and British interest in Nigeria and Ghana and in many other places, the rape of African resources continues.

It therefore becomes necessary to agree with Asogwu (2009) that the imperialist through their agents have continued to weaken African economies through their imposed harsh economic policies. The Bretton Woods institutions, the IMF and the World Bank, have also exacerbated the security and development challenges in Africa especially in those countries that need debt rescheduling who are forced to adopt Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAP). This is because the adjusted conditions are usually anti-people and anti-developmental within the African context. Neo-colonialism is … the worst form of imperialism. For those who practiced it, it means power without responsibility and for those who suffer it, it means exploitation without redress.

Apart from using Aid to project their interest in African countries, the major world powers have exhibited their interest into the exploration and takeover of the resources of African countries. For instance, in the Great Lakes region, the United State and France have become the major players in the conflict affecting the region due to their strategic interest in the natural resources of the area. According to Ntalaja (2007), America's major interest in Africa is to resist the incursion of the region by Islamic fundamentalist, terrorists and anti-USA economic interest. To this end, the United States supported and trained the Rwandan military in what they termed "Counter Genocide Force". In Congo, the United States support for Kabila against Mobutu was a reflection of America's desire to keep out leaders that are turning to countries hostile to America for assistance. Even when Rwandan and Ugandan troops were actively involved in the Congo crisis, the United States did not decline from supporting them but instead assisted them with more military equipment and strategies.

France on the other hand, was backing the political struggle in these countries. It can be argued that, the fear of losing her hegemony in the Great Lakes region to a viable, peaceful and democratic Congo and other Anglo-phone countries have made France to continue in sponsoring crisis in the region. The interest and ferocity of the involvement of the super powers in this region is also aggravated by the economic and exploitative interest of the Multinational Corporations scrambling for the resources of the region in mining concessions and exploration rights. The geological scandal status of the Congo as ascribed to her by the colonial exploiters as a result of her abundant mineral resources of copper, cobalt and gold have continued to keep the multinationals in the area irrespective of the political crisis and wars. Just as in the Niger - Delta region of Nigeria, the extraction of raw materials by the MNC in the region has been without adequate corporate responsibility such as environmental protection and local involvement - a situation that led to frustration of the locals, hence the continuous conflicts the region has been experiencing.

Kaplan (1998) uses the anarchic theory to explain the causality factors of conflicts in the West African region. He argues that the crisis of post-colonial West African states is represented in what he describes as the "new symbol of future strategic danger". To him, this new symbol is shown in the lack of responsible, responsive and productive government and state that is lawless and tyrannical, a state that is responsible for the ever occurring conflict in the region. Flay – Rich (2007) supports Kaplan's position and argues that tyrannical regimes in West African Countries of Sierra Leone, Liberia and Ivory Coast have natured barbaric impulses that vented themselves in the form of civil conflicts in these states. It should therefore be clear that the crisis of the neo-colonial state in Africa also results to the powerlessness of the states to manage and maintain the "cracked" independence that was given to them by the departing colonial masters. The neo-colonial crisis of the state in Africa was succinctly captured by Nkrumah (1965:10) when the noted that:

> Neo-colonialism is … the worst form of imperialism. For those who practiced it, it means power without responsibility and for those who suffer it, it means exploitation without redress.

The implication of the above is that the crisis of domestic governance created by the exploitative superpowers exacerbated by the capitalist manipulations of the international economic organizations through the conditions they attach to foreign aids have continued to generate crisis in African states. This condition is aggravated by the conspiracy of the African compradors who, as argued by Klay-Kieh (2007), serve as junior collaborators with the ruling classes of the metropolitan powers. Thus, it becomes necessary to argue that, using its control over state power, the compradors in Africa use the state's machinery to cow the population into submission and to undertake other anti-people activities in the interest of foreign capital. The consequences of this is that the compradors in the South neglect the cultural, ecological, economic, political, and social and security nets of their people and imbibe the foreign means which is not suited to the Africa's development and security environment. A clear example of this is Sierra Leone. The Sierra Leonean state served the interests of the imperialist powers, multinational corporations and the Lebanese oligopoly that presided over the retail trade industry. The state also provided a conducive atmosphere for profit accumulation by foreigners while at the same time suppressing internal opposition to the exploitation and deprivation suffered by the masses.

Analyzing this situation, Fyle (1993) notes that 78% of Sierra Leone's mining and export of diamonds were controlled by multinational corporations in the country and this was as a result of an open door policy introduced by Prime Minister Milton in the 1960s. This

policy gave the foreign capital unbridled 60% access to the Sierra Leonean economy. Klay-Kieh (2007) argued that the economic crisis of Sierra Leone was exacerbated by a hostile international capitalist system coupled with a perpetual capitalist mode of production and a parasitic, kleptocratic, hegemonic, non-productive, unpatriotic and non-nationalistic compradorial class who stymied people-centered development and generated various crisis. The economic crisis that was created by this approach led to the adoption of the Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) which also led to the devaluation of the Sierra Leone currency. This devaluation led to a decline in the purchasing power of civil servants and the masses, hence the emergence of smuggling of minerals by the citizens who were able to form armed gangs to increase their purchasing power.

This problem was again escalated by the corrupt activities of the ruling class. This condition led to the marginalization of the majority, rural neglect, and collapse in infrastructure, low literacy level and high poverty level. The above scenario soon gave birth to political crisis that was exacerbated by the cult ideology of the presidency. This cult ideology means that the president is untouchable and is to be feared. Thus, the presidency in Sierra Leone was elevated to the level of a deity. It became an omniscient, omnipotent and omnipresent government. The president destroyed democratic institutions and all powers were centered on him. The tenure of parliamentarians was dependent on him or her loyalty to the president. Civil societies were destroyed and a one party system was instituted in 1978. Although a multiparty system was later created, the ruling All People's Congress (APC) refused severally to include opposition parties on the ballot papers. The consequence of the above was the lack of legitimacy hence a resort to "terror rule" in retaining and utilizing power. The "Hoi Polli", a government militia group, thus became the masters of the town as they were backed by the government to intimidate, harass and even kill suspected opposition politicians. With this background, the masses came to the conclusion that, there is need for a regime change which could only be done violently.

This resolution gave birth to an ally which needed not only to supply the weaponry to be used but also to train and support the revolutionary struggle. The National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) of Charles Taylor therefore became the ready ally with the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) as it was also wedging war to oust President Samuel Doe. According to Bangura (2003), FodahSankoh's RUF and Taylor's NPFL had resolved to assist each other in their plans to over throw their respective governments. The leaders of both movements had met in military training camps in Benghazi, Libya, during their struggle. They received the support of Muammar Gaddafi, Libya's President, who was looking for allies to overcome the West's containment of his regime. In deeper

terms, the situation in Sierra Leone can be situated within the context of class suicide, ethnic maneuvering and state failure. Sierra Leone gained its independence in 1961 with Sir Arthur Morgai as its first Prime Minister.

It was originally populated by the Bulom people. According to Omagu (2001) it has approximately 18 other ethnic entities with the largest group being the Mende and Temme. The country experienced its first coup d'état in 1967 led by Major Charles Blake over an alleged electoral offences that prevented the presumed winner, Siaka Stevens, from emerging as the country's Prime Minister. Subsequently, Siaka Stevens was invited to form the government in 1968. He transformed the country into a one party state in 1978. In order to have a firm control of the affairs of the country, he further laid some structures on ground that would make him relevant. According to Reno (2003), the failure of the Sierra Leonean state was not derived from a sudden vacuum of power, but from the deliberate strategy pursued by political leaders to undermine state structures, public services and institutions, while monopolizing economic resources. This weak state of the nation which started in the 1970s was worsened by Siaka Stevens who systematically worked to weaken the state in order to ascertain his personal power and to take control of the economic resources of the country.

State failure in Sierra Leone translated into a security vacuum when Stevens undermined the army by understaffing them and providing them with little weaponry and by ignoring the rule of law. Stevens therefore encouraged what Chalbal and Daloz (1999) called the political instrumentality of disorder. Chalbal and Dazol had argued that, politics and development conditions in contemporary African societies as a source of conflicts, is situated within the controversial concept of political instrumentality of disorder. To them, this is a process by which political actors in Africa seek to maximize their returns on the state of confusion, uncertainty and sometimes even chaos. To them, Africa leaders relay on patrimonialism which in turn exacerbate the disorder as a result of the confusion, level of illiteracy and cowardice behavior of their people to capture, retain and privatize the resources of their countries. Stevens therefore relayed on this and sponsored the emergence of militia and private groups, mostly comprising of marginalized youths, an act that introduced the culture of violence in that country.

According to Ahmed (2001), upon his retirement, Siaka Stevens appointed the Army Chief, Major General Joseph Momoh as President. As a result of this, the country was not in a good shape since the people were not in support of President Momoh. The failure of the state in Sierra Leone translated into economic predation and misappropriation of the state resources by privatizing state owned businesses, non-payment of salaries of civil servants which made them to loot government properties for survival. There was massive

corruption and the repressive one party system led to the over throw of Joseph Momoh's government in 1992 by Captain Valentine Strasser. Earlier in 1991, a corporal, FodaySankoh founded the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) to fight Momoh's government. Following the international pressure and economic sanctions on Sierra-Leone over the execution of alleged coup plotters and refusal to hand over power to civilians, Captain Strasser was over thrown by Brigadier Julius Maada Bio in 1996. In his effort to bring peace to the country, a few weeks later, Brigadier Bio organized elections and Dr. Ahmed TejjanKabbah emerged victorious and was announced the president. However, the elections were nearly disturbed by RUF rebel who prevented people from voting.

With the civilians' in charge of the presidency under TejjanKabbah, the acute problem they faced was the challenge of keeping the country afloat and rebels who posed a major threat to the peace and security of Sierra-Leone. According to Stewart (2001) President Kabbah once in power had to contend with the RUF rebel military incursion. He also tried to checkmate the power of the regular army through the encouragement of civil defense military. In as much as Kabbah wanted to fight the RUF, the arms in the possession of RUF and the support RUF got from other countries within and outside Africa made it difficult as the activities of RUF were increasing on daily bases. According to Karl (2001), in May 1997, soldiers broke into the freedom prison and released Major Johnny Koromah who was held for coup plotting. They seized power after a fight and Kabbah escaped to Guinea. Now that the president was no more in office, the soldiers were once again in power. Despite international community condemnation of the regime, some African countries such as Burkina Faso, Liberia, Libya and a few others supported the coup and the regime. This created problem and division among ECOWAS members since some of their members were in support of the coup and others were against it. The division was so much that it resulted in the suspension of Sierra-Leone from the Commonwealth and the imposition of oil and arms embargo on the country by the United Nations. The United Nations further authorized ECOMOG through ECOWAS to enforce the embargo to its logical conclusion.

Cote d'Ivoire is also another West African State that has witnessed violent conflicts that suits into our analysis. Cote d'Ivoire just like other African societies has unresolved cases of ethnic domination and discrimination. The national disequilibrium question and the issues of elite class domination and exploitation of the masses of the country was deeply rooted in the economy. According to Bonzeman (1996:23), the political crisis in Cote d'Ivoire is firmly situated within the context of the desire by the ruling class to continue to maintain and control political powers within the parameters of ethnic hegemony. For

instance, for thirty years after independence, the ruling PDG was the only political party in the country. This was because the political space was restricted until 1990 when Laurent Gbagbo headed the first opposition party. By 1993, AlassaneOuattara also established the Republican Party. It is pertinent to note that, from 1960 to this period, (1960) political leadership was restricted to one ethnic group, the Baoule ethnic groups who regarded the presidency as their hereditary rights.

Just like in Liberia, President HouphonetBoigny on assumption of duty operated the open door policy that invited other francophone nationals to participate in the economic activities of the country. The involvement of foreigners in the government of Cote D'Ivoire was so high that President Boigny appointed SidiaToure, a Guinean, as the Secretary to the Government of Prime Minister AlassaneOuattara while other nationals also served as Ambassadors, Head of Service and Ministers amongst others (Shafiu, 2001). This policy became a source of political crisis when Guei became the president and insisted that those elected and holding political offices must be children of Ivorian parents. The foreigners who had dominated the economy for many years became aggrieved and fermented trouble. The consequence of allowing foreigners to occupy positions in the Ivorian government also manifested when the indigenous Ivorian political elite rejected Ouattara and considered him as a foreigner.

Just as in other African countries where the neo-colonial dependency structures have continued to be a source of conflicts, the interest of the super powers in Ivorian resources also played a prominent role in the conflict. Cote d'Ivoire presented a class of interest between France and the USA. For instance, while France accepted the calculations and alliances that brought Gbagbo to power in 2000, USA rejected it and withdrew her economic assistance. This situation affected the economic setting of the country hence the decline in the purchasing power of the Ivoirians. Again, official corruption also became rampant. Despite this, since Quattara was a former IMF Vice President, powerful nations continue to support him as long as he continued in the implementation of IMF conditions in the country. By propagating himself in power and using that power to deprive citizens, but promoting the interests of Western powers, violence and conflict erupted in the country.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

As noted above, apart from using aid/grant to project their interest in African countries, the major world powers have exhibited their interest into the exploration and takeover of the resources of African countries. For example, in the Great Lakes region, the United States and France have become the major players in the conflict affecting the region due to their strategic interest in the natural resources of the area. America's major interest in Africa is to resist the incursion of the region by Islamic fundamentalist, terrorists and anti-USA economic interest. To this end, the United States supported and trained the Rwandan military in what they termed "Counter Genocide Force". In Congo, the United States support for Kabila against Mobutu was a reflection of America's desire to keep out leaders that are turning to countries hostile to America for assistance. Even when Rwandan and Ugandan troops were actively involved in the Congo crisis, the United States did not decline from supporting them but instead assisted them with more military equipment and strategies. France on the other hand, was backing the political struggle in these countries. It can be argued that, the fear of losing her hegemony in the Great Lakes region to a viable, peaceful and democratic Congo and other Anglo-phone countries have made France to continue in sponsoring crisis in the region.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

The quote by Kwame Nkrumah perfectly captures the connections between international aid, neocolonialism and security in Africa. According to Nkrumah, "Neo-colonialism is the worst form of imperialism. For those who practiced it, it means power without responsibility and for those who suffer it, it means exploitation without redress". This goes to show that for Africans, who are recipients of international aids, they are continually tied down in a neocolonial relationship with foreign governments, institutions and organizations who grant these aids. Indeed, he who pays the piper dictates the tune. These aid 'donors' to African countries are not Father Christmas neither are they stupid. To them, these aids are 'investments' for which they must have not only returns, but also make interests. In doing so, they pete African leaders against each other or against their people. This is one of the many reasons why crisis and violence on the continent is now a permanent feature. These grant/aid donating foreign governments, institutions and organizations are usually the sponsors of violent conflicts in Africa – the modern adaptation of the British colonial philosophy of Divide-and-Rule**.**

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSESSMENT

i. Foreign aid means recolonizing African countries a second time. Discuss.

ii. Foreign superpowers like the USA, UK, France and China are not solely responsible for the levels of insecurity within the African continent. Discuss

iii. "African leaders are tools in the hands of international aid donors because whenever music is placed in donor countries, they are willing dancers". Explain and discuss this statement with clear examples.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Adebayo, A. (2014). Africa's peacemakers: Nobel peace laureates of African descent. Zed Books.

De waal, A. (2009). FAMINE CRIMES. Politics and the disaster relief industry in Africa.

Englund, H. (2006). Prisoners of freedom: Human Rights and the African poor. University of California Press.

Macmillan, M. (2013). The war that ended peace: How Europe abandoned peace for the First World War. Profile Books.

Sharit, A. (2013). My promised land: The triumph and tragedy of Israel. Spiegel and Grau

White, H. (2013). The China Choice; Why we should share power. Oxford University Press

## UNIT 2: AFRICA AND AFRICOM

## CONTENTS



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

At the end of World War II and the start-up of the Cold War, the two earliest, still existing, geographic combatant commands are the U.S. European Command and the U.S. Pacific Command, which were created in 1947. The Department of States (DoS) established its Africa Bureau in 1958, signaling the importance that the United States placed on political relations with a growing number of independent African countries (Anyasio, 2008). By contrast, the US Department of Defence (DoD) cartography of Africa was dictated by Cold War geopolitics. During the Cold War, Africa remained a low military/security priority for the United States, despite the numerous proxy wars Washington was tacitly or directly supporting on the continent. Africa was not even included in the U.S. military command structure until 1952, when several North African countries were added to the European Command. In 1983, responsibility for Africa was divided between the European, Central, and Pacific Commands - a structure that persisted until AFRICOM's creation in 2007. This unit discusses AFRICOM and its objective towards enhancing security by the USA on the African continent.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

The aim of this unit is to expose the student to interest of the United States of America in the security of the African continent and the Africans attitude towards AFRICOM. Therefore after this lecture, students should:

i. Understand American interest in Africa's security;
ii. Know the past and current attitudes of Africans towards AFRICOM

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENTS

### 3.1 History and Functions of AFRICOM

The United States Africa Command (AFRICOM or USAFRICOM) is one of ten unified combatant commands of the United States Armed Forces, headquartered at Kelley Barracks, Stuttgart, Germany. It is responsible for U.S. military operations, including fighting regional conflicts and maintaining military relations with 53 African nations. Its area of responsibility covers all of Africa except Egypt, which is within the area of responsibility of the United States Central Command. U.S. AFRICOM headquarters operating budget was $276 million in fiscal year of 2012. The Commander of U.S. AFRICOM reports to the Secretary of Defense. In individual countries, U.S. Ambassadors continue to be the primary diplomatic representative for relations with host nations.

After the end of the Cold War, U.S. military policymakers saw little need to court African leaders. The Department of Defence's1995 U.S. Security Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa, for example, concluded that ultimately the United States sees very little traditional strategic interest in Africa. However, the 1998 bombings of U.S. Embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dares Salaam, Tanzania, were an inflection point toward greater U.S. strategic interest in Africa. In 1999, DoD opened the African Center for Security Studies to support the development of U.S. strategic policy toward Africa - a move that could be seen as a precursor to its creation of AFRICOM in 2007. DoD recognized that establishing a regional center dedicated to Africa made sense, given the continent's rising importance, but could not yet justify a much larger proposition, a geographic combatant command (CCMD) for Africa.

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, popularly known as 9/11, also marked a turning point in U.S. strategic policy toward Africa. The events of 9/11 forced a reassessment of and placed greater attention on the presence of extremists on the continent. One result was the creation of the Combined Joint Task Force - Horn of Africa in 2002, ostensibly to capture Islamic fighters fleeing from Afghanistan and the Middle East. In 2003, an academic had called for the creation of "U.S. Forces Africa," but his proposal was not accepted by the U.S. Government. Around the mid-2000s, the U.S. Government reached a tipping point in its views of Africa's significance. For example, in its March 2006 U.S. National Security Strategy, the Bush administration concluded that Africa [held] growing geostrategic importance and [had become] a high priority. In congressional testimony that same month, Commander General John P. Abizaid of Central Command stated that he viewed the Horn of Africa as "vulnerable to penetration by regional extremist groups, terrorist activity, and ethnic violence". General James L. Jones of the European Command pointed out in 2006 that his Command's staff was spending more than half its time on African issues, up from almost no time 3 years

earlier. That same year, General Bantz Craddock, Jones's successor, stated that Africa in recent years had posed "the greatest security stability challenge" to [the U.S. European Command] and "a separate command for Africa would provide better focus and increase synergy in support of U.S. policy and engagement".

Consistent with the advice of General Craddock, President Bush decided in 2007 to create AFRICOM. AFRICOM's creation also marked the disappearance of the one of the U.S. Government's last organizational vestiges of the colonial period and Cold War in that U.S.-Africa security relations were no longer subordinated to the European Command. In a November 21, 2012, speech at Chatham House in London, United Kingdom (UK), AFRICOM Commander General Carter Ham made informal comments that reflected the above timeline:

> Africa, to be completely honest, is not a part of the world that the United States military has focused on very intently until recently. We have had previously only a very small number of U.S. military intelligence analysts who focused on Africa and an extraordinary but small community of attachés with repetitive assignments and experiences on the African continent. . . .That changed in the mid-2000s. And I think amidst military engagement in other parts of the world, there was a growing recognition in the United States that Africa was increasingly important to the United States in a number of areas, certainly economically but politically and diplomatically as well from a development standpoint and also from a security standpoint. So in the mid-2000s there was a decision to establish the United States military command that was exclusively focused on the African continent (Brown, 2013).

Prior to the creation of AFRICOM, responsibility for U.S. military operations in Africa was divided across three unified commands: United States European Command (EUCOM) for West Africa, United States Central Command (CENTCOM) for East Africa, and United States Pacific Command (PACOM) for Indian Ocean waters and islands off the east coast of Africa. A U.S. military officer wrote the first public article calling for the formation of a separate African command in November 2000. Following a 2004 global posture review, the United States Department of Defense began establishing a number of Cooperative Security Locations (CSLs) and Forward Operating Sites (FOSs) across the African continent, through the auspices of EUCOM which had nominal command of West Africa at that time. These locations, along with Camp Lemonnier in Djibouti, would form the basis of AFRICOM facilities on the continent. Areas of military interest to the United States in Africa include the Sahara/Sahel region, over which Joint Task Force Aztec Silence is conducting anti-terrorist operations (Operation Enduring Freedom - Trans Sahara), Djibouti in the Horn of Africa, where Combined Joint Task

Force – Horn of Africa is located (overseeing Operation Enduring Freedom - Horn of Africa), and the Gulf of Guinea.

The website Magharebia.com was launched by USEUCOM in 2004 to provide news about North Africa in English, French and Arabic. When AFRICOM was created, it took over operation of the website. Information operations of the United States Department of Defense was criticized by the Senate Armed Forces Committee and defunded by Congress in 2011. The site was closed down in February 2015. In 2007, the United States Congress approved $500 million for the Trans-Saharan Counterterrorism Initiative (TSCTI) over six years to support countries involved in counterterrorism against threats of Al Qaeda operating in African countries, primarily Algeria, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Nigeria, and Morocco. This program builds upon the former Pan Sahel Initiative (PSI), which concluded in December 2004 and focused on weapon and drug trafficking, as well as counterterrorism. Previous U.S. military activities in Sub-Saharan Africa have included Special Forces associated Joint Combined Exchange Training. Letitia Lawson, writing in 2007 for a Center for Contemporary Conflict journal at the Naval Postgraduate School, noted that U.S. policy towards Africa, at least in the medium-term, looks to be largely defined by international terrorism, the increasing importance of African oil to American energy needs, and the dramatic expansion and improvement of Sino-African relations since 2000.

The U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) is currently operating along five lines of effort:

i. Neutralize al-Shabaab and transition the security responsibilities of the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) to the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS)
ii. Degrade violent extremist organizations in the Sahel Maghreb and contain instability in Libya
iii. Contain and degrade Boko Haram
iv. Interdict illicit activity in the Gulf of Guinea and Central Africa with willing and capable African partners
v. Build peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance and disaster response capacity of African partners.

### 3.2 Africa's Attitudes towards AFRICOM

Pointing to 9/11, and U.S.-led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, many African opinion leaders are concerned that AFRICOM's founding reflected a growing militarization of U.S. relations with their continent and a new focus on anti-terrorism at the expense of traditional development aid. They feared that - far from alleviating the continent's insecurity - AFRICOM would incite, not deter, terrorist attacks. Some feared U.S.

support for repressive regimes. Others accused the United States of a "new imperialism," and said AFRICOM was a tool for U.S. "exploitation" of Africa's oil and mineral wealth.

According to Brown (2013), many African governments and civil society opinion leaders were also vehemently opposed to the creation of AFRICOM because:

i. They felt inadequately consulted during the conceptualization of AFRICOM, and resented the Command as yet another fait accompli hoisted on the continent by a superpower not interested in listening to African views about their own future;
ii. AFRICOM's headquarters were originally proposed to be in Africa, a decision that revealed DoD's lack of understanding of the politics of the continent. Any country hosting a new U.S. military command, for example, would be severely criticized for violating Africa's common positions on African defense and security, which discourage the hosting of foreign troops on African soil;
iii. Africans often have a very negative view of their own militaries because of past misbehavior, including coups, mistreatment of civilians, and corruption. Even though the reality is that U.S. military personnel are professional and committed to civilian control, they are perceived by some Africans as untrustworthy as African militaries or, even worse, as neo-colonialists;
iv. AFRICOM was particularly strongly opposed, at least initially, by countries such as South Africa and Nigeria, which saw it as a threat to their status as regional hegemons.
v. There was also a concern that AFRICOM, even if initially a positive, "new" kind of CCMD Plus, would suffer from mission creep and evolve from an engagement and training focus to an interventionist force, such as allegedly occurred with Operation RESTORE HOPE in Somalia in 1992.

Reacting to these vociferous African pushback, the Bush administration decided in May 2008 to defer any final decision on the location of AFRICOM's headquarters. This resulted in more African states publicly acknowledging their willingness to work with the new Command, including Nigeria. By October 2008, the majority of African states had at least acquiesced to the idea that the U.S. military had established a military command responsible for Africa. The United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported in February 2009 that DoD had also taken steps to clarify AFRICOM's mission, including publishing an approved mission statement, but had not yet finalized a strategy for future communication with African and other stakeholders (GAO Report, 2009).

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

It is argued that AFRICOM was finally created in 2007 because the continent's time of strategic importance to the United States had finally arrived. Ironically, the Command may also prove to be one of the many commitments that the United States made but could not really afford because its existing commitments, including a decade of wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, were already so costly. The solution is also not to close down AFRICOM, which costs a pittance compared to the overall DoD budget, but to seek cost savings to make the Command's operations more efficient. One way to do this would be to undertake a top-down right-sizing exercise, including a possible reduction in its overall staffing. AFRICOM's J-2 directorate, with a large staff spread between Stuttgart, Molesworth, and Tampa, may be a Directorate that could be scaled back. This is important because, not minding where one stands, the strategic importance of AFRICOM to security in Africa far outweighs any other selfish interests that the United States may have in Africa.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

This unit has discussed the factors leading to the establishment of AFRICOM by the government of the United States of America. AFRICOM's sole mission is to assist Africa countries in its security challenges, considering the fact that almost every country in the continent is plagued with different types of violent conflicts and security issues: ethnoreligious conflicts, terrorism, piracy, drug and human trafficking, proliferation of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALWs), poverty, unemployment, militancy, guerilla agitations, amongst others. Typical of everything human, Africans are divided on the rationale for the establishment of the AFRICOM. While some see it as America's way of penetrating Africa to allocate for itself Africa's rich resources such as oil and gold, others say the continent actually needs America's help if it must wage a successful war against the potpourri of security challenges bedeviling the continent. Some others also see AFRICOM as America's way of staying in competition with the growing Chinese interests on the continent.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

i. America's interest in Africa, through the instrumentality of AFRICOM, is a selfish one. Discuss and support your explanations with appropriate examples.
ii. Africans have divided opinions concerning the need for AFRICOM on the continent. What is your take?

iii. Africans cannot protect themselves from each other so it is important to have a foreign organization help her secure its territories. Discuss.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Anyasio, C. (2008). "An Overview of AFRICOM: A Unified Combatant Command". DISAM Journal of International Security Assistance Management.

Brown, D.E. (2013). AFRICOM AT 5 YEARS: THE MATURATION OF A NEW U.S COMBATANT COMMAND. The Letort Papers, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S Army War College, Carlisle, PA.

Ortiz, M. (2008). "U.S Africa Command: A New Way of Thinking". National Security Watch.

## UNIT 3:AFRICA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

## CONTENT



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The security interests of Africa and those of Africans should and have become a political subject in world politics. Africa's geopolitical setting has made it a viable arena for the playing out of emergent global security dimensions such as terrorism, climatic catastrophes, and the manipulation of weak despotic states. It is now paramount to identify the common security interests between Africa and the west, which by and large have turned out to be interconnected, affecting all of us around the world to at least some extent, even if their resonance, or impact, does vary. Also important is to determine what the design or blueprint of this integrated global security policy should be, taking into consideration that these emerging threats by their very nature are beyond the capacity and sometimes the will of any one state acting alone – i.e., a shared responsibility. One way to go about this would be to learn through both the positive example and negative lessons of the Transatlantic Alliance of the US and Europe, but replicated in a more global setting.

The world is now a global village and as such African countries interact with other countries from other regions of the world, especially through the instrumentality of the United Nations Organization (UNO). It is why most African countries are members of the United Nations and have also, at different times, been elected as non-permanent members of the Security Council, the strongest organ of the UNO. As members of the United Nations and other international institutions, African countries have contributed resources; human and capital, to promote international peace and security, not only within the African continent but also in other parts of the world. This unit discusses the relationship

between Africa and the United Nations and the contributions of the continent in international peace and security from the First World War to contemporary time.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

The aim of this lecture is to expose the student to the relationship between Africa and the United Nations as it relates to security. After this lecture, the student should:

i. Understand Africa's role in global security; and
ii. The United Nation and security in Africa.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 Africa Membership of the United Nations

The current relationship between African countries and the United Nations appears paradoxical: while there may be a lot of talk about Africa in the United Nations, there is not so much talk with Africa and even less so of Africa itself and its role at the UN. Historically, this bond has undergone several transformations. At the time when the UN Charter was drafted there were less than a handful of independent African states. However, as African countries decolonized throughout the 1960s, the status of Africa at the UN started to change. The newly independent African countries became members to the UN and learned to use the world organization as a podium to put forward interests such as economic development and decolonization.

In the United Nations, Member States were unofficially grouped into five geopolitical groups with the African Group having 54 Member States with Africa having three seats on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) currently represented by Angola, Egypt and Senegal. Africa also has 14 seats on the United Nations Economic and Social Council and 13 seats on the United Nations Human Rights Council. Concerning the post of the President of the United Nations General Assembly, Africa is eligible to have an African elected in years ending with 4 and 9. For example, Ali Treki of Libya was the President of the UN General Assembly in 2009. As at July 2011, the following African countries are members of the United Nations: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal,

Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

To date, African countries form the largest regional grouping at the UN, with over a quarter (28%) of all UN Member States. Yet group size per se does not automatically translate into pro-active, unified decision-making. On the contrary, speaking with one voice at the UN and synchronizing their position has become an ongoing challenge for African Member States to the UN.

### 3.2 Africa and the Security Council

The Security Council is the most powerful organ of the United Nations. It held its first session on 17th January 1946. The Security Council is charged with the maintenance of international peace and security as well accepting new members into the United Nations. The Security Council is also the only organ authorized to approve any changes to be made to the United Nations Charter. Some of its powers include the following: establishing peacekeeping operations, establishing international sanctions, authorizing military action. Since 1948, the Security Council has authorized major military and peacekeeping missions in Rwanda, Sudan, Kuwait, Cambodia, Bosnia, Namibia, Democratic Republic of Congo and Namibia.

The UNSC (United Nations Security Council, as it is officially designated) is an organ with fifteen members; five (5) permanent members and ten (10) non-permanent members. Its five permanent members are those countries who emerged victorious during the Second World War; France, United Kingdom, USA, China and Russia. Each member of this group have veto powers and as such can veto any substantive Council resolutions. The Presidency of the Security Council rotates monthly between all fifteen members.

Africa is sometimes represented by three countries (terms beginning with odd-numbered years) or two countries (terms beginning with even-numbered years), depending on the year of voting, on a non-permanent basis for a two year term in the UNSC. Currently, Africa has three representatives at the UNSC; Egypt, Senegal and Angola. According to the *Ezulwini Consensus,* a position adopted by African Foreign Ministers in the African Union (AU), Africa's goal is to be fully represented in all the decision-making organs of the UN, particularly on a permanent basis in the Security Council, which is the principal decision-making organ of the UN in matters relating to international peace and security. Several African countries such as Nigeria, South Africa, Senegal, Egypt, Kenya and Libya are pushing for their inclusion as permanent members of the UNSC.

The AU has been neutral in this and is pushing for the endorsement of two countries. African countries believe that electing an African country into a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council will enable the continent play important roles in the UN especially as it relates to promoting peace and security in Africa, instead of allowing 'outsiders' total control over peacekeeping missions on the continent as the UNSC is currently constituted.

### 3.3 Linking African Regional Security Institutions with the United Nations

During its tenure as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council in 2007 - 08, South Africa advocated closer cooperation in conflict resolution between the United Nations and regional African structures such as the African Union (AU), Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), etc. It proposed that the UN provide financial assistance and delegate some of its political and developmental tasks to regional organizations that share the same goals and interests. The South African position is that this would increase the efficiency of the UN and help fulfil Chapter VIII of its Charter.

Underlying South Africa's motivation is the advocacy for a larger voice for the Global South in both the UN and regional organizations in conflict resolution. In April 2008 the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) adopted Resolution 1809 on cooperation between the UN and the AU. In addition, one of the outcomes has been annual meetings between the UNSC and the AU Peace and Security Council. Indeed, a practical implementation of UN-AU cooperation was the introduction of the concept of 'hybridization' of peace missions, as those in Sudan and Burundi.

Regional bodies are an important component of Africa's solution to problems of global security. Regionalism and multilateralism allow Africa to be seen as a partner in resolving conflicts and promoting peace and stability rather than as a new hegemon in competition with the UN. The challenge for Africa is to help redefine security concepts in the area of overlap between regional organizations and the UN, and in the area of collective security when it comes to the nexus between security, development and democracy. The other side of this is that it may translate into an abdication of responsibility by the UN and important major powers in contributing to conflict resolution in Africa.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

Those who set the global security agenda include politicians, national and international civil servants, academics (mainly Westerners), journalists and civil society leaders, among others. In doing so, they often consider a number of variables, including, but not limited to, the following: current and projected global security threats; the physical, financial and human resources with which to address specific threats; and the language, idioms and paradigms within which the security threats and the means to address them are debated and formulated. Africa is clearly disadvantaged when it comes to these variables. Due to Africa's precarious financial, scientific and technological base, it does not have the capacity to monitor effectively the current global security problems and make reliable predictions about future threats. In terms of natural resources, Africa is enormously rich; but it lacks the science and technology needed to turn these resources into useable items or sources of global influence. As a result, Africans would find it hard to determine the objects and subjects of security and prescribe the means that are needed to address them. Africa's deepening poverty and lack of global influence stem from its weak technological and knowledge bases.

It would not be misplaced to say that almost all nations within the international system are facing security challenges and as such need to cooperate if they are to live in peace and security. This cooperation became necessary after the First and Second World Wars, but particularly after the Cold War as there have been, since 1990, more conflicts and wars within States than between States, with devastating spill-overs into other States, and increasing global and regional problems such as poverty and internally displaced persons. It is for this reason that Africa and the United Nations are cooperating on different fronts to ensure the world and Africa, in particular, is peaceful and secured.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

In this lecture, we have discussed Africa's membership of the United Nations and the role the continent is playing in the international community in the onerous goal of promoting peace and security in the world. Africa has the largest number of countries in the United Nations, 54 countries representing 28% of the total number of States in the United Nations. The continent is currently represented in the UNSC by Egypt, Senegal and Angola as non-permanent members on a two-year term. Because majority of UN peacekeeping missions have taken place in Africa, the continent is campaigning for a seat (or two) to become a permanent member in the UNSC so that she can also contribute in

decision-making concerning Africa's security at the level of the UNSC, which is the most powerful organ of the UN.

## 6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS

i. Do you think an African country should be accorded a permanent membership status in the UNSC? If yes, discuss your reason(s).
ii. How can the African Union (AU) and the United Nations (UN) together achieve regional and global peace in Africa and in the world?

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Adebayo, A. (2014). Africa's peacemakers: Nobel peace laureates of African descent. Zed Books.

Boulden, J. (ed.) (2003). Dealing with conflict in Africa. The United Nations and Regional Organizations. Palgrave Macmillan US.

Gruenberg, J. (2008). An Analysis of United Nations Security Resolutions.

Macmillan, M. (2013). The war that ended peace: How Europe abandoned peace for the First World War. Profile Books.

Nyangoni, W. (1985). Africa in the United Nations System. Fairleigh Dickinson.

Souari, I. (2006). Africa in the United Nations System (1945 – 2005). Adonis & Abbey Publishers.

Tehindrazanariveto, D. L. (2012). The African Union's Relationship with the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and security. The African Union: Legal and Institutional Framework.

White, H. (2013). The China Choice; Why we should share power. Oxford University Press

## UNIT 4: UNITED NATIONS PEACE AND SECURITY MISSIONS IN AFRICA

## CONTENT



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Generally, peace missions fall within the subject of crises management and conflict resolution. The United Nations (UN) have carried out many peacekeeping and peace enforcement missions in Africa in its objective of international peace and security because insecurity in one place amounts to insecurity in other places. Some of these missions were strictly a UN mission while others were in conjunction with the African Union (AU) or the ECOWAS. This lecture identifies and discusses some of the United Nations missions in Africa.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this lecture, the student should:

i. Know about major UN peace missions in Africa;
ii. Understand and explain why these missions were led mainly by the UN and not the AU (OAU).

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 United Nations and Peacekeeping

The role of peace-keeping operation can take many forms, and are constantly evolve in the light of changing circumstance among the task discharged by peace-keeping operation over the years. According to UN Basic Facts publication (2002:9) these different forms are;

- Maintenance of cease-fires and separation of forces by providing breathing space. This is an operation based on a limited agreement between parties, which can foster an atmosphere conducive for negotiations.
- Provision of humanitarian operation. In many conflicts, civilian populations are deliberately targeted as a means to gain political ends. In such situation, peacekeeping provide protection and support humanitarian operations.
- Implementation of a comprehensive peace settlement complex, multi-dimensional operation deployed on the basis of comprehensive peace agreement, can assist in such diverse tasks.

There are four basic principles guiding the deployments of United Nations (UN) peacekeepers in any conflict situations, these are:

- **Consent***:* Nations that are expected to host peacekeepers accept and show commitment to the hosting of the peace keepers before are sent. Therefore, nations are free to reject troupes from unfriendly nation to the conflict. The Encarta Encyclopedia (Microsoft 2001) assert that classical peacekeeping has always been conducted with the consent of disputant, who thus have at least to agree to settle their quarrel and not to endanger the safety of the peacekeeping forces.

- **Impartiality:** Naturally, biases in conflict ostensibly destroy any form of trust held earlier by the parties in the conflict. To this therefore, confidence building measure have to be established by the peacekeeping contingent. For instanceSessay (1992:12) argues that Nigeria's neutrality as the leader of the ECOMOG forces in Liberia served the initial acrimony between NPFL of Charles Taylor and the rebels.
- **Non-Use of Force:** Peacekeepers are not allowed to use force except in case of self-defense. Sometimes conflict parties could become too hostile to peacekeeping forces, it is only during the process that peacekeepers are permitted to use force to contain the situation and possibly in self-defense.

The use of force in any operation by the international community must be mandated by the Security Council or it will be considered a breach of the peace and threat to the security of the international system. For any use of force not to be considered null-and-void, it must be sanction by a resolution of the Security Council giving it the legal backing and support. Suffice it to say here that, the drafting of such mandate is not devoid of high politicking and horse-trading. This is because it involves the grating and contribution in many areas by member states, because of this, some form of reluctance is sometimes exhibited by those that think they are not directly affected.

The Charter of the UN does not contain any provision for the granting of mandate to any force. However, some conventions have been developed over the years by the UN for the specific settlement of dispute that are considered very serious for peace operations to be mandated under chapter VI and VII of the Charter.

The mandate and command of UN peace operations therefore flows from the Security Council through the Secretary-General and his representatives in the field to the military contingents as contributed to it by member states. The mandates of the Security Council is usually not specific on the amount of force used, that is why it uses the term in "all measures necessary" For instance, the operation of UNPROFOR in Bosnia, "all necessary means" where used just as it was used by UNOSOM II in Somalia. In each situation of UN peace operations, the amount of force to be used depends on the nature and capability of the 'enemy' and the amount of strength available for the UN forces.

In commanding the UN forces, as earlier mentioned, the UN has always contracted the command of its forces to the member states, sometimes to a single state or to a coalition of willing states acting under the flag of the UN. It is worth observing that, in practice, however, these operations are not carried out under the flag of the UN as found in the US-led coalition in Operation Desert Storm and the international force for East Timor (INTERFET), led by Australia.

The actual command and control of UN peace operation is therefore vested in the Secretary-General. This gives the Secretary-General the duties of the Commander-In-Chief of the UN force especially in the absence of a functional UN military Staff Committee. He makes guidelines for the proposal of the force to the Security Council before the council authorizes the use of force and the deployment of the mission. The Security Council's resolutions usually cite the report of the Secretary as drafted on his behalf by the secretariat. The Secretary-General takes decisions on the use of force, on the application of Air power, disposition of ground forces and dismissal of commanding officers as did in the Congo by Dag Hammarskjöld.

To carry out the duty of commanding the field forces, the Secretary-General usually appoints a head of the mission who is referred to as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG), and a Force Commander to lead the military component. Normally, the special representative is to have control over the military commander, but in some cases, one person performs the two roles. The Force Commander provide military advice for the Secretary, however, the two officers are given a great deal of autonomy in establishing, managing and commanding of the operation. The secretariat staff also helps in advising on the nature of force and the options available in the resolution of conflict.

The last chain of command is the nation's contributing their armies to the collective force of the UN. Contingents are supposed to be under the control of the UN however with continues contact with their national military command. In contributing, the nation's still base on their interest have a say in the participation of their forces. We can therefore conclude that, UN peace operations are actually supposed to be "collective" in nature if they are to succeed.

### 3.2 United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC)

On 30th June 1960, four days after Congo gained flagship independence from Belgium, the country's 25,000 strong security organ, *Force Publique,* which was both the country's army and police, mutinied against Belgian officers and the capital, Leopoldville, was immediately thrown into chaos. To arrest the situation, Belgium immediately deployed its troops who were still stationed in the country and sent in reinforcement from Belgium to twenty three (23) locations in the country for the protection of Belgian citizens and other foreign nationals. The Congolese people were outraged by this move because Belgium did not seek the consent of the Congolese government before it airlifted its troops from Belgium into Congo. Many commentators were of the opinion that the deployment of Belgian troops to the mineral-rich province of Katanga, in particular, was done to support Katanga's independence from Congo.

With the rising wave of the conflict, the then UN Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold on July 13th 1960, invoked Chapter XV, Article 99 of the UN Charter which provides that "The Secretary General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter that in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security'. The basis of the invoked Chapter XV by Hammarskjold was that the conflict in Congo between the Congolese and Belgians can draw the two Cold War antagonists; the United States and the Soviet Union, along with their allies and proxies, into the crisis which

would then escalate and become an international security concern. Thus, he sought authorization so as to take the necessary steps, in consultation with the Congolese Government, to provide the Government with military assistance. He hoped that once UN troops become present in Congo, with the first contingent coming from Ghana, Belgium would withdraw her troops. The peace operation was named United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC).

After submitting several reports to the United Nations Security Council, the Council approved the UN Secretary-General's submissions and sanctioned the mission on 22 July 1960. By July 26, ONUC's military strength had grown to include about 8000 troops from Ghana, Guinea, Ethiopia, Morocco, Ireland, Tunisia, Sweden, Liberia and Mali. The ONUC was headed by a civilian, Ralph Bunche who was the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SPSG) but was later replaced by a Swedish General, Carl von Horn, as the commander of the mission. Explaining the role of ONUC's mission in the Congo, General Horn explained that the ONUC troops will carry arms but will use them only for self-defense. Noting that ONUC are peacemakers who would ensure the restoration of calm, harmony and safety for all - Congolese, Belgians or other nationals. Some of the weapons in the armory of the ONUC included artillery, armored personnel carriers (APCs), tanks and 14 bombing and fighting aircrafts. As ONUC got fully involved in the mission, it had almost 20,000 troops, officers and specialized personnel from 28 countries. Because of the rotation of troops by those countries whose Government and military supported ONUC, more than 93,000 military personnel eventually served with the mission.

ONUC's functions included patrolling areas threatened by disorder; disarming civilians and renegade military groups; rescuing civilians and evacuating them; the wounded and dead, out of affected areas; and establishing and guarding UN protected areas and refugee camps. ONUC began its operation in Congo as a peacekeeping mission mandated to use force only as a last resort. However, because peacekeepers and their posts were being attacked, they were later permitted to use force whenever necessary, especially to prevent civil war and foreign mercenaries. To achieve its mission, ONUC, was forced into using arms beyond self-defense.

ONUC had obvious difficulties in achieving this and the mission has been classified as one of the most violent peacekeeping missions by the United Nations as about one hundred and twenty-seven military personnel died in action while 133 were wounded. ONUC eventually ended its mission to the Congo in early 1961 after a measure of peace and security had been restored.

### 3.3 United Nations Mission in Somalia (UNOSOM II)

UNISOM I, the earlier mission of the UN sent to restore peace and security in Somalia could not achieve its mission owing to many reasons and so the United Task Force (UNITAF), a non-UN multinational 'coalition of the willing' led by the USA, took over. UNITAF mission, which was operational from 1993 to 1994, was known as Operation Restore Hope. The mandate of UNITAF followed the adoption of Resolution 794 by the UN Security Council which determined that the situation in Somalia constituted a 'threat to international peace and security'. UNITAF failed to disarm the warlords, even when they were able to and as such the warlords cooperated with UNITAF, in the expectation that any UN follow-up peacekeeping mission would be militarily weaker.

In March 1993, the Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 814 authorizing a second UN Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II) to succeed UNITAF. UNOSOM II was the first mission mandated to use force beyond self-defense and like UNOSOM I and UNITAF, it was deployed without the consent of the Somalian government (even though there was no government in place at the time in Somalia).

UNOSOM II's mandate was to build the State of Somalia. The former US Ambassador to the UN, Madeleine Albright, described UNOSOM II's mandate as "an unprecedented enterprise aimed at nothing less than the restoration of an entire country as a proud, functioning and viable member of the community of nations". However, UNOSOM's objective is to assist Somalia in its rebuilding process instead of taking over the rebuilding process for Somalis. UNOSOM II along with other UN agencies were enjoined to assist in famine relief, economic rehabilitation, the repatriation of refugees and displaced persons, the re-establishment of national and regional institutions, the re-establishment of the Somali police, the investigation and facilitation of the prosecution of serious violations of international law, the development of a de-mining programme, the monitoring of the arms embargo, disarmament, and the creation of conditions for political reconciliation, rehabilitation and reconstruction.

UNOSOM II had a smaller, less capable and less coherent military force than UNITAF. Its strength was 20000 troops, 8000 civilian and logistic personnel all totaling 28000. The first countries to pledge troops to UNOSOM II were France, Italy, Belgium, Pakistan and the USA, with the USA providing the highest number of troops and logistics – mainly resources transferred from UNITAF. UNISOM II achieved a milestone as this was the first time the USA would contribute its troops to a UN Mission. The USA also deployed a Joint Task Force (JTF), a Quick Reaction Force (QRF), the US Army Task Force

Ranger and Delta Force commandos to Somalia. Two of the most capable contingents in UNOSOM II were troops from Australia and Canada. UNOSOM II SRSG was a retired US submarine commander, Admiral Jonathan Howe (this was the first time a man with military background would serve as the SRSG to a UN mission) while the troop commander was General CevikBir from Turkey.

UNOSOM II encountered many challenges and its mission was not as easy as envisioned, especially as it had a smaller troop that UNITAF and ONUC. When the factions in the conflict refused to accept its political strategy, UNOSOM II was left with no choice than to response with military force. It may be argued that the UN used both too little and too much force in its second mission to Somalia. Boutros-Ghali, the UN Secretary General at the time acknowledged that the Somalia strategy 'exposed weaknesses to UNOSOM II's complicated operational structure'. This made the mission to Somalia, without design, move from peacekeeping to peace enforcement which was, as still being witnessed today, self-defeating. Thus, peace enforcement was a massive failure in Somalia as it only further divided the country. UNOSOM II had to force its way out of Somalia as the militants asked the mission to pay 'rent' for the two years it has occupied their country.

The conflict in Somalia constitutes one of the most protracted crises in contemporary times. Since the ousting of General Siad Barre in December 1991, peace has remained elusive for the people and the state of Somalia. Conflict has continued unabated in the country, aggravated by the increasing number of internal actors and untimely interferences on the part of external players from within Africa and outside Africa. This state of affairs can partly be explained by what has come to be known as the 'Somali syndrome', in other words, externals have withdrawn from involvement in peacekeeping efforts in Somalia owing to the complexity of this conflict as well as the 'allergy' of Somali fighting factions towards external interveners. As a consequence, no peacekeeping operation was undertaken in Somalia between March 1995 – when the United Nations Operation in Somalia II (UNOSOM II) withdrew from the country – and January 2007, when the African Union (AU) Peace and Security Council (PSC) decided to deploy the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM).

### 3.4 United Nations Mission to Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL)

The UNAMSIL was designated to first supplement and then supplant the failing regional peace operation deployed by the ECOWAS. This move became necessary because in spite of the victories of the ECOMOG troops against the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) led by FodaySankoh, the ECOMOG faced imminent collapse due to the

withdrawal of the Nigerian contingent, which had contributed the largest number of troops and logistics.

The UNAMSIL was therefore established by the Security Council of the United Nations to: (a) monitor compliance with the Lome Peace Agreement earlier signed by the Sierra Leone government and the RUF in July 1999 - an agreement that was meant to end the war; (b) encourage the parties to establish confidence-building mechanisms; (c) support the anticipated elections; (d) ensure the security and freedom of movement of UN personnel; and (e) assist the government in implementing a disarmament, demobilization and reintegration plan by establishing a presence at key locations throughout the country, including at disarmament, reception and demobilization centers. UNAMSIL was also mandated, within its capabilities and areas of deployment, to afford protection to civilians under imminent threat of physical violence, but also take into account the responsibilities of the Sierra Leone's government.

UNAMSIL's SRSG was OluyemiAdeniji, a Nigerian, while the force commander was Major-General Vijay Kumar Jetley, an Indian. The UNAMSIL had an authorized strength of about 4500 troops who were mostly from Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana and Jordan. The mission also had 220 military observers and four CivPols. In February 2000, the Security Council increased the size of UNAMSIL to 11,100 troops, following the withdrawal of the Nigerian contingent by President Obasanjo. UNAMSIL was mandated to provide security at key locations and government buildings, facilitate humanitarian assistance along specified thorough fares, providing security at all disarmament, demobilization and reintegration sites in the country, and assisting the government in law enforcement and guarding weapons surrendered in the disarmament process. Even though there were pressures from the ECOWAS for the UNAMSIL to engage in peace enforcement, the mission remained largely peacekeeping.

By early 2000, the overall security situation in the country began to improve and the Lome Peace Agreement was being implemented fitfully. This became so because UNAMSIL troops increased their surveillance and patrols not only in Freetown, the capital, but also in other towns and villages. At this time, even though the disarmament and demobilization was slow in most sites, the access to humanitarian supplies began to increase. By 10$^{th}$ November 2000, the UNAMSIL and ECOWAS induced the Sierra Leonean government and the RUF to sign the Abuja Ceasefire Agreement. The two warring parties agreed that UNAMSIL could deploy behind RUF lines in order to supervise the ceasefire. The RUF also agreed to return all UN weapons it seized from the Kenyan and Guinean contingent of the UNAMSIL. On March 14 2001, UNAMSIL finally deployed its troops behind RUF lines. By May, UN had extended its control to the

Kailahun region, by December 2001, 37000 combatants had given up their arms and by January 2002, 45000 rebels had been disarmed and demobilized and the UNAMSIL's mission was declared completed with the closure of the last disarmament site in Kailahun. However, UNAMSIL stayed behind to monitor and provide logistics for the general elections of May 14 2002. Since then, Sierra Leone has been largely peaceful till day.

### 3.5 United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR)

The United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) was deployed in October 1993 with a mandate: (a) to monitor observance of the Arusha Peace Agreement of August 1993, including the cantonment, demobilization and integration of the armed forces of the parties; (b) to establish a weapons-secure area in the capital, Kigali, and to monitor the security situation until elections could be held; (c) to help in mine clearance, the repatriation of Rwandan refugees and the coordination of humanitarian assistance; and (d) to investigate incidents involving the gendarmerie and police.

UNAMIR Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) was Jacques-Roger Booh-Booh from Cameroon while the force commander was General Romeo Dallaire, a Canadian, who became the hero of the mission. The strength of UNAMIR personnel was 2548, with 2217 as troops and 331 as military observers and CivPols. Most of the troops of UNAMIR were from Ghana, Canada, Belgium and Bangladesh. Due to the lessons from ONUC, the UNAMIR was authorized to use force in self-defense and also permitted the use of force in defending civilians under direct attacks, and use force to prevent crimes against humanity.

In April 1994, following the shooting down in Kigali of the aircraft conveying the President of Rwanda Juvenal Habyarimana and his Burundian counterpart CyprienNtaryamira as they returned from peace talks in Tanzania, Rwanda was plunged into crisis. Violence in the country following the death of the Rwandan President, a Hutu, continued unabated for three months where opposition politicians and civilians, mainly from the Tutsi ethnic group, were targeted and massacred in their thousands. These killings were carried out mainly by two Hutu militia groups; the Interahamwe and the Impuzamugambi militias.

Even though big nations like France and the USA only sent aircrafts to evacuate their nationals, UNAMIR was able to protect tens of thousands of foreigners and Rwandans who sought protection in hotels, hospitals and the Amahoro football stadium. UNAMIR also helped in the evacuation of foreign nationals, the protection of UN civilian

personnel, rescued individuals and groups trapped in the crisis and provided humanitarian assistance to people under its protection. UNAMIR also carried out daily patrols in an attempt to stop the killings by the Hutu militias. It was reported that while some troops of UNAMIR risked their lives to save civilians, some turned their eyes to killings that happened right in front of them.

UNAMIR was faced with many challenges one of which is the many restrictions placed on it by the UN as its hands were often tied. For example, when commander Dallaire sought authorization to seize some catchments of weapons that UNAMIR had identified hidden somewhere, his request was not granted by the UN Secretariat while UNAMIR was compelled to return all already-seized weapons to their owners. As the conflict escalated, the interim President of Rwanda, AgatheUwilingiyimana and 10 Belgian peacekeepers who had tried to protect her, were murdered in the UNDP compound. With the failure of the UN to support UNAMIR's operations, especially its failure to authorize it to use overwhelming force, the Belgian contingents were withdrawn from UNAMIR by Belgium while Ghana and Bangladesh threatened to withdraw their troops too. Despite the force commander's bravery by staying in Kigali and pleading for more troops and the authorization to use force, the UN Secretariat and the Security Council did not grant approval. With a weak logistic base, UNAMIR ran out of food, medical supplies and ambulances. UNAMIR could not prevent the killing of about 500,000 – 1,000,000 Rwandans (mainly Tutsis) during the conflict that lasted for a hundred days, especially because of the UN stance on the non-use of force during peacekeeping missions, but it was able to control to some degree, the spread of violence in spite of the many challenges that it faced.

The Rwandan tragedy demonstrated the gap in UN peacekeeping operations concerning the use of weapons for the protection of innocent civilians from organized violence, ethnic cleansing and genocide. The UN Secretary General at this time was Boutros-Boutros Ghali, an Africa from Egypt.

### 3.6 Impediments to the United Nations Peacekeeping Missions

The Security Council, which has the prime responsibility for the proper use of force in UN peace operations, has seriously abdicated this responsibility on several accounts especially as there have been major changes in the patterns of conflict. Some of these impediments are discussed below:

**(i) The Changing Nature of Conflicts and Terrorism**

Modern conflicts are characterized by ethnic colorations such as the cases in Somalia, Rwanda and Congo DR and these have brought challenges to the UN. Add to this, conflicts that are made complicated by the cross-border involvement of States and other non-state actors such as the conflicts in DR Congo and Burundi, for economic interests. All these, including the rising wave of terrorism and the proliferation of small arms and light weapons.

**(ii) Huge Financial Commitments**

The huge financial commitments have made the handling of conflicts more difficult for the United Nations and it's pursue of international peace thorough peacekeeping missions. For instance, in assessing the performance of the UN towards international peace at its 50$^{th}$ Anniversary Celebration in 1995, the Newsweek Newspaper wrote that the budget for the United Nations peacekeeping missions increased from $230 million in 1988 to a whopping $1 billion in 1995. The large number of peacekeepers who lose their lives during peacekeeping has also posed a great challenge to UN peacekeeping missions. Aggression by member states has also been a fundamental threat to collective security efforts.

**(iii) Oppression of Weak Nations by Powerful Nations**

In spite of its express rejection of aggression under the United Nations, powerful nations have in practice used their strength to pursue aggressive policies against weaker nations. Examples of such display of strength by a powerful nation against a weaker nation abounds in history: the attack of Manchuria by Japan, Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, North Korea invasion of South Korea, Iraq invasion of Kuwait, US invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, among others are ready instances of the brazen show of might. These acts of aggression poses great threats against international security and the United Nations is often hapless because most of these big nations constitute the permanent members of the Security Council and as such often use their veto powers to block any perceived usurp of their influence.

**(iv) Armament and Arms Races**

The issue of armament has also been a major hindrance to the United Nations peacekeeping efforts. Activities after the Second World War show that nations have engaged their resources in the development of military arsenal in biological, chemical and thermonuclear areas. This has posed great danger to world peace to the extent that Shaposknikov (1986) pointed out "atomic bombs dropped over the two Japanese cities of

Hiroshima and Nagasaki was only 20 kilotons. Yet today, there are nuclear warheads of 20 megatons or 100 times more powerful". The accumulation of arms by nations to serve as deference to prospective aggressors or as a means of national security have made arms readily, especially in the black market. This situation made Martenson as cited in Blue (1990) to cry out that:

> Our small planet is becoming endangered by the arsenals of weapons which could blow it up, by the burden of military expenditures which could sink it under, and by the unmet basic needs of two-thirds of its population which subsist on less than one-third of its resources… the needs of nations security are legitimate and must be met. But must we stand by as helpless witnesses of a drift towards greater insecurity at higher cost?

In the presence of this high degree of weapons, the aggressor on whose collective efforts are to be taken against sometimes may pose higher weapons than those of the collective force. This may lead to higher loss of lives and properties and most a times make the war unwinnable.

**(v) Unclear and Impossible Mandates of the Security Council**

Another impediment facing the United Nations peacekeeping missions is that the Security Council has repeatedly issued unclear and almost impossible mandates, which have failed to mention what chapter of the UN Charter an operation was being authorized under and thus leading to such euphemisms such as "all necessary means" to convert the possibility that force might be used and thereby abusing the concept of deterrence. With this, the UN has therefore failed to control the excesses of peacekeepers but instead it depends on the goodwill of the belligerent parties to end conflicts by acting on the moral authority of the UN. This has in most cases left force commanders and peace-keepers bewildered and vulnerable and in some cases mortally endangered.

**(vi) Insufficient Peacekeeping Resources**

The Security Council have often failed to provide sufficient military and other resources to allow peace missions carry out their mandates and thus limited their use of force in situations where the use of force was almost unavoidable. The permanent members of the Security Council have always being unwilling to make financial and personnel contributions and this makes them reluctant in authorizing the necessary military forces to conflict zones. The Security Council, at least until recently has paid scant attention to the appropriate concept of operations or rules of engagement for its peace operations. Until the operation in Sierra Leone, no mention was made in a Security Council resolution of the right of a UN peace operation to use force to protect civilians at risk of

genocide or other gross violations of human rights, even in the darkest days of Rwanda and Bosnia.

While it is essential that any threat or use of force in an UN peace operation is carefully considered, the failure of UN troops to use force in a UN peace operation even to defend themselves many a times has led to the loss of credibility both for the UN and for its peace operations. This has contributed to the widespread view that peacekeepers are paper tigers that can be pushed around and manipulated. Particularly Goulding (1996:53) argues that, faction leaders lack respect for military force that fails even to defend itself. He therefore suggest that since the use of force by peacekeepers in self-defense has not led to their becoming embroiled in escalating violence, but instead in reducing the harassment of operation forces and protecting strategic facilities as happened in Cyprus, it should be allowed to give efficiency to operation troops.

**(vii) Absence of an Independent Military Adviser**

Finally, the Security Council has allowed itself to remain dangerously amateurish in military matters. According to Findlay (2002:121), the Security Council has never attempted to establish its own independent source of military advice within the United Nations since the collapse of the Military Staff Committee in 1948. Instead, it has continued to rely on the Secretary-General and the United Nations Secretariat for such advice. This has made it difficult for the Security Council to examine comprehensively the qualification or the suitability of UN forces, their commanders or the state readiness or capability of troop contributions.

As far as the future of peacekeeping is concerned, it is clear that some measures of incongruence exist between rising demander and greater opportunity open to the United Nations. The United Nations has also reshaped her strategies as earlier said. The future of peacekeeping as a conflict management procedure or a security mechanism depends largely on the cooperation stance of the international community. This is why the United Nations always co-operates with regional organizations in whose areas the crises occur in line with Chapter VIII of the Charter. For example, the United Nations worked closely with the Organization of American States (OAS) in Haiti, the European Union (EU) in former Yugoslavia, ECOMOG in Liberia and Sierra Leone, and the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the precursor of the African Union (AU) in Western Sahara and the Great Lake region in respect of Ethiopia and Eritrea.

Despite these impediments, the United Nations peacekeeping missions have a crucial stabilizing effect on many conflicts and in ensuring international peace, both on a regional and global basis.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

The fact as to why peacekeeping remains one of the most formidable challenges for the relationship between Africa and the UN speak for themselves. Between 1948 and 2007, about 40 percent, 26 out of 63, of the UN's peacekeeping and observer missions have been in Africa. Currently the continent hosts about half, 8 out of 18, of the UN peacekeeping missions. In theory, peacekeeping operations are successful when four minimum requirements are met: There must be a peace to be kept that is sustained by a viable political process among the parties in conflict; there has to be unified political support from the outside; there has to be a credible and achievable mandate, and last but not least, the mission has to have self-sustaining resources. In practice, not all these requirements are always met. Yet even more relevant are cases where none of the preconditions are fulfilled, but where the international community nevertheless sees a need to intervene. This was the starting point for the discussion of the hybrid UN-AU Mission in Darfur (UNAMID), which brought to the fore several interrelated issues around peacekeeping in Africa.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

The United Nations (UN) has played a very important role in the security of African countries starting with its mission to Congo in the early 1960s. The UN has also intervened in African countries such Rwanda, Somalia, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Sierra Leone. Even though not all of these missions were successful, as the Somalia missions (UNOSOM I and II) exemplifies, the United Nations remains a key partner in African security.

## 6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS

i. To what extent is the consent of the host government an important consideration in relation to peacekeeping emergencies?
ii. Identify and discuss the immediate causes of the 1994 Rwandan Genocide.
iii. Discuss the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) and the lessons to be learnt by Africans.
iv. Identify and discuss the impediments to UN missions in Africa.

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Adebayo, Adekeye, (2014). Africa's peacemakers: Nobel peace laureates of African descent. Zed Books.

Bass, J. Gary (2013). The Blood Telegram: Nixon, Kissinger and a Forgotten Genocide. Knopf.

Dennis, C.Jeff. (1999). Why Peace Fails.

Europe Center for Conflict Prevention (2003). The power of the media: A handbook for peacebuilders.

Findlay, Trevor (2002): The Use of Force in UN Peace Operations

Shakhnazarov, G (1978): The Destiny of the World: The Socialist Shape ofthe World. New York: Mc Hill

Sharamo, R &Mesfin, B. (2011). Regional Security in the Post-Cold War Horn of Africa. Institute for Security Studies.

White, Hugh. (2013). The China Choice; Why we should share power. Oxford University Press

Zeeuw, Jeroen De. (2008). From Soldiers to Politicians: Transforming Rebel Movements after Civil War. VIVA BOOKS PRIVATE LIMITED.

Macmillan, Margaret. (2013). The war that ended peace: How Europe abandoned peace for the first world war. Profile Books.

## UNIT 5: AFRICA'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

## CONTENT



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Africa and Africans have played key roles in fostering international security, long before the independence of African countries from their respective colonial masters. Therefore, this lecture takes a look into the contributions of Africa in global security by looking at the roles Africans played in the First World War, Second World War, and their contributions, as newly independent states, to peace operations of the United Nations, especially those missions outside the African continent.

## 2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this lecture, the student show understand and appreciate the roles Africa played and is still playing in the politics of global security. This is important because most Western history literature tend to ignore the important roles Africans played in promoting international security especially during the First and Second World Wars.

## 3.0 MAIN CONTENT

### 3.1 Africa and the First World War (1914 – 1918)

The First World War, otherwise called World War I or the Great War, originated in Europe and began on 28 July 1914 and lasted until 11 November 1918 in which more than 70 million military personnel including 60 million Europeans were mobilized. The

war threw all the world's economic great powers into two groups; the Allies (British Empire, France, Russian Empire, Italy, Japan, and USA) and the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Ottoman Empire and Bulgaria). The trigger for the war was the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary by GavriloPrincip on 28th of June 1914. The casualty figure of the First World War was 22 million (Momah, 1995).

Africans took part in the First World War as colonial entities of big European nations such as Great Britain, France and Germany. It was estimated that up to 2 million Africans sacrificed their lives for Europe and for global peace in this war. France, more than any other European power, used African troops, including Senegalese riflemen who fought in the victorious battle to take the German colony of Togo. France also sent Senegalese troops to fight at Gallipoli which is present day Turkey. African troops also joined the fighting in France where there now exist a memorial in their honor at the Delville Wood near the town of Longueval. Britain also recruited Africans as soldiers. The African contingent that fought with the British were mainly from Nigeria, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Gambia, Uganda, Malawi, Zimbabwe and Kenya. South African soldiers who fought alongside Britain were key in the fight against the Germans in German Southwest Africa, an area that is now Namibia, where the first armistice of the war was signed in 1915. But unlike the case of the Africans who fought with the French, the African troops with the British army fought only within Africa. Germany was undefeated in Africa but surrendered in Mozambique three weeks after the 1919 Treaty of Versailles was signed.

### 3.2 Africa and the Second World War (1939 – 1945)

After the devastations of the First World War, and the formation of the League of Nations to prevent another global war, another war broke out in 1939. This war, as the First, involved two main military groups; the Allies and the Axis. The Second World War was the most widespread war in human history that directly involved more than 100 million people from over 30 countries. The Second World War was particularly marked with mass deaths of civilians in the Holocaust and atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki altogether resulting to more than 60 million deaths. The war began on the first day of September 1939 with the invasion of Poland by Germany that resulted in France and the United Kingdom declaring war on Germany two days later. The casualty figure at the end of the Second World War was 50 million (Momah, 1995).

More than a million Africans were conscripted as soldiers and fought on the side of the Allied Forces during the Second World War. Most of these soldiers were from Nigeria,

Ghana, Sierra Leone and the Gambia. Regiments were also gotten from British East Africa including Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi. Men of the 81st and 82nd West African Divisions fought against the Japanese in Burma. The 81st unit was made up of African soldiers from Gambia, Nigeria and Ghana. Both divisions formed part of the Royal West African Frontier Force (RWAFF). Another African battalion, the King's African Rifles (KAF) had African contingents from Kenya, Somalia, Malawi, and Tanzania. These African troops fought in Somalia and Abyssinia against the Italians, in Madagascar against the Vichy French and also in Burma against the Japanese. Some reports claim that out of a population of 42 million Africans living in British colonies, 372,000 served in the Allied Forces during the Second World War. Of this, 3,387 were killed or reported missing and 5,549 were wounded.

It is therefore appropriate to say that Africans played a key role in the victory of the Allied Forces in the international war against hegemony as represented by Germany and her allies.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

The contribution of Africa and Africans to global peace and security cannot be underestimated because even as colonized populations, Africans contributed to global peace and security by fighting alongside the Allies and paying the ultimate price in the First and Second World Wars. Thus, even though most Western writers do not give Africans this credit, perhaps because Africans fought these wars as colonized populations, it is important for the student to know that Africans were as important as the Europeans during the wars. Also, African troops have participated in United Nations peace missions around the world, and not just in Africa. Therefore, Africa has contributed, and is contributing to global peace and security.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

In this lecture, we have discussed the relationship between Africa and the rest of the world especially as it concerns her contributions to international peace and security. It was estimated that up to 2 million Africans sacrificed their lives for Europe and for global peace in the First World War fought between 1914 and 1918. In that war, France, more than any other European power, used African troops, including Senegalese riflemen who fought in the victorious battle to take the German colony of Togo. In the same war, France also sent Senegalese troops to fight at Gallipoli which is present day Turkey.

During the Second World War in 1939 to 1945, African troops in units such as the 81st and 82nd West African Divisions fought against the Japanese in Burma. The 81st unit was made up of African soldiers from Gambia, Nigeria and Ghana. Both divisions later formed part of what became known as the Royal West African Frontier Force (RWAFF). Another African battalion, the King's African Rifles (KAF) had African contingents from Kenya, Somalia, Malawi, and Tanzania. These African troops fought gallantly in Somalia and Abyssinia against the Italians, in Madagascar against the Vichy French and also in Burma against the Japanese.

In contemporary times also, African troops have been deployed to crisis zones under the umbrella of the United Nations Peacekeeping missions and as such, contributed to maintaining international peace and security in countries outside of Africa.

## 6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS

i. Africans played major roles in promoting international peace and security during the First and Second World Wars. Discuss.
ii. Discuss the lessons African soldiers and leaders learnt during their participation in the First and Second World Wars.

## 7.0. REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS


Anderson, M. & Wallace, M. (2012). Opting out of war: Strategies to prevent violent conflict. Lynne Rienner.

Barber, B. (2013). If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities. Yale University Press.

Hale, T, Held, D, & Young, K. (2013). Gridlock: Why Global Cooperation is failing when we need it most. Polity.

Hansen, S. (2013). Al-Shabaab in Somalia: The history and ideology of a militant Islamist group, 2005 – 2012. Oxford University Press.

Odendaal, A. (2013). A Crucial Link: Local Peace Committees and National Peacebuilding. United States Institute of Peace.

Schirch, L. (2013). Conflict Assessment & Peacebuilding Planning. Kumarian Press.