

Møller, Bjørn

**Working Paper**

## The pros and cons of subsidiarity: The role of African regional and subregional organisations in ensuring peace and security in Africa

DIIS Working Paper, No. 2005:4

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), Copenhagen

*Suggested Citation:* Møller, Bjørn (2005) : The pros and cons of subsidiarity: The role of African regional and subregional organisations in ensuring peace and security in Africa, DIIS Working Paper, No. 2005:4, ISBN 8776050629, Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), Copenhagen

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/84562>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



**DANISH INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

STRANDGADE 56 • 1401 COPENHAGEN K • DENMARK

TEL +45 32 69 87 87 • [diis@diis.dk](mailto:diis@diis.dk) • [www.diis.dk](http://www.diis.dk)

**THE PROS AND CONS OF SUBSIDIARITY**

THE ROLE OF AFRICAN REGIONAL AND SUBREGIONAL  
ORGANISATIONS IN ENSURING PEACE AND SECURITY  
IN AFRICA

Bjørn Møller

*DIIS Working Paper no 2005/4*

© Copenhagen 2005

Danish Institute for International Studies, DIIS

Strandgade 56, DK-1401 Copenhagen, Denmark

Ph: +45 32 69 87 87

Fax: +45 32 69 87 00

E-mails: [diis@diis.dk](mailto:diis@diis.dk)

Web: [www.diis.dk](http://www.diis.dk)

Cover Design: Carsten Schiøler

Printed in Denmark by Vesterkopi as

ISBN: 87-7605-063-7

Price: DKK 25.00 (VAT included)

DIIS publications can be downloaded  
free of charge from [www.diis.dk](http://www.diis.dk)

Bjørn Møller, Senior research fellow, DIIS<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The author holds an MA in History and a Ph.D. in International Relations, both from the University of Copenhagen. Since 1985, he has been (senior) research fellow, subsequently programme director at the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI), which was in 2003 incorporated into the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), where he is attached to the Department of Development Studies. He served as Secretary General of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) from 1997 to 2000, and has been External Lecturer at the Institute of Political Studies, University of Copenhagen since 1994 and at the Centre of African Studies since 2002. In the academic year 2003/04, he served as Visiting Associate Professor at the research centre on Development and International Relations (DIR) at Aalborg University. In addition to being the author of numerous articles and editor of seven anthologies, he is the author of three books: *Resolving the Security Dilemma in Europe. The German Debate on Non-Offensive Defence* (1991); *Common Security and Nonoffensive Defence. A Neorealist Perspective* (1992); and *Dictionary of Alternative Defence* (1995). He is currently writing a two-volume book on *Civil Wars, Genocides and Interventions. African Conflicts and Conflict Management*.

# Contents

Abstract .....	2
1. Subsidiarity, Regional organisations and Hegemons .....	3
1.1 The Principle of Subsidiarity.....	3
1.2 The Pros and Cons.....	4
1.3 Organisations and Hegemons in IR Theory.....	6
2. Regionalism and/or SubRegionalism?.....	9
2.1 Criteria of Regionness.....	9
2.2 Delimitation of Regions and RSCs .....	11
2.3 The Organisational Landscape .....	13
3. From OAU to AU, Now with NEPAD and CSSDCA.....	16
3.1 Pan-Africanism .....	16
3.2 The OAU .....	17
3.3 The African Union .....	20
3.3.1 NEPAD.....	25
3.3.2 The CSSDCA.....	27
3.3.3 Subsidiarity under the AU? .....	29
4. Subregional Organisations in Africa .....	30
4.1 ECOWAS .....	30
4.2 SADC.....	34
4.3 IGAD .....	38
4.4 Other Subregional Organisations.....	41
4.4.1 COMESA.....	42
4.4.2 ECCAS.....	43
4.4.3 Miscellaneous .....	44
4.5 Assessment: Variable Geometry or Confusion? .....	45
5. Conclusion: Obstacles and Opportunities .....	46
5.1 Making the Best of Hegemony.....	46
5.2 With a Little Help from Our Friends: Western Support? .....	48
6. Endnotes.....	48

## Abstract

The paper critically analyses the emerging international norm of subsidiarity according to which “Africa are responsible for African conflicts”, which is found to be a possible justification for “buck-passing” on the part of the West, leaving the continent with the fewest military means to deal with the largest number of the most destructive armed conflicts. The paper then provides an overview of the various regional and subregional organisations in Africa, including the African Union (AU), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) as well as a host of less important organisations. It concludes with a survey of the various forms of support promised to these organisations by the West.

# I. Subsidiarity, Regional organisations and Hegemons

Since the end of the Cold War it has become increasingly fashionable to suggest that regional organisations should play a more prominent role—often argued as an application of the principle of “subsidiarity”. However much may be said in favour of this principle as a general norm, it also has its pitfalls, which will be mentioned below. Not only does it entail a prominent role for *regional* as opposed to global organisations; it also envisages a central role for *organisations* as such (as opposed to states) which some find unrealistic and/or undesirable. Finally, there is a controversy over the compatibility of this role for organisations with hegemony—a concept which seems to increasingly acquire derogatory connotations which some (including the present author) regard as unwarranted.

## I.1 THE PRINCIPLE OF SUBSIDIARITY

The origins of the principle of subsidiarity go way back, inter alia to the papal encyclicals *Rerum Novarum* (Leo XIII, 1891) and *Quadragesimo Anno* (Pius XI, 1931). According to the latter, the principle entails that

a community of a higher order should not interfere in the internal life of a community of a lower order, depriving the latter of its functions, but rather should support it in case of need and help to co-ordinate its activity with the activities of the rest of society, always with a view to the common good.<sup>1</sup>

Besides European Union law, where it is one of the central principles (e.g. enshrined in the new Constitution for Europe signed in June 2004)<sup>2</sup> the principle is also enshrined in international law, defining certain roles for regional organisations. Chapter VIII of the UN Charter thus stipulates that

The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority (art. 53.1) (. . .)

The Members of the United Nations (...) shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.” (art. 52.2)


Regional organisations thus represent instances of first resort as far as the peaceful resolution of conflicts is concerned, but it is also underlined that different rules apply to the use of non-peaceful means with the stipulation that “No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council” (art. 53.1). The UNSC thereby reserves for itself the right to either authorise military action by regional organisations, or withhold such authorisation, in which case the use of forces constitutes a violation of art. 2.4 of the Charter, according to which “All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state (...)”.<sup>3</sup>

The UN Charter also mentions the “inherent right of individual or collective self-defence” (art. 51), the latter referring to alliances such as NATO.<sup>4</sup> However, such alliances do *not* constitute such regional arrangements or agencies as referred to in chapter VIII. In Europe, for instance, the regional organisation is the OSCE rather than NATO or even the EU; and in Africa the relevant regional organisation was the Organisation for African Unity (OAU), a position now assumed by its successor, the African Union (AU), more on which below.

## 1.2 THE PROS AND CONS

The gist of the norm of subsidiarity is thus that regional and subregional organisations should be the “first resort” for problems transcending national borders, leaving the “international community” and global organisations like the UN to deal only with those problems that cannot be solved at lower levels (see Fig. 1).<sup>5</sup>

A number of considerations do indeed speak in favour of such a division of labour. For instance, in the case of an intra-state conflicts, adjacent countries are often more inclined to get involved because they almost inevitably suffer from the consequences of the conflict, e.g. in the form of a flow of refugees—as illustrated by the figures for refugees in the Horn of Africa in Table 1. Hence, states may be more likely to honour their obligations as members of a region or subregion, i.e. as neighbours, than as members of the international community, as doing so corresponds to their national interest.




Origin	Asylum	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Djibouti	Ethiopia	-	0.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	8.0	3.0	1.5	1.6	0.1
Eritrea	Sudan	502.6	424.5	419.3	282.8	328.3	315.0	342.3	342.1	367.7	324.5
Ethiopia	Sudan	200.9	173.2	160.6	48.1	51.5	44.3	35.6	35.4	34.1	16.1
Somalia	Djibouti	20.0	17.7	20.6	21.3	23.0	21.5	21.6	21.6	21.7	21.7
Somalia	Ethiopia	406.1	228.1	269.7	305.4	287.8	249.2	195.3	180.9	121.1	67.1
Sudan	Ethiopia	25.6	44.4	51.8	61.1	75.7	56.9	58.6	70.3	71.7	80.9

Furthermore, neighbouring countries are often in a better position to comprehend a conflict than distant ones, as they often (but not always) share the same culture. Finally, the regional level of action is often most suitable for managing problems of ethnic groups and nations “straddling borders”, such as the Hutus and Tutsis of Central Africa, as well as for handling other border-transcending issues, such as shared rivers and similar environmental matters, cross-border migration and transborder crime, and perhaps for dealing with border disputes.<sup>7</sup>

Notwithstanding all these attractions, however, the subsidiarity norm is not without its problems. First of all, regional or subregional organisations may either be missing or too weak for the task. Few regions have as strong economic, political and normative foundations for regional collaboration as has (Western) Europe, where a particular form of regionalisation predominates, namely regional integration. In most other parts of the world, and certainly in Africa, other and less ambitious modes of regionalisation are the best that can realistically be hoped for. By implication, to relegate the responsibility for such complicated matters as conflict prevention, management and resolution to such regional or subregional organisations may be a recipe for failure, as the requisite means may not be available at these levels, simply because of a general lack of resources affecting both the members and the organisation as such.

Secondly, subsidiarity may come to be seen as a justification for what is really “buck-passing”, i.e. for neglecting Africa (as well as most other parts of the developing world) and leaving the solution of its problems to the Africans themselves—even though it is not really obvious why, for instance, Mauritania should have a greater





responsibility towards, say, Lesotho than any other UN member state. To thus devolve responsibility to Africans may, however, be very appealing to the developed world for whom Africa's importance is rapidly declining,<sup>8</sup> thereby also making less and less foreign assistance available. The "war against terrorism" proclaimed by the United States may entail (for good or bad) a slightly greater attention being paid to (at least parts of) Africa, but it remains to be seen whether this will last.

Thirdly, what makes such buck-passing even less fair when applied to Africa is the fact that it will be the strong who are passing the buck to the weak, who neither have the economic nor the military capacity to shoulder the burden, as will be obvious from the distribution of global military expenditures in Figure 1.<sup>9</sup> If we compare this distribution of military capacities with the needs, i.e. the number of armed conflicts by region, the division of labour comes to look even less fair (see Table 2).<sup>10</sup> Even though Africa's share of the world's major armed conflicts has

	Europe	Middle East	Asia	The Americas	Africa
<b>1990</b>	-	4	13	4	11
<b>1991</b>	1	6	11	4	11
<b>1992</b>	3	5	12	3	7
<b>1993</b>	5	6	10	3	7
<b>1994</b>	4	6	10	3	6
<b>1995</b>	3	6	11	3	5
<b>1996</b>	1	6	10	3	3
<b>1997</b>	-	4	9	2	4
<b>1998</b>	1	4	9	2	11
<b>1999</b>	2	3	9	2	11
<b>2000</b>	1	4	9	2	9
<b>2001</b>	1	4	9	3	7
<b>2002</b>	1	2	9	3	6
<b>2003</b>	1	3	8	3	4

declined significantly, it is still very substantial and the numbers even conceal such devastating conflicts as the one in the DRC.

### 1.3 ORGANISATIONS AND HEGEMONS IN IR THEORY

Subsidiarity usually means devolving responsibility to a particular category of actors, namely regional or subregional organisations or institutions.

Even though the terms are often used as synonyms, it is relevant to distinguish between institutions and organisations. One point of departure may be Hedley Bull's definition of institutions as "a set of habits and practices shaped towards the realisation of a common goal."<sup>11</sup> This concept of institutions is thus broader than that of organisations, and institutions may or may not include organisations, identified as such by a certain physical permanence and such observable features as offices, staffs, letter-heads, logos and in today's world homepages—which some institutions have, but others lack. The institutions listed by Bull included the balance of power, international law, diplomacy, the managerial system of the great powers, and war as well as the state itself.<sup>12</sup> Institutions are thus very similar to regimes, defined as "sets of implicit or

explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actor expectations converge.”<sup>13</sup> Organisations usually require regimes or institutions in order to function, but they add to these a formal shape as well as a physical presence.<sup>14</sup>

There is far from unanimity among international relations scholars about the importance of international organisations, i.e. about whether institutionalisation and multilateralism matters. Both classical and neo-realists downplay the importance of organisations, seeing them almost exclusively as instruments for states, especially great powers, and thus as reflecting the distribution of power within the system. Not only do great powers thus decide on what the organisation can do, but they also reserve to themselves the option of doing what they think needs to be done unilaterally.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, according to realists the very presence of organisations may produce what may be called “negative synergies”, making the combined strength of an organisation less than the sum of its parts, simply because all members will be tempted to “free-ride” on each other—an instance of the collective goods problems to which we shall soon turn. If this holds true it would be preferable to count on initiatives by individual states (e.g. regional or global great powers) acting unilaterally than to unrealistically pin one’s hopes on multilateral and institutional action—and Africa has certainly seen such unilateral action, as when Tanzania intervened in Uganda to overthrow the dictator Idi Amin.

Both classical liberalism and modern neo-liberal institutionalism place greater emphasis on institutions, crediting them with an identity of their own and a considerable potential autonomy. Arguably, institutionalisation thus holds the promise of, in due course, transcending the anarchical self-help system of international relations,<sup>16</sup> i.e. pointing towards genuine integration, as has been the case of the European Communities.<sup>17</sup> Such integration, in its turn, is credited with an even stronger peace-furthering potential than that of non-institutionalised interdependence on which it rests,<sup>18</sup> thus holding out the prospects of transforming a region into a “security community” within which war has become inconceivable.<sup>19</sup>

Finally there are several more “post-modern”, “reflectivist” or “constructivist” theories with implications for international institutions and organisations—e.g. such as emphasise the role they play in framing or even creating national identities and interests,<sup>20</sup> or such as see institutions and organisations as creating “epistemic communities”, thereby also contributing to the formation of larger communities among states and/or between their respective societies.<sup>21</sup>

Hegemonic stability theory seems to occupy an intermediate position between realism and liberalism. It is inspired by the Italian communist leader Antonio Gramsci and particularly by his *Prison Notebooks*, which dealt with national affairs, explaining how the capitalist class was able to

co-opt (strata of) the working class into a grand coalition under its own leadership (“hegemony”), *inter alia* by ideological means.<sup>22</sup> The concept has subsequently been applied to international relations by kindred spirits from “critical IR theory” such as Robert Cox, who defined international hegemony as “the formation of a coalition of top-down forces activated by a common consciousness in which those at the bottom are able to participate”.<sup>23</sup> The term has also been used by mainstream authors belonging to the International Political Economy (IPE) tradition such as Charles Kindleberger and (partly) Robert Gilpin<sup>24</sup> as well as by IR theorists such as Robert Keohane.<sup>25</sup> Hegemony differs from simple domination in that the hegemonic power has to forge consent around their own values (e.g. free trade) and strategies as common ones, which means that (in the words of Gramsci) “every relationship of ‘hegemony’ is necessarily a pedagogical relationship”.<sup>26</sup> A hegemonic role thus also constrains the hegemon as it cannot afford to (be seen to) behave too selfishly, but must show concern for the common good, or at least appear to be doing so.

Quite a strong case can be made for a central role of hegemons within international organisations, be they global, regional or subregional, *inter alia* because their presence may be a hedge against the problem of free-riding which tends to haunt organisations as a special case of the “collective action problem”.<sup>27</sup> If a good is common in the sense that everybody can enjoy it, it is an almost irresistible temptation to leave the “production” of the good to others. However, IR analysts, including realists such as Robert Gilpin, have highlighted the fact that special rules seem to apply to the largest members of a system. For them there may actually be a direct correlation between consumption and production of common or public goods,<sup>28</sup> simply because their share of total “production” is so large that it has noticeable implications for what will be available for “consumption”. Hence, the very largest members not only have the leverage to punish free-riding, but also an obvious incentive to do so in order to achieve a fair distribution of the production.

Hegemony may thus be a partial solution to the problem of how to produce public goods, not only in the economic sphere but also, for instance, with regard to peace and security. The preconditions for such a hegemony were to a certain extent present within the two opposing alliances during the Cold War, just as they were within the international monetary system as long as the US dollar remained the universal reserve currency.<sup>29</sup> Similar preconditions of hegemony may also be present on a regional or subregional level in such cases where one state surpasses all the rest in terms of most relevant elements of power, as seems to be the case of South Africa in Southern Africa and of Nigeria in West Africa.<sup>30</sup> However, hegemony is not merely a matter of power preponderance, but also presupposes a certain commonality of values, which obviously prevented the establishment of a South African hegemony in the era of apartheid.

Hegemony may further facilitate the creation and maintenance of the regimes often constituting the foundations of organisations, and the function of which is to regulate international relations in the self-interest of all states, *inter alia* by reducing transaction costs and minimising “negative externalities”, thereby allowing for mutually advantageous cooperation and promoting the production of public goods. It seems a reasonable assumption that the “regime entrepreneurs” (also called “drivers”) will typically be the great powers, acting in their own interest, but thereby also promoting the common good by adopting and enforcing the sets of norms and rules constituting the regime, preferably multilaterally, and also abiding by these norms and rules themselves.<sup>31</sup>

## 2. Regionalism and/or Subregionalism?

A devolution of responsibilities to regional organisations obviously presupposes a division of the world into regions. Unfortunately, however, not only has the regional level generally been disregarded in the IR literature, but the definition and delimitation of regions remain controversial, both theoretically and politically.

### 2.1 CRITERIA OF REGIONNESS

What is clear is that a region is a subset of the global international system. How to delimit such a subset, however, is controversial because several criteria might be applied, each yielding a different result—none of them, of course, being more correct than the others.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, for analytical (and sometimes also political) purposes it may be useful with a further subdivision to the level of subregions or even smaller groupings. For instance, if one treats “Africa” as a region, then North and sub-Saharan Africa might appear the most obvious next level, implying that subregions such as the Horn of Africa, the Great Lakes, West or Southern Africa would then, at most, qualify a “sub-subregions”. Moreover, we would need additional “sub” prefixes to label any subset within them, such as the Mano River states or subsets consisting of merely parts of adjacent states such as the “region” comprising Rwanda, Burundi and the eastern Congo.

Furthermore, the right choice of criteria for delimitation is not obvious. The first possible criterion that springs to mind is simple geographical (or geopolitical) proximity, as a region is usually held to consist of contiguous states. For instance, one would never label the Commonwealth a region for the simple reason that it comprises non-contiguous states. This contiguity criterion, however, begs the question of where to draw the outer borders, unless there happen to be clear natural boundaries.

The African continent happens to be fairly clearly delimited in the sense that all of “Africa” is within the continent which contains only Africa—the only exceptions being the Egyptian Sinai Peninsula outside the continent and tiny parts of Spain (i.e. of Europe) within the continent in the form of exclaves on the coast of North Africa. However, it is far from obvious that countries like Egypt or the rest of the Maghreb really belong to Africa rather than to the Middle East—or even to an emerging Mediterranean region.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, in relations between peoples, societies and states, “functional proximity” is not merely a matter of physical distance, but also a function of topography, infrastructure, technology and economic factors. For instance, the fastest route of travel between several African capitals happens to be via Europe (albeit increasingly Johannesburg), simply because intra-African transport networks are so under-developed, partly as a legacy of colonialism.

A second possible criterion is a variation of the geographical one, but focusing on ecosystems such as shared rivers (as in the Nile Basin Initiative).<sup>34</sup> In several cases, belonging to such an ecosystem creates a certain commonality, at least in the sense of mutual dependency and shared interests, but it may also form the basis of conflicts over the division of “shared” natural resources.<sup>35</sup>

Thirdly, one might apply the criterion of cultural affinity, which happens to almost coincide with that of “civilisations” as used by Samuel Huntington, who predicted a clash between some of the world’s (alleged) nine great civilisations.<sup>36</sup> The criterion may, however, be unwieldy as cultural homogeneity is usually more pronounced when seen from the outside (where it is viewed as “otherness”) than from the inside.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, “culture” has many aspects (e.g. religious, ideological, and ethnic) which do not automatically yield the same delimitation. A variation on this theme is the notion of regions as “imagined communities”, in analogy with nations as understood by Benedict Anderson and other social constructivists. Like nations, regions may be constituted as such by the members “imagining” themselves as belonging together, and the rest of the world acknowledging them as such, regardless of whether either has any “objective” foundation.<sup>38</sup>

The latter variation brings us into the sphere of politics, where a fourth convenient political or legal criterion of delimitation may recommend itself in the form of membership of institutions or organisations defined as “regional”, e.g. by the United Nations. The main problem with this is that most African regional and subregional organisations remain so fragile (and the commitment to them by members so weak) that it is counter-intuitive to accept them at face value as a criterion for regionness. Moreover, large parts of Africa are almost devoid of (significant) organisations, as is the case of the Great Lakes “region”. A final problem with this criterion is the

considerable overlap between the membership of these organisations (*vide infra*), implying that many states would have to be counted as simultaneously belonging to several different regions.

A fifth possible criterion is the “scientific” or empirical criterion of interaction density, according to which regions may be identified as such by their above-average density of interaction. Most analyses have focused on trade and similar forms of economic interaction, but this would yield rather meagre results in all of Africa because of the low level of intra-African trade (even within economic communities such as ECOWAS or SADC), at least as far as the formal economy is concerned. However, one might also look at phenomena such as labour migration and other cross-border human interaction which might arguably also form the basis of regionalisation and regional delimitation,<sup>39</sup> yet with the implication that the contours of regions would then vary according to focus.

As a variation of this empirical criterion, we might define regions as having an above-average intensity of interaction and interdependence in the specific field of peace and security. Barry Buzan has thus suggested the term “regional security complex” (RSC) for “a group of states whose primary security concerns link together sufficiently closely that their national securities cannot realistically be considered apart from one another”.<sup>40</sup> By logical implication, the delimitation of an RSC would have to be determined empirically, but this in turn presupposes a clear criterion for what to count as security issues. The theory has subsequently been amended (mainly by Buzan’s colleague Ole Wæver) to allow for, in principle, any issue to count as one of security, depending on what is “securitised”—a “speech act” in which an issue is referred to as being urgent and having “existential” significance and thus as warranting a resort to “extraordinary measures”.<sup>41</sup> The actual security concerns of states and other actors are then what should count and which should serve to delimit an RSC (i.e. a region or subregion), regardless of whether these concerns are about traditional security matters such as wars or arms races or about non-military matters such as organised crime, environmental degradation, drought or HIV/AIDS, i.e. the whole range of issues that are sometimes referred to as components of “human security”.<sup>42</sup> In the following I shall take this criterion as the analytical point of departure.

## 2.2 DELIMITATION OF REGIONS AND RSCS

Considering Africa’s size and diversity it seems obvious to seek a subdivision, if only for analytical purposes, into more manageable entities. One might, for instance, subdivide the continent into simple geographical subregions, as done by the Africa Institute of South Africa, yielding six subregions as set out in Table 3.

**Table 3: Geographical Subregions in Africa<sup>43</sup>**

North Africa	Sub-Saharan Africa					
	West		Central	North-Eastern	Southern	W. Indian Ocean
Algeria	Benin	Liberia	Burundi	Djibouti	Angola	Comoros
Egypt	Burkina Faso	Mali	Cameroon	Eritrea	Botswana	Madagascar
Libya	Cape Verde	Mauritania	CAR	Ethiopia	Lesotho	Mauritius
Morocco (Sahrawi) <sup>44</sup>	Cote d'Ivoire	Niger	Chad	Kenya	Malawi	Seychelles
Tunisia	The Gambia	Nigeria	DRC	Somalia	Mozambique	
	Ghana	Senegal	RoC	Sudan	Namibia	
	Guinea	Sierra L.	Eq. Guinea	Tanzania	South Africa	
	Guinea-Bissau	Togo	Gabon	Uganda	Swaziland	
			Rwanda		Zambia	
			Sao Tome & P.		Zimbabwe	

The OAU in 1976 stipulated that “there shall be five (5) regions of the OAU, namely, Northern, Western, Central, Eastern, and Southern”, yet without specifying which states were to belong to which subregion. The Secretary General was supposed to report back to the following session on this, but apparently did not,<sup>45</sup> thus leaving the question of authoritative subdivision open. The African Union has, likewise opted for a subdivision into five regions, as set out Table 4. However, this subdivision contains several paradoxes, e.g. the fact that present and former SADC members Mauritius and the Seychelles are counted as belonging to East Africa, and Rwanda (along with Uganda) is counted as belonging to a different subregion than Burundi or the DRC.

**Table 4: Africa’s Subregions according to the AU<sup>46</sup>**

Northern	West			Central		East		Southern	
Algeria	Benin	Gambia	Mauritan	Burundi	DRC	Comoros	Rwanda	Angola	South
Egypt	Burkina	Ghana	Niger	Camer.	Eq. Guin.	Djibouti	Seych.	Botsw.	Africa
Libya	Faso	Guinea	Nigeria	CAR	Gabon	Eritrea	Somalia	Lesoth.	Swazil.
Tunisia	Cape	Guin.B.	Senegal	Chad	Sao T&P	Ethiopia	Sudan	Malawi	Zambia
Sahrawi	Verde	Liberia	Sierra L.	RoC		Kenya	Tanzania	Mozamb	Zimb.
	Cote d’I.	Mali	Togo			Madag.	Uganda	Namibia	
						Maurit.			

Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver have recently sought to apply the above RSC theory to Africa, in principle proceeding from the criterion that members of such complexes should be interdependent with regard to security, whilst (in principle) determining this on the basis of which issue areas are “securitised”. Distinguishing between Cold War and post-Cold War patterns, they were able to identify only one-and-a-half full-fledged RSCs prior to 1990, i.e. those of the Middle East (including North Africa) and Southern Africa, plus a “proto-complex” covering West Africa and a “pre-complex” encompassing the Horn of Africa, whereas East-Central Africa remained “an unstructured region”. After 1990 the situation gradually became clearer, according to the two authors, who were in 2003 able to identify two-and-a-half RSCs, i.e. (parts of) the Middle East, Central and Southern Africa, plus two proto-complexes in West Africa and the Horn, respectively.<sup>47</sup>

Finding the terminology rather confusing, and the actual delimitation less than obvious, I have opted for a slightly different subdivision of Africa into (sub-) regional security complexes, set out in Table 5. It deliberately disregards the “rule” that RSCs are not allowed to overlap, i.e. that countries can only belong to one RSC, for the simple reason that several countries do seem to belong to more than one, usually because they are straddling the border between RSCs. This is the case of Mauritania (North and West Africa), Egypt (North Africa and the Horn of Africa), the DRC, Angola and Tanzania (the Great Lakes subregion and Southern Africa), and Kenya arguably belonging to both the Horn of Africa and the Great Lakes subregional security complexes.

<b>Table 5: African Subregional Security Complexes</b>		
<b>RSC</b>	<b>Members</b>	<b>Possible/ peripheral members</b>
<b>North Africa</b>	Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Sahrawi	Chad, Mauritania, Sudan,
<b>Horn of Africa</b>	Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan	Chad, Egypt, Kenya, Uganda
<b>West Africa</b>	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Togo, Niger, Nigeria, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Mali, Gabon, Sierra Leone	Cameroon, Comoros, Equatorial Guinea
<b>Great Lakes</b>	Burundi, Central African Rep., Rep. of Congo, Rwanda, Uganda, DRC	Angola, Tanzania
<b>Southern Africa</b>	Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe	DRC, Tanzania
<b>Others</b>	Madagascar, Mauritius, Seychelles	

### 2.3 THE ORGANISATIONAL LANDSCAPE

Africa is home to quite a number of regional as well as subregional organisations, as set out in Table 6 which merely lists some of the existing organisations included in the CIA’s *World Factbook*, including such as are mainly, but not exclusively, African. Unfortunately, however, there may be less to the apparent pattern of organisational density than meets the eye, as some of the listed organisations seem to be little more than empty shells. Moreover, only few of them are



devoted to security and conflict matters or have a scope or strength allowing them to “branch out” into this field.

<b>Table 6: African Regional and Subregional Organisations<sup>48</sup></b>																
<b>Organisation</b>	<b>AFDB</b>	<b>AMU</b>	<b>AU/OAU</b>	<b>BDEAC</b>	<b>COMESA</b>	<b>Entente</b>	<b>EADB</b>	<b>CEPGL</b>	<b>ECOWAS</b>	<b>IGAD</b>	<b>CEMAC</b>	<b>SACU</b>	<b>SADC</b>	<b>WADB</b>	<b>WAEMU</b>	<b>Total member-ships</b>
<b>North Africa</b>																
Algeria	✓	✓	✓													3
Egypt	✓		✓		✓											3
Libya	✓	✓	✓													3
Morocco	✓	✓														2
Sahrawi			✓													1
Tunisia	✓	✓	✓													3
<b>Horn of Africa</b>																
Djibouti	✓		✓		✓					✓						4
Eritrea	✓		✓		✓					✓						4
Ethiopia	✓		✓		✓					✓						4
Somalia	✓		✓						✓							3
Sudan	✓		✓		✓					✓						4
<b>West Africa</b>																
Benin	✓		✓			✓			✓					✓	✓	6
Burkina Faso	✓		✓			✓			✓					✓	✓	6
Cape Verde	✓		✓						✓		✓					4
Cote d'Ivoire	✓		✓			✓			✓					✓	✓	6
The Gambia	✓		✓						✓							3
Ghana	✓		✓						✓							3
Guinea	✓		✓						✓							3
Guinea-Bissau	✓		✓						✓				✓	✓		5
Gabon	✓		✓	✓							✓					4
Liberia	✓		✓						✓							3
Mali	✓		✓						✓					✓	✓	5
Niger	✓		✓						✓					✓	✓	6
Nigeria	✓		✓			✓			✓							3
Sao Tome/Principe	✓		✓													2
Senegal	✓		✓						✓					✓	✓	5
Sierra Leone	✓		✓						✓							3
Togo	✓		✓			✓			✓					✓	✓	6
<b>Great Lakes</b>																
Burundi	✓		✓		✓			✓								4
Central Afr. R.	✓		✓	✓				✓								3
DR of the Congo	✓		✓		✓			✓					✓			5
Rep. of the Congo	✓		✓	✓							✓					4
Rwanda	✓		✓		✓			✓								4
Uganda	✓		✓		✓		✓			✓						5

<b>Southern Africa</b>																
Angola	✓		✓		✓							✓				4
Botswana	✓		✓									✓	✓			4
Lesotho	✓		✓									✓	✓			4
Madagascar	✓		✓		✓								✓			4
Malawi	✓		✓		✓								✓			4
Mauritius	✓		✓		✓								✓			4
Mozambique	✓		✓										✓			3
Namibia	✓		✓		✓							✓	✓			5
South Africa	✓		✓									✓	✓			4
Swaziland	✓		✓		✓							✓	✓			5
Tanzania	✓		✓				✓						✓			4
Zambia	✓		✓		✓								✓			4
Zimbabwe	✓		✓		✓								✓			4
<b>Indeterminate</b>																
Cameroon	✓		✓	✓								✓				4
Chad	✓		✓	✓								✓				4
Comoros	✓		✓		✓											3
Equatorial Guinea	✓		✓	✓								✓				4
Kenya	✓		✓		✓		✓			✓						5
Mauritania	✓	✓	✓						✓							4
Seychelles	✓		✓		✓											3
<b>African members</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	
<b>Other members</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Legend</b>	<p>ECOWAS: Economic Community of West African States  AfDB: African Development Bank  AMU: Arab Maghreb Union (AMU)  AU: African Union  BDEAC: Central African States Development Bank  COMESA: Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa  Entente: Council of the Entente  EADB: East African Development Bank  CEPGL: Economic Community of the Great Lakes Countries  IGAD: Inter-Governmental Authority on Development  CEMAC: Monetary and Economic Community of Central Africa  OAU: Organization of African Unity  SACU: Southern African Customs Union  SADC: Southern African Development Community  WADB: West African Development Bank  WAEMU: West African Economic and Monetary Union</p>															

There seems to be little correspondence between the borders of RSCs and subregional organisations, which may be quite a serious problem, as RSCs (almost by definition) represent the required geographical scope for addressing security-related problems, e.g. by subregional organisations. Even more seriously, there seems to be no correspondence at all between the need for and the availability of security- and conflict-related organisations, as those subregions most in need of strong organisations (the Great Lakes, for instance) have none.

However, this mismatch need not be a serious problem under a regime built on subsidiarity, as subregional organisations are merely intended as first resorts. When they are unavailable or inadequate for the task, the responsibility for dealing with problems simply moves one step up

the hierarchical ladder, i.e. to the regional level. We shall therefore begin with the regional organisation for the African continent, the OAU and its successor, the African Union.

## 3. From OAU to AU, Now with NEPAD and CSSDCA

Even though one may well dispute whether the African continent constitutes a region, considering that North Africa may just as well be counted as part of the “Greater Middle East”,<sup>49</sup> both the existence of organisations with a continental scope and the actual interaction with sub-Saharan Africa by certain Maghreb countries (e.g. Libya and Egypt) seems to indicate that the continent is in fact a meaningful entity, as does the existence of a corresponding ideology.

### 3.1 PAN-AFRICANISM

In analogy with, for instance, pan-Arabism,<sup>50</sup> Pan-Africanism continues to play a certain role, at least in the discourse in and on Africa. It is an ideology with historical roots that can be traced at least as far back as the 19<sup>th</sup> Century and with a considerable present standing.<sup>51</sup> It consists of several elements.

- A shared mythology of a glorious past of African unity, unfortunately based on extremely weak historical evidence.<sup>52</sup>
- A collective historical memory of victimisation, stemming from the slave trade and the colonisation of Africa,<sup>53</sup> and shared between the African peoples and the diaspora. Hence also the incidence of pan-African ideology among African diaspora communities, inter alia in the United States and the Caribbean, where it sometimes takes rather baroque forms such as Rastafarianism.<sup>54</sup>
- A sense of community, i.e. of all of Africa “belonging together”, perhaps even in the sense of forming one nation.<sup>55</sup>
- A shared hope for an “African renaissance”, pronounced on several occasions, but most recently and eloquently by South African president Thabo Mbeki.<sup>56</sup>

The Pan-African Congress in 1945 first enunciated the pan-African ideal in a “Declaration to the Colonial Peoples”,<sup>57</sup> and this call was followed up by the leaders of the various liberation movements which sprang up in the course of the 1950s. The ideology continued to influence them after the transformation of many of these leaders into presidents or prime ministers of the

independent states coming into being since the late 1950s, as was the case of Kwama Nkrumah and Julius Nyerere.<sup>58</sup> There was, however, no unanimity among the proponents of pan-Africanism, even at this early stage, but a division between radicals and gradualists. The former regarded the formation of states as a detour from the goal of one pan-African polity, whereas the latter viewed state formation as an indispensable step towards the goal of unity which gradually receded into the background.

### 3.2 THE OAU

When the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) was founded in 1963, it thus reflected a compromise between the two positions. On the one hand it was certainly inspired by the ideology of pan-Africanism, and the preamble of the OAU Charter<sup>59</sup> thus referred to

a common determination to promote understanding among our peoples and cooperation among our states in response to the aspirations of our peoples for brotherhood and solidarity, in a larger unity transcending ethnic and national differences.

The same commitment to unity was reflected in article II, which referred to “the unity and solidarity of the African states”, but when it came to the basic principles, referred to in article III of the Charter, the emphasis shifted to the existing states. The following were listed:

1. The sovereign equality of all Member States.
2. Non-interference in the internal affairs of States.
3. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each State and for its inalienable right to independent existence.
4. Peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiation, mediator conciliation or arbitration.
5. Unreserved condemnation, in all its forms, of political assassination as well as of subversive activities on the part a neighbouring States or any other States.
6. Absolute dedication to the total emancipation of the African territories, which are still dependent.
7. Affirmation of a policy of non-alignment with regard to all blocs.

For all their indisputable merits, these principles were bound to make the OAU a guardian of state rights, even at the expense of the rights of the African peoples and the lofty aspirations referred to in the charter’s preamble, including “freedom, equality, justice and dignity”—values which have on numerous occasions been violated by incumbent African regimes.

The founding of the OAU might thus be seen as the codification of an embryonic “Westphalian system” in Africa,<sup>60</sup> based on the states emerging from decolonisation within the borders that had been established by the former colonial masters according to criteria which had absolutely nothing to do with the interests of the inhabitants.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, the OAU might be seen as a “safety net”, protecting the newly independent states through their process of state-building. Besides thus helping with state-building, the organisation probably also contributed to keeping the number of inter-state wars in Africa impressively low—even though there is, of course, no telling how frequent they would have been in the absence of the OAU..

One of the defects of this system is that the implicit privileging of existing states within pre-determined borders has been an almost insurmountable obstacle to dealing constructively with intra-state conflicts, be they secessionist struggles such as that of Eritrea, power struggles or outright genocides as that in Rwanda in 1994. Another defect was that states enjoyed the same rights regardless of their form of government, providing dictatorships with few incentives to democratise. Indeed, African despots could count on the support from other African governments and the OAU to withstand pressure from the West or the international community to introduce democracy.<sup>62</sup>

The OAU was not particularly successful in promoting human rights either, notwithstanding its adoption in 1981 of an “African Charter on Human and People’s Rights”, which listed all the civil rights as well as numerous “second generation human rights”.<sup>63</sup> Even though it was in 1998 decided to strengthen this human rights regime by the establishment of an African Court on Human and Peoples’ Rights, this did not enter into force until 25 January 2004, i.e. after the OAU had been replaced by the AU.<sup>64</sup> The court is intended to adjudicate in cases presented to it by the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights (established by the OAU in 1998), as well as to try cases brought before it by individuals and NGOs, but only in so far as the states involved allow such jurisdiction. The court’s decisions are legally binding, but it remains to be seen whether states will actually help enforce its sentences.<sup>65</sup> If not, little may come out of it.

There was also less than met the eye to the establishment, through the Abuja Treaty of 1991, of an African Economic Community (AEC) under the auspices of the OAU.<sup>66</sup> Indeed, even though the treaty formally entered into force in 1994, virtually nothing has been implemented, and the economic relations between the states of the continent thus remain quite insignificant. On balance, the OAU thus does not seem to have accomplished much with regard to the promotion of the “liberal peace”, which has become so fashionable in the West (and among IR liberalists), neither with regard to democratisation and human rights nor trade and economic

interdependency—all of which would presumably have furthered peace and thus constituted indirect strategies of dealing with conflicts.<sup>67</sup>

The record of the OAU was not much more impressive in the field of directly security-related activities.<sup>68</sup> First of all, the OAU was involved in setting norms and standards, but was quite ineffective in enforcing them. This was, for instance, the case of the “OAU Convention for the Elimination of Mercenarism and Civil Conflicts” (signed in 1977, in force since 1985), which did little to prevent the actual use of mercenaries and PMCs (private military companies) by African states such as Sierra Leone or Angola.<sup>69</sup> Another example of OAU norm-setting was the proclamation in 1996 of Africa as a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Pelindaba Treaty, which had, by the time of writing, not yet entered into force.<sup>70</sup> The fact that Africa is now free of nuclear weapons has probably much less to do with this treaty than with the unilateral decision by South Africa to abandon its clandestine nuclear weapons status,<sup>71</sup> combined with the fact that no other African state seems to have ever so much as contemplated going nuclear—with the possible exception of Libya which has now abandoned whatever ambitions it may have had. Besides this treaty, the OAU did not really venture far into the field of arms control,<sup>72</sup> except for a rather ineffectual “Bamako Common African Position on Small Arms”, signed in 2000,<sup>73</sup> yet with no verifiable impact on state behaviour.

In 1999, the OAU further adopted a “Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism” which entered into force in October 2002, committing member states to “prevent their territories from being used as a base for the planning, organization or execution of terrorists acts” (art. 4.2a) and to collaborate with each other in the fight against terrorism, e.g. by sharing information and extraditing suspects—but also underlining that “armed struggle against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces” was not to be regarded as terrorism (art. 3.1).<sup>74</sup>

Following the adoption of the *Cairo Declaration* of 1993 the OAU established a “Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution”. This step was motivated by the recognition that “no single factor had contributed more to the present socio-economic problems on the Continent than the scourge of conflicts within and between African countries”. The objectives of the Mechanism were quite ambitious, ranging from “the anticipation and prevention of situations of potential conflict from developing into full-blown conflicts” through “peace-making and peace-building” to peacemaking in full-blown conflicts and post-conflict peace-building. The Mechanism was built around a Central Organ, with the OAU Secretary General and the Secretariat together constituting its operational arm, but it also featured an annually elected Bureau of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government.<sup>75</sup>

The OAU also on a couple of occasions ventured into field of direct peace support operations. This was the case of the deployment of an “OAU Neutral Force” in Chad in 1981-82 which was singularly ineffective, according to most accounts.<sup>76</sup> The deployment in Rwanda of an OAU Military Observer Team (1990-91) followed by Military Observer Groups (1991-93) also did absolutely nothing to prevent the 1994 genocide.<sup>77</sup> After the Rwanda debacle the OAU fielded Observer Missions in Burundi (1993-96) and in Comoros (1997-99) as well as an OAU Liaison Mission in Ethiopia-Eritrea, none of which seems to make much of a difference.<sup>78</sup>

The main obstacle to the OAU playing any significant role in any of the above conflicts (to say nothing of the conflicts in which it did not even seek involvement) was probably the strong norm of non-interference in domestic affairs, which made the organisation powerless to do anything about most of the violent conflicts on the continent which (legally speaking) were exactly that, as they pitted incumbent rulers against challengers from within the country who were struggling either to overthrow the government or to secede from the state.

In all fairness, however, it must be acknowledged that these were norms shared by the OAU with the rest of the proverbial “international community” and that they were in perfect conformity with international law. In 1999, moreover, the OAU took a modest step away from the general norm of recognising and defending whichever regime was in power by deciding (at the Algiers summit) to ban leaders installed through coups.<sup>79</sup> However, it was not until the OAU was replaced with the AU, that any real departure from the norm of “sacrosanct sovereignty” took place.

### 3.3 THE AFRICAN UNION

The principled decision to establish what is now the African Union (AU)<sup>80</sup> was taken at the OAU summit meeting in Sirte, Libya, in 1999. In preparation of this summit, the Libyan dictator Qadhafi had used his country’s oil wealth to ensure the support for his vision of a united Africa from several African leaders, inter alia by paying the OAU arrears of seven African countries and by ensuring a luxurious all-expenses-paid summit.<sup>81</sup>

Following a hectic drafting process, OAU ministers in June the following year reached agreement on a draft treaty,<sup>82</sup> and at a summit meeting in Lomé, 11 July 2000, the Constitutive Act of the African Union (CAAU) was signed by 53 African heads of state.<sup>83</sup> It formally entered into force in 2001 with the ratification by two thirds of the member states—which criterion was met (perhaps not entirely by coincidence) when Nigeria deposited its instruments of ratification. The entry into force allowed for the solemn proclamation of the AU at the 5<sup>th</sup> extraordinary summit

of the OAU (2 March 2001) in Sirte,<sup>84</sup> but it was decided to let the new organisation coexist with the OAU for one year in order to smooth the transition.

In July 2001 another summit was convened, where Amara Essy (Cote d'Ivoire) was appointed new Secretary General and a decision on the "Africa Initiative" was adopted<sup>85</sup>—along with a declaration on Zimbabwe which cast some doubt on the sincerity on the break with the past, as this mainly urged the Brits to honour their "colonial obligations" without criticising Robert Mugabe.<sup>86</sup> On the 17<sup>th</sup> of October the same year, i.e. a month after the terrorist attacks against the United States, a Summit of heads of state passed a declaration on terrorism, which seems to have earned the new organisation *in statu nascendi* some goodwill in Washington.<sup>87</sup> Later, an actual "action plan on terrorism" entered into force, binding the signatories to, among other things, refuse safe haven for terrorists.<sup>88</sup> At a subsequent conference on terrorism, however, concerns were expressed about Western double standards,<sup>89</sup> showing that the AU was not a mere pawn in the "new cold war" under conditions of unipolarity.<sup>90</sup>

Following the above preparatory steps, the AU was solemnly inaugurated at a summit in Durban, 9-10 July 2002.<sup>91</sup> To its credit, the summit refused to recognise the regime in Madagascar because of its unconstitutional basis, i.e. in conformity with decisions taken in Lomé in 2000.<sup>92</sup> Nigerian President Obasanjo explained this refusal in the following words: "We have put our foot down. If at this stage of the African Union we don't do things on principle, we are going to fail before we start". A number of important decisions about principles and structure were also taken at this summit, e.g. about the establishment of an AU Security Council.<sup>93</sup>

Before proceeding with this, however, let us pause to look at the most central document of the AU, the Constitutive Act (CAAU).<sup>94</sup> The preamble of the CAAU paid tribute to the ideology of pan-Africanism with the claim that it was

INSPIRED by the noble ideals, which guided the founding fathers of our Continental Organization and generations of Pan-Africanists in their determination to promote unity, solidarity, cohesion and cooperation among the peoples of Africa and African States; and (...)

GUIDED by our common vision of a united and strong Africa and by the need to build a partnership between governments and all segments of civil society, in particular women, youth and the private sector, in order to strengthen solidarity and cohesion among our peoples.



The general principles entail the same duality as characterised the OAU, as they list as objectives both to “achieve greater unity and solidarity between the African countries and the peoples of Africa” and the to “defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of its Member States” (art. 3a-b). The document does, however, contain a significant departure from the past, which may help reconcile the two principles through an explicitated exception. While upholding the principles of sovereignty and non-interference in domestic affairs, it establishes the right of the AU to intervene in cases of “war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity”. A decision to thus intervene may be taken by the Assembly with a two-thirds majority vote (art. 4h and 7.1). It further allows the Executive Council, composed of representatives of all states, to meet in extraordinary sessions if the need should arise (art. 10.2). While these decisions would seem to provide scope for the AU to take action in cases such as the Rwandan genocide, it remains to be seen which practice will develop.<sup>95</sup>

The CAAU further underlines the need to “promote peace, security and stability as a prerequisite for the implementation of our development and integration agenda” (art. 3f), just as it expresses the determination “to promote and protect human and peoples’ rights, consolidate democratic institutions and culture, and to ensure good governance and the rule of law”. More concretely, the constitutive act ambitiously envisages “the establishment of a common defence policy for the African continent” (art. 4d), to which we shall return below.

As far as structure is concerned the CAAU envisages quite an elaborate organisational setup,<sup>96</sup> featuring an Assembly of the Union, an Executive Council, a Pan-African Parliament, a Court of Justice, a Commission, a Permanent Representatives Committee, various specialised technical committees and financial institutions and an Economic, Social and Cultural Council (art. 5).<sup>97</sup> Most of these institutions had by the time of writing (December 2004) been established and begun their work. For instance, the African Parliament was thus inaugurated on the 18<sup>th</sup> March 2004.<sup>98</sup>

Most controversial seems to have been the institutions most directly involved with peace and security—as should come as no surprise to IR Realists who would expect states to be most reluctant to relinquish sovereign rights in this domain of “high politics”. Considerable progress has nevertheless been achieved, at least as far as decisions and institutionalisation is concerned.

At the Addis Ababa summit in July 2002 it was agreed to establish a Peace and Security Council (PSC), intended as “an operational structure for the effective implementation of the decisions taken in the areas of conflict prevention, peace-making, peace support operations and intervention, as well as peace-building and post-conflict reconstruction”.<sup>99</sup> Besides functions

taken over from the OAU's "Mechanism",<sup>100</sup> the PSC is intended to develop the common defence policy for the Union mentioned in CAAU (art. 3e). Even though its structure exhibits clear inspiration from the UN Security Council (the supreme authority of which is explicitly acknowledged) it differs from the latter by having neither permanent members nor veto rights, but all its fifteen members are to be elected, ten of them for a two-year term and five for a three-year term. Even though elections are supposed to take into account geographical representativity and rotation, membership of the Security Council will also entail obligations in terms of payment of dues and contributions to the operations and the Peace Fund set up to fund them.<sup>101</sup>

Among the functions of the Security Council are peacekeeping and even intervention in the aforementioned contingencies of war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide, in which it is also envisaged to play a pro-active role by making proposals to the Assembly. It is further supposed to ensure collaboration between the AU and subregional organisations such as ECOWAS and SADC. In its deliberations and activities, the Security Council will be supported by a so-called "Panel of the Wise", consisting of "five highly respected African personalities from various segments of society who have made outstanding contribution to the cause of peace, security and development on the continent" (art. 11).<sup>102</sup> The protocol establishing the PSC formally entered into force in January 2003,<sup>103</sup> but the actual launch of the PSC, including its Central Organ of the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution only took place on the 25<sup>th</sup> of May 2004.

Under the auspices of the Security Council, the CAAU further envisaged to establish an African Standby Force (ASF), to be "composed of standby multidisciplinary contingents, with civilian and military components in their countries of origin and ready for rapid deployment at appropriate notice". Such deployment is envisioned to take place both for preventative purposes, in the form of forceful interventions, and for post-conflict peace-building (art. 13). Partly in order to make this feasible, a Military Staff Committee should be established and a certain standardisation of equipment as well as doctrines undertaken.<sup>104</sup>

The first steps to implement thus consisted in a meeting of experts and the preparation of concept papers,<sup>105</sup> followed by a series of consultations and meetings between the chiefs of staff and defence ministers of member states. One of the first tangible achievements was an agreement (May 2003) on a "Policy Framework for the Establishment of the African Standby Force and the Military Staff Committee".<sup>106</sup> This was followed by the adoption (January 2004) of a "Draft Framework for a Common African Defence and Security Policy", and (at an extraordinary AU Assembly, 28 February 2004) by a "Solemn Declaration" on the same topic, acronymed the "CADSF".<sup>107</sup> In this declaration, the states acknowledged

(art. 5) ... a definition of defence which encompasses both the traditional, military and state-centric notion of the use of the armed forces of the state to protect its national sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as the less traditional, non-military aspects which relate to the protection of the people's political, cultural, social and economic values and ways of life [and that] ... each African country's defence is inextricably linked to that of other African countries, as well as that of other regions and, by the same token, that of the African continent as a whole.

In the same vein it was also acknowledged that

(art. 6) ... ensuring the common security of Africa involves working on the basis of a definition which encompasses both the traditional, state-centric, notion of the survival of the state and its protection by military means from external aggression, as well as the non-military notion which is informed by the new international environment and the high incidence of intra-state conflict. The causes of intra-state conflict necessitate a new emphasis on human security, based not only on political values but on social and economic imperatives as well. This newer, multi-dimensional notion of security thus embraces such issues as human rights; the right to participate fully in the process of governance; the right to equal development as well as the right to have access to resources and the basic necessities of life; the right to protection against poverty; the right to conducive education and health conditions; the right to protection against marginalization on the basis of gender; protection against natural disasters, as well as ecological and environmental degradation.

The main emphasis was thus, quite logically, placed on internal threats such as intra-state war and genocide (art. 8.ii). Whilst paying due tribute to the principles of sovereignty and non-interference in domestic affairs, the right of the AU (enshrined in the CAAU) to intervene in cases of war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity was also reiterated, albeit with an addition of a fourth contingency that might trigger intervention, namely "a serious threat to legitimate order".

In article 12 a commitment to collective defence was formulated in the words that "any threat or aggression on one African country is deemed to be a threat or aggression on the others, and the continent as a whole". More concretely, the following were identified (art. 13j) as the ambitions of the CADSF:

...enhance AU's capacity for and coordination of, early action for conflict prevention, containment, management, resolution and elimination of conflicts, including the

deployment and sustenance of peacekeeping missions and thus promote initiatives that will preserve and strengthen peace and development in Africa.

This bears a striking resemblance to the ambitions of the European Union, where such tasks are usually referred to as “Petersberg Tasks”,<sup>108</sup> but the AU is more ambitious than its European counterpart by also envisaging to “facilitate the establishment of a threat deterrence and containment capacity within the AU” (art. 13r). Even more ambitiously, it was decided to establish an African Standby Force, “based on brigades to be provided by the five African regions” to be completed by the year 2010.

All of the above is, of course, so far little more than words—and the experience from the OAU certainly cautions against automatically assuming full implementation of all decisions. What nevertheless speaks in favour of some optimism is that fact that the AU took upon itself to oversee the peace process in Burundi, which has been one of Africa’s most intractable conflicts, inter alia through the deployment of peacekeepers, provided by South Africa, Ethiopia and Mozambique—and that this mission seems to have been concluded satisfactorily and then handed over to the United Nations Operation in Burundi (ONUB).<sup>109</sup> At the AU summit in Addis Ababa in July 2004 it was further decided to dispatch monitors as well as a 300-strong protection force (comprising mainly Nigerian and Rwandan troops) to the troubled Darfur region of Sudan, mainly intended to allow for a return of the estimated more than one million refugees in neighbouring Chad.<sup>110</sup>

One explanation of the impressive progress made since the 1999 Sirte Summit may be that what began as “just another of Qadhafi’s crazy ideas” has been embraced by the continent’s two great powers, Nigeria and South Africa, who seem to be playing a “shared hegemonic” role (*vide infra*). The reason why they decided to lend their support to the AU project may be that both were allowed to proceed with their respective favourite projects under the auspices of the new organisation—South Africa with its NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa’s Development) project<sup>111</sup> and Nigeria with its initiative for a Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Cooperation in Africa (CSSDCA), to both of which we shall now turn.

### 3.3.1 NEPAD

The origins of NEPAD (initially under the name “New African Initiative”, NAI) date back to the Sirte summit of the OAU in September 1999, where South African president Mbeki and Algerian president Bouteflika were mandated to negotiate a general debt cancellation for Africa. This duo was subsequently (as a Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement in April 2000) expanded to a troika with Nigerian president Obasanjo.<sup>112</sup> What was now called the Millennium Partnership for

the African Recovery Programme (MAP) was endorsed by the OAU in 2001 when it was acknowledged as Africa's principal development initiative and a Programme of Action was adopted.

NEPAD still has quite a loose structure and thus does not really qualify as an organisation. A fifteen-member Task Force was in 2001 appointed to oversee the implementation of the Programme of Action, a five-member Steering Committee has been appointed, and a small Secretariat. It was in September 2002 recognised by the United Nations as "a serious commitment to address the aspirations of the continent".<sup>113</sup> The main objectives of NEPAD are the eradication of poverty and creation of sustainable development, but as a precondition of such development it also features a "Peace, Security, Democracy and Political Governance Initiative". A set of criteria for good governance has been developed and a "peer review" mechanism (African Peer Review Mechanism, APRM) has been launched which is to assess both the political and the economic credentials of African states—a potentially highly controversial endeavour, even though states are free to submit themselves to a review or not.<sup>114</sup>

At the Durban summit of the AU in 2002 (but under the auspices of NEPAD), the *Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance* contained the following paragraph:

We are determined to increase our efforts in restoring stability, peace and security in the African continent, as these are essential conditions for sustainable development, alongside democracy, good governance, human rights, social development, protection of environment and sound economic management. Our efforts and initiatives will also be directed at seeking speedy peaceful solutions to current conflicts and at building Africa's capacity to prevent, manage and resolve all conflicts on the continent.<sup>115</sup>

The Peace and Security Initiative was in 2001 described as including a recognition that "Long-term conditions for ensuring peace and security in Africa require policy measures for addressing the political and social vulnerabilities on which conflict is premised". It further emphasised the need to strengthen Africa's conflict-management capacity, especially with regard to "prevention, management and resolution of conflict; peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace enforcement; post-conflict reconciliation, rehabilitation and reconstruction; and combating the illicit proliferation of small arms, light weapons and landmines"—a very tall order, indeed, but still quite unspecified.<sup>116</sup> One of the reasons for the conspicuous vagueness of NEPAD about conflicts may be that agreement has been reached between South Africa and Nigeria about a division of labour, according to which this would fall under the "jurisdiction" of CSSDCA.

### 3.3.2 The CSSDCA

The origins of the Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Cooperation in Africa (CSSDCA) are to be found in the so-called “Kampala Movement”, the nucleus of which was the African Leadership Forum (ALF). It was launched in 1988 by Olusegun Obasanjo who was at that time former Nigerian president (originally appointed by the military), but who is today the democratically elected president of his country.<sup>117</sup> The ALF in 1990-91 held a number of preparatory conferences, e.g. with the OAU, civil society organisations and countries of the North, gradually developing the vision of the CSSDCA as a counterpart of the CSSE (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe) and its pos-Cold War successor, the OSCE (Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe)—as had been suggested by academics such as Laurie Nathan for some time.<sup>118</sup>

In May 1991, the ALF convened a conference in Kampala, jointly with the OAU and the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), with Ugandan president Museveni as the chair and attended by his colleagues from Zambia, Sudan, Botswana and Mozambique. The conference adopted the *Kampala Document*, which recommended the launch of a CSSDCA, intended as

... an effective process among African countries which would create a framework for preventing, containing and eliminating pernicious intra- and inter-African conflicts and serve as an instrument, for the management and resolution of such disputes and conflicts as well as for the sustenance of regional co-operation, integration and development.<sup>119</sup>

Where the CSCE had established three “baskets”, the Kampala Document envisaged the establishment of four “calabashes” on security, stability, development and cooperation, each containing various initiatives. Some of these were quite controversial, e.g. to modify the principle of sovereignty to acknowledge a shared African responsibility for the protection of human rights in member countries.<sup>120</sup>

When it was tabled by then OAU chairman Museveni, the proposal to launch a CSSDCA was merely “noted”, but not adopted by the OAU in 1991 (partly because of the opposition from Sudan and Libya). The initiative thus remained dormant until 1999 when the idea was resurrected from near oblivion by Nigerian president Obasanjo at the OAU summit in Algiers. It was formally endorsed by the organisation, and the first meetings (at ministerial level) under its auspices took place in May 2000. The subsequent OAU Summit (Lomé in 2000) then adopted the *Solemn Declaration on the CSSDCA*, and it was agreed that a Standing CSSDCA Conference would be established, to convene every two years during the Summit. Furthermore, review

meetings of senior officials were to take place in-between the biannual summit sessions.<sup>121</sup> In preparation of the 2002 OAU/AU summit in Durban a number of experts meetings were held in December 2001 (in South Africa) on the development and cooperation calabashes, and in May 2002 (in Ethiopia) on those on security and stability, and a “unit” was created under the AU Secretariat to take care of CSSDCA matters.

The Memorandum of Understanding on the CSSDCA of July 2002<sup>122</sup> listed a number of core values, which entailed the adoption of a very broad concept of security, reminiscent of (perhaps even inspired by) European and American academic literature, but also echoing the debate launched by the UNDP on human security:<sup>123</sup>

Security as a multi-dimensional phenomenon that goes beyond military considerations and embraces all aspects of human existence, including economic, political and social dimensions of individual, family, community and national life.

It also acknowledged that “Good governance (...) is a pre-requisite for sustainable peace and security in Africa”; and it embraced interdependency and cooperative security theory with its formulation that “The security of each African country is inseparably linked to that of other African countries and the African continent as a whole”. As a means to realise these values, the MOU envisaged “a collective continental architecture for promoting security and inter-African relations, that goes beyond the traditional military definition and embraces imperatives pertaining to human security, principles relating to good governance, the promotion of democracy and respect for human rights.” It further expressed the intention to strengthen capacities for conflict prevention and management, e.g. via the OAU “Mechanism” described above.

Under the heading of “key performance indicators” were included a number of more concrete objectives such as the signing of non-aggression pacts, the formulation of a common defence policy for Africa, stand-by arrangement for peace support operations, police collaboration, various initiatives to control the flow of small arms and light weapons, the establishment of national institutes for conflict prevention and management (with some involvement of non-government agencies), the establishment by 2005 of an operational early warning mechanism as well as a strengthening of confidence-building measures (CBMs). In the latter field, however, the MOU strayed quite far from the European model of CBMs (basically comprising transparency-enhance measures such as notification and invitation of observers to military manoeuvres).<sup>124</sup> In the African version, a number of other activities were listed such as

annual border post activities, joint border patrols, joint border development and management, regular consultations amongst security agencies operating along the borders, joint training programmes for personnel operating at the borders, including workshops and seminars to educate them on regional and continental agreements on free movement of persons, goods and services and stabilising measures for localised crisis situations for inter-state relations.

The gist of these recommendations was formally confirmed at the Durban summit in 2002,<sup>125</sup> but as with so many other African initiatives, it may be prudent to wait and see whether implementation will meet the expectations—which may well presuppose a continued commitment by the regional great powers, i.e. mainly Nigeria and South Africa.

### **3.3.3 Subsidiarity under the AU?**

The principles of subsidiarity have not been formally codified by the AU, as they have by the EU (*vide supra*), but the relationship between the global, regional and subregional organisations still seem to be in the process of being worked out.

First of all, the AU pays due tribute to the subsidiarity principle “upwards” by acknowledging the supreme authority in matters of peace and security of the UN Security Council. As for the implications “downwards”, the matters are less clear. There are no references to the subregional organisations as instances of first resort, but they are rather referred to in AU documents as mere “implementing organs”, e.g. in the “Solemn Declaration on a Common African Defence and Security Policy” (art. 26). In the Protocol on the PSC the contribution of subregional mechanisms is duly acknowledged as is the “need to develop formal coordination and cooperation arrangements” between them and the AU’s PSC. Both documents are abounding with vague terms such as partnership, consultation, harmonisation and cooperation, but they contain little concrete in terms of divisions of labour and responsibilities—except for reference to MOUs on cooperation to be negotiated and signed.

More concrete plans have, however, been developed with regard to the aforementioned stand-by forces (ASF), where the fielding of five subregional (i.e. multinational) brigade-size on-call units as well as a standing brigade at the AU level are envisaged.<sup>126</sup> The plans for their use—when or if they will ever be ready—seem to follow the subsidiarity principles quite closely, as they are envisioned to undertake the less time-critical missions whereas the AU brigade is supposed to be tasked with both swift deployment to intervene in an emergency and with filling possible gaps at the subregional level.



## 4. Subregional Organisations in Africa

Besides the above all-African regional organisations, sub-Saharan Africa is also host to a number of subregional organisations (see Table 5 above). Most of these are devoted to economic collaboration (but without any major significance in this field)<sup>127</sup> and only three have so far had any noteworthy role to play in the field of conflict and security: ECOWAS in West Africa, SADC in Southern Africa and, to a much more limited extent, IGAD in the Horn of Africa.

### 4.1 ECOWAS

The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) was established in 1975 as a vehicle for economic collaboration,<sup>128</sup> but it has increasingly become involved in conflict management.<sup>129</sup> As early as 1976 a treaty on “Non-Recourse to Aggression” was signed, followed in 1978 by a “Non-Aggression Protocol”<sup>130</sup> and in 1981 by a “Protocol on Mutual Assistance on Defence.”<sup>131</sup> Only in the 1990s, however, did ECOWAS embark on actual crisis management and resolution, and then without the privilege of being able to put the requisite institutions in place at a leisurely pace before going into action. Rather, the organisation was forced to improvise and “muddle through” as best it could, driven by events on the ground.

What spurred this development was the effective break-down of the state in Liberia in 1990, following the attack by Charles Taylor’s NPFL guerrillas, which threatened to destabilise the region as a whole. These events occurred immediately after the inauguration of the Standing Mediation Commission, which undertook a couple of (fairly unsuccessful) missions to the collapsing member state. The obvious need for something more “robust” led to the creation of a subregional peacekeeping force, euphemistically labelled ECOWAS Ceasefire Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) which was deployed to Liberia in August 1990 with the task of defending the incumbent regime of Samuel Doe.<sup>132</sup> Since then, ECOMOG forces have also been deployed to neighbouring Sierra Leone in 1998 after the overthrow of elected president Kabbah.<sup>133</sup> Both deployments were arguably reasonably successful, and the performance of the ECOMOG forces largely satisfactory, even though their achievements have not been tantamount to conflict resolution.<sup>134</sup>

ECOWAS subsequently deployed a small peacekeeping operation in Guinea-Bissau in 1998-99, which ended in failure. According to Adekeye Adebajo, this failure was partly due to the absence of Nigeria: “Lacking the regional Gulliver, the Lilliputian peacekeepers had to withdraw from Bissau by June 1999”.<sup>135</sup> In late 2002, ECOMOG troops were deployed to Cote d’Ivoire to

monitor a ceasefire in the civil war that had been ravaging this country, and they were subsequently integrated with a UN mission in 2004. Something similar happened in Liberia when a peace agreement had been reached between then president Charles Taylor and the rebels, which ECOMOG assumed responsibility for monitoring until its forces were converted into a UN mission less than a month later.<sup>136</sup>

The deployments have been accompanied by a strengthening of the structural framework, e.g. in the form of an Allied Armed Force of the Community (AAFC) with a joint commander and the establishment of a Defence Council. ECOWAS has also taken steps (at the summit meeting in Lomé in 1997) to create an early warning and conflict resolution mechanism, including plans for an early warning centre, to which should be added the establishment of a Mediation and Security Council. Most of these plans, however, remain to be implemented and their practical consequences have been minor. For instance, ECOWAS proved unable to prevent the crises in Guinea Bissau in 1998-99 or in Côte d'Ivoire in 1999/2000.<sup>137</sup>

In 1993 the Treaty of ECOWAS was amended (24 July) to accommodate a number of innovative measures in the field of peace and security.<sup>138</sup> The preamble thus spoke of “integration” pointing forwards to an economic union. Under the fundamental principles (art. 4) were listed, among others, the equality of states, solidarity and collective self-reliance, non-aggression, maintenance of regional peace, stability and security, promotion and protection of human rights and democracy. In art. 59 on regional security, it was stated that member states

(2) (...) undertake to co-operate with the Community in establishing and strengthening appropriate mechanisms for the timely prevention and resolution of intra-State and inter-State conflicts, paying particular regard to the need to: a) maintain periodic and regular consultations between national border administration authorities; b) establish local or national joint commissions to examine any problems encountered in relations between neighbouring States; (...) e) employ where appropriate, good offices, conciliation, mediation and other methods of peaceful settlement of disputes; f) establish a regional peace and security observation system and peace-keeping forces where appropriate;

ECOWAS now has a fairly elaborate organisational structure, featuring the following main bodies:<sup>139</sup> An Authority of Heads of States and Government, a Council of Ministers, a Community Parliament (inaugurated in 2000),<sup>140</sup> an Economic and Social Council, a Community Court of Justice, an Executive Secretariat and a Fund for Cooperation Compensation and Development. To these have been added various specialised bodies such as a Mediation and

Security Council. At the summit in Lomé (10 December 1999) a protocol was adopted concerning the “Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, Resolution, Peace-Keeping and Security”.<sup>141</sup> This body is responsible for “collective security and peace” (art. 1) and tasked with the promotion of democracy (art. 2) and the prevention, management and resolution of both internal and international conflicts (art. 3) and well as the furthering of cooperation with regard to conflict prevention, early warning, peacekeeping, control of cross-border crime, international terrorism and the proliferation of small arms and anti-personnel mines. It envisaged the constitution and deployment of “a civilian and military force to maintain or restore peace within the subregion, whenever the need arises”. The Mechanism features the following institutions (art. 4):

- An Authority of Heads of State and Government (art. 5)
- A Mediation and Security Council comprising seven elected member states plus the current chairman of the Authority and his predecessor. Decisions are to be taken by a two-thirds majority and might entail mandates for forceful interventions (art. 8-10)
- An Executive Secretariat tasked with fact-finding, mediation and similar activities (art. 15)

A number of organs were further established to assist the Mediation and Security Council (art 15), including a Defence and Security Commission, comprising the chiefs of staff and other military and civilian personnel (art. 18-19), a Council of Elders consisting of “eminent personalities” who should be available for mediation and similar tasks, and the aforementioned ECOMOG. It was described as “several stand-by multi-purpose modules (civilian and military) in their countries of origin and ready for immediate deployment” (art. 21-22) and charged with military tasks ranging from observation to peacekeeping and even humanitarian intervention as well as what are rightly civilian tasks such as policing—a very tall order, indeed. For this purpose it was further decided to create “composite stand-by units” for ECOMOG and to develop common training programmes and instruction manuals (art. 28-30).

A subregional peace and security observation system known as the Early Warning System was further established (Art. 22-24) consisting of an Observation and Monitoring Centre located at the secretariat and in charge of data collection and analysis on behalf of the Executive Secretariat (art. 23) as well as four “observation and monitoring zones” tasked with data collection (art. 24)

The Mechanism is to be applied (art. 25) in cases of external aggression and conflicts between member states as well as in cases of internal conflicts insofar as they either “threaten to trigger a humanitarian disaster” and pose serious threats subregional peace and security and in the case of successful or attempted coups against democratically elected governments. The protocol further

envisaged “a graduated strategy for building peace” including such activities as the supervision of elections and general support the development of democratic institutions (art. 42), disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration programmes, also for child soldiers (art. 44) and measures to control the flow of small arms (art. 50-51).

It is obviously easier to sign agreements than to implement them, but the implementation of these various measures does seem to be proceeding fairly smoothly. The Mediation and Security Council was thus inaugurated on the 15<sup>th</sup> of May 2000,<sup>142</sup> the Council of Elders has held its inaugural meeting,<sup>143</sup> and a peace fund has been created, intended to allow for a swift response to crises, but critically dependent on contributions from donors.<sup>144</sup>

Even though ECOWAS is far from flawless, its track record is thus quite impressive. What may make support for it particularly attractive to the donor community (i.e. the West) is that its activities come cheap. For instance, whereas the cost of each UN soldier forces in Liberia was \$500,000 p.a., that of UNOMOG troops was a mere \$30,406.<sup>145</sup> Perhaps even more importantly, ECOMOG forces have proven to be far less casualty-scared than, say, those of the United States or other western powers. The Nigerian casualty toll in Liberia and Sierra Leone has thus been estimated at nearly one thousand,<sup>146</sup> but whereas the USA “ran away” from Somalia after having lost a mere eighteen troops and the Belgians from Rwanda after losing ten,<sup>147</sup> Nigeria remained in place.

The greatest weakness of ECOWAS may be its critical dependency on the contribution of Nigeria, both in military and other terms, and the accompanying suspicions that the organisation is little more than a convenient multilateral framework for Nigerian interventions.<sup>148</sup> The deployments have all placed severe strains on the capacity of the smaller member states, and there is little reason to expect this to change.<sup>149</sup> Some of these forces, and especially those of Ghana, do however have a long experience with peacekeeping missions (mainly under UN auspices) which may partly make up for their modest numbers.

Nigeria’s position may thus be a rather clear case of hegemony, albeit not really in the usual derogatory sense of the term, more on which in the concluding section. Even though Nigeria’s commitment to ECOWAS appears firm, the democratic form of government may not really help in this respect. It was easier for a military dictator like Abacha to dispatch troops to foreign countries and have their corpses sent home in body-bags than it may be for a democratically elected president such as Obasanjo, who is dependent on the consent of the electorate. It may thus require a lot of genuine leadership to achieve this consent of the population to sacrifice the lives of citizens to save strangers. By the time of writing in October 2004, the issue did not

appear to have surfaced in Nigerian party politics, but it just may in the future, with potentially critical implications for ECOWAS as a whole.

Another potentially critical factor is the rivalry between the Anglo- and Francophone states in West Africa, which has been lurking beneath the surface all along. The present domestic turmoil in the Cote d'Ivoire has weakened the Francophone "bloc", but it is conceivable that France might, at some stage decide to "pull some strings" within *la Francophonie*,<sup>150</sup> which just might weaken Nigeria's hegemonic position and thereby perhaps ECOWAS as such.

## 4.2 SADC

Until the early 1990s, the Southern African RSC clearly constituted a "conflict formation" or a "conflict system" as war was all too conceivable among members of the subregion, especially between South Africa and the rest (*vide infra*). Indeed several wars and other major armed conflicts did take place, some of which were of indigenous origins while others were by-products of the Cold War, i.e. "proxy wars", in which the two superpowers supported opposing sides in a regional conflict as an alternative to fighting it out among themselves. This was, arguably, the case of the civil wars in Mozambique and, to an even greater extent, Angola.<sup>151</sup>

Since the dismantling of the apartheid regime and the integration of South Africa into the subregion, however, war among the states comprising it has become increasingly unlikely, perhaps even inconceivable in the sense that war does not even figure as a contingency for national security planning. The subregion may thus constitute, or at least approach, the status of a "security community" (in the classical sense of Karl Deutsch) between the members of which war has become inconceivable.<sup>152</sup>

Evidence of this is the steadily progressing institutionalisation of the subregion around the Southern African Development Community (SADC). It had its origins in the loose organisation of the Frontline States (FLS, collaborating against the apartheid regime in South Africa) and its economic counterpart, the SADCC (Southern African Development Coordination Conference, established in 1980),<sup>153</sup> partly as a counterpart to the economic bloc forged around the apartheid state, SACU (Southern African Customs Union).<sup>154</sup>

In 1992 SADC was launched and the new South Africa soon acceded to the organisation (1994). Among the stated objectives of SADC were some which may appear well-intended, but entirely unrealistic such as to "promote the interdependence and integration of our national economies for the harmonious, balanced and equitable development of the Region" (preamble).<sup>155</sup> The basic

principles included “the sovereign equality of all Member States; solidarity, peace and security; human rights, democracy, and the rule of law; equity, balance and mutual benefit; and the peaceful settlement of disputes”, as formulated in the SADC Treaty (art. 4). The field of “politics, diplomacy, international relations, peace and security” was mentioned as one among several areas of cooperation (art. 21g).

The membership of SADC was gradually enlarged to include the DRC (after the fall from power of President Mobuto), Mauritius and the Seychelles (which left the organisation in 2004, mainly for economic reasons).<sup>156</sup> Other states (e.g. Rwanda) have indicated their interest in joining, but so far SADC seems to have exhibited a slight preference for deepening over expansion, even though Madagascar joined in 2004.<sup>157</sup>

The structure described in the treaty was quite elaborate, featuring the following main bodies: a Summit of Heads of State or Government, a Council of Ministers, various commissions, a Standing Committee of Officials, a Secretariat headed by an Executive Secretary and a Tribunal (articles 9-16). This structure has been gradually been formalised, to some extent inspired by the OSCE and (to a lesser extent) the EU.<sup>158</sup> In 2001 the treaty was amended,<sup>159</sup> inter alia with a view to referring properly to the new African Union and to accommodating new offices, including “troikas” for the various bodies (*vide infra*)—an arrangement intended into ensure continuity by including the incumbent office-holder as well as his immediate predecessor and successor (art. 9A). Moreover, amendments have regulated (in art. 10A) the structure, competences and objectives of the “Organ on Politics, Defence and Security” (OPDS, often referred to as “the Organ”).<sup>160</sup>

The Organ been established by the SADC summit of 1996, but had initially enjoyed a curious special status—also because its first chairman was Zimbabwean president Robert Mugabe, who obstinately remained in office until 2001 even though the chairmanship was supposed to have rotated on an annual basis. Among the institutions of the Organ was the Inter-state Defence and Security Committee (ISDSC)—a left-over from the FLS, established as early as 1975.<sup>161</sup> In 2001, however, the Organ itself was subsumed directly under SADC, and its members were stipulated as the respective ministers for foreign affairs, defence and public or state security. It now has two subordinate bodies, i.e. the ISDSC, comprising the ministers of defence and of state or public security and the ISPDC, consisting of the ministers of foreign affairs.<sup>162</sup>

Among the objectives of the Organ, as stipulated in the 2001 Summit’s “Protocol on Politics, Security and Defence Cooperation” (art. 2), are the following:

- a) protect the people and safeguard the development of the Region against instability arising from the breakdown of law and order, intra-state conflict, interstate conflict and aggression; (...)
- d) promote regional co-ordination and co-operation on matters related to security and defence and establish appropriate mechanisms to this end;
- e) prevent, contain and resolve inter-and intra-state conflict by peaceful means;
- f) consider enforcement action in accordance with international law and as a matter of last resort where peaceful means have failed;
- g) promote the development of democratic institutions and practices (...) and encourage the observance of universal human rights (...);
- h) consider the development of a collective security capacity and conclude a Mutual Defence Pact to respond to external military threats;
- i) develop close co-operation between the police and state security services of State Parties in order to address :
  - (i) cross border crime; and
  - (ii) promote a community based approach to domestic security; (...)
- k) develop peacekeeping capacity of national defence forces and co-ordinate the participation of State Parties in international and regional peacekeeping operations (...)

The methods envisaged to further these goals (art. 3) include preventive diplomacy, negotiations, conciliation, mediation, good offices, arbitration and adjudication, as well as the establishment of an early warning system, but the Summit may also resort to enforcement action, albeit only as a matter of last resort and only with the authorization of the UN Security Council. It was further envisaged to establish collective security arrangements under the auspices of a Mutual Defence Pact.<sup>163</sup>

SADC has also taken some steps to address the serious problem of small arms proliferation in the region—partly as a legacy of the end of the civil wars in Angola and Mozambique—e.g. with a “Protocol on the Control of Firearms, Ammunition and Other Related Materials”.<sup>164</sup> The military activities have, likewise, been expanded, mainly in the form of training for peacekeeping activities, (e.g. at the now defunct Regional Peacekeeping Training Centre, RPTC, in Harare),<sup>165</sup> towards which end a couple of military exercises have also been conducted, including the “Blue Hungwe” and the “Blue Crane”.<sup>166</sup>

More controversially, two military deployments have taken place, ostensibly under the auspices of SADC. First of all, Zimbabwe, Angola and Namibia became militarily involved in the DRC, i.e.

in what was formally speaking a text-book collective defence operation intended to protect a member state against aggression from Rwanda and Uganda. However, the deployment only received a SADC mandate *ex post facto*, and the intervention has been highly controversial, both with regard to the accomplishments, costs and the underlying motivations, as it seems that Angola was mainly driven by national security concerns related to UNITA operations out of the DRC, and Zimbabwe by the desire to exploit Congolese natural resources.<sup>167</sup> Secondly, South Africa and Botswana launched a singularly ill-fated intervention in Lesotho in 1998, which likewise received a SADC mandate, but only after the fact.<sup>168</sup>

Besides providing forces for peacekeeping activities, SADC is officially committed to function as a collective defence organisation. In 2003 a Mutual Defence Pact was thus signed,<sup>169</sup> including an apparently NATO-inspired (and similarly vaguely formulated) collective defence clause in article six:

1. An armed attack against a State Party shall be considered a threat to regional peace and security and such an attack shall be met with immediate collective action.
2. Collective action shall be mandated by Summit on the recommendation of the Organ.
3. Each State Party shall participate in such collective action in any manner it deems appropriate.
4. Any such armed attack, and measures taken in response thereto, shall immediately be reported to the Peace and Security Council of the African Union and the Security Council of the United Nations.

More concretely, the Pact (in art. 9) envisions collaboration in military training and joint exercises, yet without entailing any binding commitments on the signatories. It further refers to joint research and development (R&D) and production of military equipment. Considering that the only state in the region with any significant arms industry is South Africa, this clause may be almost tantamount to an invitation to purchase South African weaponry.<sup>170</sup>

Generally, SADC is hampered by the apparent rivalry between South Africa and the rest, based on the fact that the RSA possesses all the wherewithal of hegemony (both in military, political, economic, demographic, and geographic terms) or even regional unipolarity (see Table 7). It thus seems unlikely that the other states in SADC will be able to field any major military operations without the participation of the RSA<sup>171</sup>—in analogy with the situation of Nigeria in West Africa. While other states may be uncomfortable with the prospects of such hegemony, the most outspoken among the opponents of South African hegemony has been Zimbabwe. The ongoing



crisis in this country has obviously weakened the standing of the Mugabe government and, by implication, the anti-South African “bloc”.

**Table 7: SADC Countries compared<sup>172</sup>**

Country	Area	Populat. (000)	GDP (Bill. US\$)	MILEX (Mil. USD\$)	Troops (000)	MBT	AIFV/ APC	Artil.	Cbt. Ac.	Arm. hel.
Angola	1,246,700	10,366	10.1	1,200	107.5	400	570	404	140	40
Botswana	600,370	1,586	10.4	61	9.0	0	30	18	30	0
Congo (DRC)	2,345,410	53,625	31	250	55.9	60	?	100	4	6
Lesotho	30,355	2,177	18.2	34	2.0	0	0	2	0	0
Malawi	118,480	10,548	9.4	10	5.0	0	0	9	0	0
Mauritius	1,860	1,190	12.3	11	..	0	0	0	0	0
Mozambique	801,590	19,371	19.1	35	6.1	80	275	136	0	4
Namibia	825,590	1,798	7.6	104	9.0	?	60	24	2	2
Seychelles	455	80	0.6	13	0.2	0	0	0	0	0
South Africa	1,219,912	43,586	369	2,000	63.4	168	2,833	190	86	7
Swaziland	17,363	1,104	4.4	19	..	?	?	?	?	?
Tanzania	945,087	36,232	25.1	21	34.0	45	60	265	19	0
Zambia	752,614	9,770	8.5	76	21.6	30	13	96	71	12
Zimbabwe	390,580	11,365	28.2	127	40.0	40	330	30	52	32
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,296,366</b>	<b>202,799</b>	<b>553.9</b>	<b>3,961.0</b>	<b>353.7</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>4171</b>	<b>1,274</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>SA/Total (%)</b>	<b>13.1</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>66.6</b>	<b>50.5</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>67.9</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>6.8</b>

Generally, the RSA has been mindful of the problem and gone out of its way to allay such concerns, but the facts remain. The field in which the South African dominance is most pronounced may be that of the economy, where all the other SADC member states are far more dependent on South Africa than *vice versa*. While all of Africa only accounts for three percent of South Africa’s imports and fourteen percent of its exports, its share of the imports by other SADC member states is much larger, ranging from ten percent in Angola, through 35, 41, 43 and 55 percent in Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Malawi and Zambia to 77, 80, 84 and 90 percent in Botswana, Namibia, Swaziland and Lesotho, respectively.<sup>173</sup> SADC developments thus seem promising, but very much dependent on South Africa’s continued commitment to the organisation and the acceptance by the other members of its role as benevolent hegemon and *primus inter pares*.

### 4.3 IGAD

Several competing schemes for subregionalism in the Horn of Africa have, at various stages, popped up, including that of a idea of “Red Sea Federation”, comprising Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Ethiopia and Somalia,<sup>174</sup> yet none of them had made much headway.

The Horn does, however, feature one subregional organisation, namely the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, IGAD. It was founded in 1996 on the basis of IGADD (Inter-Governmental Authority on Drought and Desertification) which had been launched in 1986. Its membership comprises Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Somalia, Sudan and (since its independence in 1993) Eritrea.<sup>175</sup> Its central organs are the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, the Council of Ministers, the Committee of Ambassadors and the Secretariat, which is located in Djibouti and headed by an Executive Secretary.<sup>176</sup> As all other subregional organisations in Africa, IGAD is based on the principles of the sovereign equality of all member states and non-interference in their internal affairs (art. 6A), yet with the option (which may be mainly theoretical) of taking decisions through qualified (two thirds) majority in the Council of Ministers (art. 10.5).

Even though the main objectives of IGAD were initially economic and included the fostering of “comprehensive cooperation” as a path to economic integration, article seven of the IGAD Agreement also highlighted the goals to “promote peace and stability in the subregion and create mechanisms within the subregion for the prevention, management and resolution of inter and intra-State conflicts through dialogue” and to “facilitate repatriation and reintegration of refugees, returnees and displaced persons and demobilized soldiers” (art. 13A.S) The agreement also obliges member states to deal with disputes “within this subregional mechanism before they are referred to other regional or international organisations” (art. 18A).

In conformity with these lofty goals, IGAD has embarked on the implementation of a five point programme on Conflict Prevention, Resolution and Management, launched in 1998. At the Khartoum summit in 2000, the establishment of the “mechanisms in the IGAD subregion for the prevention, management and resolution of inter-state and intra-state conflicts” was endorsed.<sup>177</sup> At the subsequent summit meeting in January 2002, an elaborate protocol was adopted on the “Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism for IGAD Member States” (CEWARN).<sup>178</sup> CEWARN is very ambitiously intended for both early warning and response (art. 5.1). However, in actual fact it seems to entail little more than an enhanced exchange of information, including the establishment of various databases (art. 7.4) on the basis of which the intention is to “develop case scenarios and formulate options for response” (Annex I.1.c). In addition to the central mechanism, the intention is to also establish national units and to liaise with NGOs and civil society organisations involved in the gathering of information (art. 12.1.b).<sup>179</sup>

Under the auspices of the Political and Humanitarian Affairs Section<sup>180</sup> a number of programmes have also been initiated with a potential impact on peace and security issues. However, few (if

any) had actually commenced by the time of writing in December 2004: A disaster risk management capability, a pilot programme for the reintegration and rehabilitation of returnees, internally displaced persons and affected host communities, an assessment of the capacities for conflict prevention, management and resolution in the IGAD subregion, training of the IGAD Secretariat and national ministries in conflict prevention, management and resolution, initiatives to curtail illicit trafficking of small arms and for mine clearance and mine victims assistance.<sup>181</sup> In the spring of 2004, moreover, decisions were taken to form an Eastern Africa Standby Brigade (EASBRIG) as one of the building blocs of the African Stand-by Force described under the AU, and the first meeting of defence ministers took place in July 2004. However, it remains to be seen whether the brigade will actually materialise, and whether it will be an IGAD project. Even though the meetings have taken place under the auspices of IGAD, participants have also included Rwanda and (the new SADC member) Madagascar, whereas neither Somalia nor Eritrea have attended.<sup>182</sup>

IGAD has for quite some time been active, albeit not entirely successful, in the Sudan and the Somali peace processes. As far as the former is concerned, IGAD has, *inter alia*, established a permanent secretariat for the Sudan peace process (located in Nairobi), appointed special envoys and hosted negotiations between the government of Sudan and the SPLM. The main achievement in this respect has been the signing (20 July 2002) of the Machakos Protocol, which still seems to hold some promise for a lasting resolution of the conflict.<sup>183</sup> Since then a series of agreements have been reached on the following outstanding issues: the structure of government (18 November 2002), the cessation of hostilities (4 February 2003),<sup>184</sup> the general principles of power and wealth sharing (6 February 2003),<sup>185</sup> security issues during the interim period (25 September 2003),<sup>186</sup> power sharing (26 May 2004)<sup>187</sup> and the special problems of Abyei (26 May 2004)<sup>188</sup> and the Southern Kordofan, Nuba Mountains and Blue Nile (26 May 2004),<sup>189</sup> followed in June 2004 by an “agreement on agreements”, confirming the previous protocols and committing the parties to continue.<sup>190</sup> However impressive this sequence may appear, it must be added that IGAD had (by December 2004 at least) done nothing to address the humanitarian crisis in the Darfur region, leaving this to the AU.<sup>191</sup>

As for Somalia, various mediation efforts have been undertaken by IGAD, mostly intended to somehow create unity among the rivalling clans and factions around the Transitional National Government (TNG) which was “elected” by the Arta conference in Djibouti in 2000, attended by two thousand delegates.<sup>192</sup> This so-called “Eldoret process” began with a gathering of Somali political leaders in October 2002 in Kenyan town Eldoret, under the auspices of IGAD. On the 7<sup>th</sup> of October the Eldoret Declaration on “Cessation of Hostilities and the Structure and Principles of the Somali National Reconciliation Process” was adopted.<sup>193</sup> Besides a cease-fire

(which was almost immediately violated) it entailed agreement on the basics of a new federal constitution entailing considerable devolution of power to inclusive and representative local and regional political structures; and an invitation to the international community to monitor the process. Subsequently, the signatories reconstituted themselves as a “Leaders’ Committee”. One of the problems was, however, that the follow-up conference in Eldoret became chaotic, both because of disagreement between the Leaders’ Committee and the “Somali Advisory Group” which had also been appointed, and because of the huge turn-up for the conference.

In 2003, the process was continued, now under the leadership of the new IGAD envoy, Kenyan Ambassador Bethuel Kiplagat, and relocated to Mbagathi outside Nairobi. By then, however, what had begun as a promising process had, according to the International Crisis Group, evolved toward “an unimaginative ‘cake-cutting’ exercise in power-sharing by an un-elected and only partially representative political elite that threatens to repeat the history of earlier failed initiatives”.<sup>194</sup> Regional rivalry between, on the one side, Ethiopia, sponsoring the Somali Reconciliation and Reconstruction Council (SRRC) and, on the other side, Djibouti and various Arab countries, supporting the TNG, did not help at all. By the summer of 2004, however, a parliament had been appointed (rather than elected) which had selected the former warlord and leader of the semi-autonomous Puntland region, Abdullahi Yusuf Ahmed president of Somalia.<sup>195</sup> Whether he will ever move the site of his “government” from Kenya to Somalia was by the time of writing still unclear.

Because of the lack of resources within the subregion, the IGAD countries depend on external support, for which purpose an “IGAD Partners Forum” has been established on the basis of the previous “Friends of IGAD”.<sup>196</sup> Besides this potential weakness, the main obstacle to a strong organisation in the Horn of Africa, for which the need is so obvious, is the rather intense hostility between several members (e.g. Ethiopia-Somalia, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Sudan-Uganda) and the absence of any obvious leader. Even though Ethiopia might seem the obvious candidate for this role, its legitimacy would be questioned by too many of the other members for it to be able to command consent.

#### **4.4 OTHER SUBREGIONAL ORGANISATIONS**

Besides SADC, ECOWAS and IGAD a number of other subregional organisations in Africa have either stated ambitions to play a role with regard to conflicts or actual activities in this domain, including COMESA and ECCAS.

#### 4.4 | COMESA

The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa, COMESA (not to be confused with COMESSA, i.e. the Community of the Sahel and Saharan States, also known as CEN-SAD)<sup>197</sup> was founded in 1993 as a successor to a Preferential Trade Area for Eastern and Southern Africa (PTA), and formally came into being the following year. The members include the Great Lakes countries Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda, countries of the Horn such as Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya and Sudan, the present, former or future SADC members Angola, the DRC, Malawi, Madagascar, Mauritius, Namibia, the Seychelles, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe—but significantly neither South Africa nor Botswana or Lesotho (which are members of SACU, *vide supra*)—and two otherwise unattached countries, Egypt and the Comoros.<sup>198</sup>

The main objective of the organisation is to create a customs union as a first step towards regional economic integration,<sup>199</sup> but COMESA also has ambitions to play a role in conflict and security matters, inter alia to “to cooperate in the promotion of peace, security and stability among the Member States in order to enhance economic development in the region,” as it was stated in the COMESA Treaty (art. 3d), which also committed the members to “foster and maintain an atmosphere that is conducive to peace and security through co-operation and consultations on issues pertaining to peace and security of the Member States with a view to preventing, better managing and resolving inter-State or intra-State conflicts” (art. 163).<sup>200</sup>

In its programmatic document, *Vision and Strategy*, the link between economic and conflicts was spelled out in terms reminiscent of those used about the European Union in the 1950s.

COMESA recognises that without peace and security, there can not be meaningful development. But we also know that most of the military conflicts in the region have economic roots, i.e. access to, and sharing of economic resources. COMESA's approach to the issues of wars is three-fold: first, it will concentrate on creating an environment that enables trade and investment to take place, and one that creates more opportunities for interaction, co-operation and integration. This will in turn not only provide opportunities for economic growth, but will also create a greater awareness oneness [*sic*], thus diminishing incidences of conflict.<sup>201</sup>

After a meeting of COMESA's Intergovernmental Committee in November 1999 in Lusaka, the Secretariat commissioned a study on how to involve COMESA more directly in efforts to secure peace and rebuild war-torn economies in the subregion (if so it is). In March 2000, a decision was taken to develop a legal framework on peace and security and on a three-tiered structure composed of heads of state and government, ministers of foreign affairs; and a Committee on

Peace and Security.<sup>202</sup> A meeting of this Peace and Security Committee was planned for the 2-3 June 2004 in preparation of the summit scheduled for 9 June, but the results have not been made public. Instead, the Summit communiqué urged Member States (*sic!*) to set up a mechanism for sharing information for the maintenance of peace, security and stability in the region, which made very little sense indeed, as this is surely a task for the organisation as such.

At a meeting of the COMESA Foreign Ministers in Lusaka in April 2001 it was agreed to prioritise the control of the proliferation of small and light weapons, the campaign against landmines, and the control of arms sales, and at a subsequent meeting in May 2002, agreement was reached on tasking national parliaments to promote “a culture of peace and security”, e.g. by strengthening the accountability of governments in these matters. However significant this may all sound, very little has actually been implemented.

#### 4.4.2 ECCAS

The Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) was established in 1983 on the basis of two smaller economic organisations, UDEAC (*Union Douanière et Économique de l'Afrique Centrale*) and GEPGL (*Communauté Économique des Pays des Grand Lacs*) plus Sao Tomé and Príncipe. The members are Angola (which had merely observer status until 1999), Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Republic of Congo, the DRC, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Rwanda and Sao Tomé and Príncipe.<sup>203</sup>

According to its founding treaty ECCAS was mainly intended to create a customs union, but the organisation was (on paper) given a rather elaborate organisational structure, the main bodies being a Conference of Heads of State and Government, a Council of Ministers, a Court of Justice, a General Secretariat and a Consultative Commission, in addition to which the establishment of a number of technical committees was envisioned (art. 7).<sup>204</sup> However, ECCAS was almost completely dormant until 1999, when efforts were undertaken to resuscitate the organisation, e.g. with the addition of a parliamentarians forum in 2002. In February 2000 it adopted a “Mutual Assistance Pact,”<sup>205</sup> apparently inspired by NATO and formally committing member states to come to each other’s assistance in the case of aggression from non-members (articles 2 and 3) and to prepare for this through joint military manoeuvres (art. 5.2). Decisions to activate these steps should preferably be taken by consensus, but might also be taken with a two-thirds majority (art. 7). The 2000 meeting also adopted a protocol on the establishment of a “Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa” (COPAX), which underlined sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs as the guiding principles (art. 3), but which also mentioned the need for, e.g., CBMs and common approaches to such problems as refugees and internally displaced persons as well as transnational crime and arms trafficking (art. 4).<sup>206</sup> Out of this have

sprung decisions (in June 2002) to establish a “Defence and Security Commission” (DSC), a Central African Multinational Force (FOMAC) and an early warning mechanism (MARAC), standing orders for all of which have been adopted.

- The DSC is described (in art. 1) as an advisory organ consisting of (representatives of) the chiefs or staff and police chiefs plus experts from the ministries of the interior, defence and foreign affairs and other ministries, when appropriate.<sup>207</sup>
- FOMAC is described as consisting of “interservice, police, gendarmerie contingents and of civilian modules” (art. 1) with the size of up to three brigades with appropriate naval and air support (art. 5)—but with a light brigade of 1600 troops as the immediate objective—and to undertake missions such as observation and cease-fire monitoring, preventing deployment, peacekeeping, enforcement of sanction and even humanitarian intervention (art. 2), both on behalf of ECCAS, the OAU/AU) and the UN (art. 8).<sup>208</sup>
- MARAC is supposed to be responsible for data collection and analysis about impending crises and conflicts (art. 1), to be gathered by national bureaus and collated in a central data base.<sup>209</sup>

This rather elaborate organisational structure notwithstanding, it remains to be seen whether anything tangible will come out of these decisions. By the time of writing there was nothing to indicate this.

#### 4.4.3 Miscellaneous

Besides COMESA and ECCAS with possible prospects of playing a role, the African continent is also host to several other organisations with stated ambitions of playing a role in the field of peace and security, but with very dubious prospects of actually doing so.

- The Arab Maghreb Union (AMU) was founded in 1989 and comprises Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Libya and Mauritania, but significantly not Egypt.<sup>210</sup> Even though its founding treaty<sup>211</sup> mentions the objective of “contributing to the preservation of the peace based on justice and equity” (art. 2), the AMU has not really made any contribution to this—in fact the organisation has been almost moribund since its creation. A decision was taken in 1999 to relaunch the AMU,<sup>212</sup> but not much has come out of this. The main reason for this is probably the never-ending dispute between Algeria and Morocco over Western Sahara (Sahrawi). An indication of the problems of AMU was the postponement *sine die* of the summit scheduled for December 2003, both because of this rivalry and due to a Mauritanian-Libyan dispute, the former accusing the latter of supporting an attempted coup.<sup>213</sup> It also did not help forge a sense of unity within the organisation that Libya

decided to withdraw from the Arab League.<sup>214</sup> The only factor which may warrant some cautious optimism about the future of the AMU is thus the apparent wish of the European Union (and to a lesser degree NATO) to create some unity, manifested *inter alia* in the Euro-Mediterranean dialogue process.<sup>215</sup>

- The East African Community, EAC, comprises Uganda, Tanzania and Kenya. In 1998, it adopted a Memorandum of Understanding on defence matters, but this has yet to show any practical significance.<sup>216</sup>
- The Non-Aggression and Defence Agreement (ANAD) was established in 1977 and comprises Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Togo. However, it remained dormant until 1996, when a decision was taken to reinvigorate it. In 1999 decisions were taken to set up a peace force and an intervention fund, but no steps seem to have been taken to implement this decision.<sup>217</sup>
- The Entente Council includes Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Niger and Togo, but does not seem to play any significant role.<sup>218</sup>
- The Mano River Union (MRU) comprises Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea, but throughout the 1990s it was completely inactive because of the intense conflict involving the two former. In 2000, however, attempts were made to revitalise it, e.g. with a decision to set up a joint security commission,<sup>219</sup> yet without much actual progress being achieved.<sup>220</sup> At a meeting of the foreign ministers in August 2001 it was decided to convene a summit to decide on CBMs and the like,<sup>221</sup> and an agreement has been reached on joint border controls and confidence-building units<sup>222</sup> as well as on a ten-year action plan for, *inter alia*, demobilisation of child soldiers and repatriation of refugees.<sup>223</sup> However, the only recorded step towards implementation has been a deployment of Guinean troops along the border with Liberia as well as some plans for the creation of safe corridors for refugee repatriation.<sup>224</sup>

#### 4.5 ASSESSMENT: VARIABLE GEOMETRY OR CONFUSION?

There are thus a number of subregional organisations in Africa which might, at least in principle, serve as instances of first resort for the prevention, management or resolution of conflicts on the continent. Moreover, there seem to be a willingness to streamline the relations between these various subregional (or even smaller) organisations and the AU. This allows for a degree of optimism, as what we see emerging may prove to be a fruitful form of “variable geometry” rather than a “quilt” that might provide numerous loopholes and allow for buck-passing—like what we saw in Europe in the handling of, for instance, the Yugoslav succession wars, where it was not clear whether this was the responsibility of the UN, NATO, the EU or the OSCE.<sup>225</sup>



Variable geometry might hold some attractions if it were to facilitate, for instance, the use by the AU of Arab troops provided by members of the AMU to peacekeeping forces in the Sudan (e.g. in Darfur) to serve alongside non-Arab troops provided by IGAD member states, so as to inspire confidence with both the local rebel movements (SLA and JEM) and the government in Khartoum. However, when the available resources are scarce and there are few benefits to be gained from becoming involved in conflicts such as that in Darfur, overlapping memberships of subregional organisations may also make it all too tempting for everybody to avoid engagement by claiming that the responsibility belongs somewhere else. Moreover, if the envisaged subregional brigades envisaged by the AU are ever to become a reality, they will have to be based on well-defined subregional organisations with fixed memberships, as it would surely be a recipe for confusion to have, for instance, Tanzanian troops “double-hatted” to serve both in an East African and a Southern African brigade.

## 5. Conclusion: Obstacles and Opportunities

It seems that the main problems with African regionalism in the field of security stem from a combined lack of resources and commitment. Not only do member states of regional and subregional organisations lack the political, economic and not least military means to contribute to the organisation, e.g. for peacekeeping operations; they also tend to succumb to the same temptations to free-ride as do states elsewhere in the world.

### 5.1 MAKING THE BEST OF HEGEMONY

It also seems that those subregional organisations which function best, i.e. ECOWAS and SADC do so thanks to the commitment of their dominant powers, i.e. Nigeria and South Africa, respectively—whereas the lack of strong subregional hegemons in the Great Lakes Region and the Horn of Africa may go some way towards explaining that the absence of strong organisations. If this holds true, quite a strong case can be made in favour of subregional hegemony. Several variants of the general hegemonic stability theory have been suggested, which may prove relevant for the analysis of Africa.

- What one might call “subaltern hegemony” is based on what has been called “sub-hegemons” or even “sub-imperialists”. During the Cold War, the two superpowers (and especially the United States under the “Nixon Doctrine”) supported regional and subregional great powers, e.g. with generous arms supplies in the understanding that they would uphold “order” (as defined by the superpower) in their respective subregions.<sup>226</sup> This would surely have very little attraction to any African states today.
- Shared hegemony by two great powers has been labelled “bigemony”. Even though the term was originally applied to the United States and Japan for Asia,<sup>227</sup> it might also be applicable to a shared hegemony of Nigeria and South Africa on the African continent. Not only do both play a certain hegemonic role in their respective subregions, but they also seem increasingly inclined to collaborate with each other, e.g. within the African Union, in providing both leadership and resources.
- “Cooperative hegemony” might be defined as a grand strategy and a type of regional order based on “soft rule within and through co-operative arrangements”. This would supposedly be an appealing strategy to major powers exhibiting deficiencies in one or several respects, e.g. by “only” excelling in “soft power” as is arguably the case of the European Union in Europe.<sup>228</sup> However, it is not obvious which African state might fill this role, but the two “bigemons” could certainly emphasize soft over hard power.

Unfortunately, however, both soft and hard power preponderance tends to provoke resentment, as is obviously the case of both Nigeria and South Africa. As some South Africans have convincingly argued, their country has literally “bent over backwards” to allay their neighbours’ concerns, but to no avail. While this may well be frustrating there seems to be no alternative for the hegemons to continue taking deliberate steps to promote confidence among weaker neighbours in their own benevolence and concern for the common good, as opposed to their own national interests. This will require for the hegemons to strictly abide by the rules determined (mainly by themselves) for the entire group of countries, i.e. not succumbing to the temptations of (U.S.-style) “exceptionalism”; to systematically prefer multilateral action to unilateralism, even though the latter remains an option; and preferring non-military to military solutions to problems, whilst not shying away from the latter if necessary. Both Nigeria and South Africa seem at present to be aware of the pitfalls of preponderance and to do their utmost in the above respects. If they continue along this road, their shared leadership within the AU and their respective subregions bodes well for the future of peace and security in the continent.

## 5.2 WITH A LITTLE HELP FROM OUR FRIENDS: WESTERN SUPPORT?

One of the main problems, both for the would-be hegemon and smaller African states, is the mismatch between needs and capabilities. On the one hand, the number of violent conflicts in need of conflict prevention or management initiatives, including military peace support operations, is very high. On the other hand, the military capacities available for such operations remains inadequate.<sup>229</sup> Fortunately, some assistance is likely to be available from the prosperous West.

The United States has thus created the African Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI), which has subsequently been renamed ACOTA (African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance), providing training to military staff from a selected number of African states.<sup>230</sup> France has launched RECAMP (*Renforcement des capacités Africaines de maintien de la paix*),<sup>231</sup> and the UK has on several occasions dispatched British Military Advisory and Training Teams (BMATTs), which have now been subsumed under a larger “Global Conflict Prevention Pool”.<sup>232</sup> Besides the great powers, a number of smaller states of the West (including the author’s home country, Denmark)<sup>233</sup> have also provided some support, as has the European Union, most recently at the EU-Africa Ministerial Troika Meeting, Dublin, 1 April 2004<sup>234</sup> Perhaps even more importantly, at its meeting on Sea Island, 10 June 2004, the G8 launched a “G8 Action Plan: Expanding Global Capability for Peace Support Operations”,<sup>235</sup> entailing a commitment to “train and, where appropriate, equip a total of approximately 75,000 troops worldwide by 2010”, a good part of which will surely be Africans. All this is a poor substitute for the actual involvement to which these countries are both legally and morally obliged, but it is probably better than nothing.

## 6. Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops: *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (chapter 2: The Human Community), para 1885, at [www.usccb.org/catechism/text/pt3sect1chpt2.htm#7](http://www.usccb.org/catechism/text/pt3sect1chpt2.htm#7). On subsidiarity in general see Carozza, Paolo G.: “Subsidiarity as a Structural Principle of International Human Rights Law”, *The American Journal of International Law*, vol. 97, no. 38 (2003), pp. 38-79; Newcombe, Hanna: “Subsidiarity”, in idem (ed.): *Hopes and Fears. The Human Future* (Toronto: Science for Peace, 1992), pp. 92-96; Wilke, Marc & Helen Wallace: “Subsidiarity: Approaches to Power-sharing in the European Community”, *RILA Discussion Papers*, no. 27 (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1990); Schilling, Theodor: “Subsidiarity as a Rule and a Principle, or: Taking Subsidiarity Seriously”, *Working Paper*, no. 10/95 (New York University School of Law, Jean Monnet Center, 1995).

<sup>2</sup> “Provisional Consolidated Version of the Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe” (CIG 86/04). The formulation is “Under the principle of subsidiarity, in areas which do not fall within its exclusive competence the Union shall act only if and insofar as the objectives of the intended action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States, either at central level or at regional and local level, but can rather, by reason of the scale or effects of

the proposed action, be better achieved at Union level” (Title III: Union Competences, Art. I.9: Fundamental Principles, para 3).

<sup>3</sup> On regional organisations and the UN see Weiss, Thomas G., David P. Forsythe & Rogert A. Coate: *The United Nations and Changing World Politics* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994), pp. 33-36; Alagappa, Muthiah: “Introduction”, in idem & Takashi Inoguchi (eds.): *International Security Management and the United Nations* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 1999), pp. 269-294

<sup>4</sup> Murphy, John F.: “Force and Arms”, in Oscar Schachter & Christopher C. Joyner (eds.): *United Nations Legal Order*, vols. 1-2 (Cambridge: Grotius Publications, 1995), vol. 1, pp. 247-318, especially p. 261. On alliances in general see Walt, Stephen M.: *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press); Snyder, Glenn: *Alliance Politics* (Ithaca, NJ: Cornell University Press, 1997).

<sup>5</sup> O’Brien, David: “The Search for Subsidiarity: The UN, African Regional Organizations and Humanitarian Action”, *International Peacekeeping*, vol. 7, no. 3 (Autumn 2000), pp. 57-83; Vogt, Margaret A.: “Regional Arrangements, the United Nations, and Security in Africa”, in Alagappa & Inoguchi (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 3), pp. 295-322.

<sup>6</sup> Figures from UNHCR: *Statistical Yearbook 2001: Refugees, Asylum-seekers and other Persons of Concern. Trends in Displacement, Protection and Solutions* (Geneva: UNHCR, 2002). See also Bariagaber, Assefaw: “States, International Organisations and the Refugee: Reflexions on the Complexity of Managing the Refugee Crisis in the Horn of Africa”, *Journal of Modern African Studies*, vol. 37, no. 4 (1999), pp. 597-619.

<sup>7</sup> Kornprobst, Markus: “The Management of Border Disputes in African Regional Subsystems: Comparing West Africa and the Horn of Africa”, *Journal of Modern African Studies*, vol. 40, no. 3 (2002), pp. 369-393.

<sup>8</sup> On Africa’s marginalisation see Shaw, Timothy M.: “Africa in the Global Political Economy: Globalization, Regionalization, or Marginalization?”, in Björn Hettne, András Inotai & Osvaldo Sunkel (eds.): *The New Regionalism and the Future of Security and Development* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 2000), pp. 93-120; Wright, Stephen: “Africa and Global Society: Marginality, Conditionality and Conjuncture”, in Sola Akinrinade & Amadu Sesay (eds.): *Africa in the Post-Cold War International System* (London: Pinter, 1998), pp. 133-146

<sup>9</sup> Figures from SIPRI “World and Regional Military Expenditure Estimates 1994 –2003”, at [http://web.sipri.org/contents/milap/milex/mex\\_wnr\\_table.html](http://web.sipri.org/contents/milap/milex/mex_wnr_table.html).

<sup>10</sup> “Regional Distribution, Number and Types of Major Armed Conflicts, 1990-2003”, at [http://web.sipri.org/contents/conflict/MAC\\_patterns.html](http://web.sipri.org/contents/conflict/MAC_patterns.html).

<sup>11</sup> Bull, Hedley: *The Anarchical Society. A Study of Order in World Politics*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995), p. 71.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 68 and 71.

<sup>13</sup> Keohane, Robert O.: “The Demand for International Regimes”, *International Organization*, vol. 36, no. 2 (Spring 1982), pp. 325-355, quote from p. 325. See also Krasner, Stephen D. (ed.): *International Regimes* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press 1982); Müller, Harald: *Die Chance der Kooperation. Regime in den internationalen Beziehungen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993); Rittberger, Volker (ed.): *Regime Theory and International Relations* (Oxford: Clarendon Paperbacks, 1995); Hasenclever, Andreas, Peter Mayer & Volker Rittberger: *Theories of International Regimes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Stein, Arthur: “Coordination and Collaboration: Regimes in an Anarchic World”, in David Baldwin (ed.): *Neorealism and Neoliberalism. The Contemporary Debate* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), pp. 29-59.

<sup>14</sup> Kratochwil, Friedrich & John Gerard Ruggie: “International Organization: The State of the Art”, in Paul F. Diehl (ed.): *The Politics of Global Governance. International Organizations in an Interdependent World* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1997), pp. 29-40; Jacobson, Harold K., William M. Reisinger & Todd Mathers: “National Entanglements in International Governmental Organizations”, *ibid.*, pp. 57-71; Gallarotti, Giulio M.: “The Limits of International Organization: Systematic Failure in the Management of International Relations”, *ibid.*, pp. 375-414; Barnett, Michael & Martha Finnemore: “The Politics, Power and Pathologies of International Organizations,” *International Organization*, vol. 53, no. 4 (Autumn 1999), pp. 699-732; Gruber, Lloyd: *Ruling the World: Power Politics and the Rise of Supranational Institutions* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000).

<sup>15</sup> See, for instance, Mearsheimer, John J.: “The False Promise of International Institutions”, *International Security*, vol. 19, no. 3 (Winter 1994/95), pp. 5-49; Grieco, Joseph M.: “Understanding the Problem of International Cooperation: The Limits of Neoliberal Institutionalism and the Future of Realist Theory”, in Baldwin (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 13), pp. 301-338, idem: “Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism”, in Charles W. Kegley (ed.): *Controversies in International Relations: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), pp. 151-171.

<sup>16</sup> Keohane, Robert O.: “Neoliberal Institutionalism: A Perspective on World Politics”, in idem (ed.): *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1989), pp. 1-20; idem: “Institutional Theory and the Realist Challenge after the Cold War”, in Baldwin (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 13), pp. 269-300;

idem & Lisa L. Martin: "The Promise of Institutional Theory", *International Security*, vol. 20, no. 1 (Summer 1995), pp. 39-51; Martin, Lisa L. & Beth A. Simmons: "Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions", in Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane & Stephen D. Krasner (eds.): *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999), pp. 89-117; Kratochwill, Friedrich & John Gerard Ruggie: "International Organization: a State of the Art or an Art of the State?", *International Organization*, vol. 40, no. 4 (1986), pp. 753-775; Ruggie, John Gerard: "Multilateralism: the Anatomy of an Institution", in idem (ed.): *Multilateralism Matters. The Theory and Practice of an Institutional Form* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), pp. 3-47.

<sup>17</sup> On the EU see Marks, Hooghe, Liesbet Hooghe & Kermit Blank: "European Integration from the 1980s: State-Centric v. Multilevel Governance," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 34, no 3 (September 1996), pp. 341-378; Moravcsik, Andrew: "Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach," in S. Bulmer and A. Scott (eds.) *Economic and Political Integration in Europe: Internal Dynamics and Global Context* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), pp. 29-80; Rosecrance, Richard: "The European Union: A New Type of International Actor," in Jan Zielonka (ed.) *Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1998), pp. 15-25. On regional integration see Haas, Ernst B.: *International Political Communities* (New York: Anchor Books, 1966); Nye, Joseph S.: *Peace in Parts: Integration and Conflict in Regional Organization* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1971); Russett, Bruce: *International Regions and the International System* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967); Hodges, Michael (ed.): *European Integration. Selected Readings* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972). More recent studies include Taylor, Paul: *International Organization in the Modern World. The Regional and the Global Process* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1993); Lawrence, Robert Z.: *Regionalism, Multilateralism, and Deeper Integration* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1996); Keating, Michael & John Loughlin (eds.): *The Political Economy of Regionalism* (Newbury Park: Frank Cass, 1997); Coleman, William D. & Geoffrey R. D. Underhill (eds.): *Regionalism and Global Economic Integration* (London: Routledge, 1998); Kahler, Miles: *International Institutions and the Political Economy of Integration* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1995).

<sup>18</sup> Keohane, Robert O. & Joseph S. Nye: *Power and Interdependence. World Politics in Transition* (Boston, MA: Little Brown, 1977); idem & idem: "Power and Interdependence in the Information Age", *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 77, no. 5 (Sept-Oct. 1998), pp. 81-94; Wilde, Jaap de: *Saved from Oblivion: Interdependence Theory in the First Half of the 20th Century. A Study on the Causality Between War and Complex Interdependence* (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1991); Haas, Ernst B.: "War, Interdependence and Functionalism", in Raimo Väyrynen (ed.): *The Quest for Peace. Transcending Collective Violence and War Among Societies, Cultures and States* (London: Sage, 1987), pp. 108-127; Copeland, Dale C.: "Economic Interdependence and War. A Theory of Trade Expectations", *International Security*, vol. 20, no. 4 (Spring 1996), pp. 5-41; Barbieri, Katherine: "Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict", *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 33, no. 1 (February 1996), pp. 29-49.

<sup>19</sup> The classical work is Deutsch, Karl W. et al.: *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area. International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957). For a constructivist revision of the theory see Adler, Emmanuel & Michael Barnett: "Security Communities in Theoretical Perspective", in idem & idem (eds.): *Security Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 3-28; idem & idem: "A Framework for the Study of Security Communities", *ibid.*, pp. 29-65. On the EU as a security community see Wæver, Ole: "Insecurity, Security and Asecurity in the West European Non-War Community", *ibid.*, pp. 69-118; idem: "Integration as Security: Constructing a Europe at Peace", in Charles Kupchan (ed.): *Atlantic Security: Contending Visions* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1998), pp. 45-63.

<sup>20</sup> Lapid, Yosef & Friedrich Kratochwill (eds.): *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1995). See also Wendt, Alexander: *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

<sup>21</sup> According to constructivism, international organisations may come to form "epistemic communities", based on shared understandings of the world and "how things are done". See the special issue of *International Organization*, edited by Peter M. Haas, on "Knowledge, Power, and International Policy Coordination" (vol. 46, no. 1, Winter 1992). See also Ruggie, John Gerard: *Constructing the World Polity. Essays on International Institutionalism* (London: Routledge, 1998), *passim*; Weber, Steven: "Institutions and Change", in Michael W. Doyle & G. John Ikenberry (eds.): *New Thinking in International Relations* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1997), pp. 229-265; Bøås, Morten & Desmond McNeill: *Multilateral Institutions. A Critical Introduction* (London: Pluto, 2003).

<sup>22</sup> Gramsci, Antonio: *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), pp. 323-377. See also Salamini, Leonardo: *The Sociology of Political Praxis. An Introduction to Gramsci's Theory* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), pp. 17, 79-80, 126-153.

<sup>23</sup> Cox, Robert: "The Way Ahead: Toward a New Ontology of World Order", in Richard Wyn Jones (ed.): *Critical Theory and World Politics* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2001), pp. 45-60, quote from p. 56. See also idem: "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory", in Robert O. Keohane (ed.): *Neorealism and Its Critics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), pp. 204-254; idem: *Production, Power, and World Order*.

- Social Forces in the Making of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987), *passim*; idem (with Timothy J. Sinclair): *Approaches to World Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 124-143 & *passim*.
- <sup>24</sup> Kindleberger, Charles P.: "Dominance and Leadership in the International Economy. Exploitation, Public Goods, and Free Rides", *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 2 (June 1981), pp. 242-254; Gilpin, Robert: *The Political Economy of International Relations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 72-92; idem: *Global Political Economy. Understanding the International Economic Order* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), pp. 93-100; Russett, Bruce: "The Mysterious Case of Vanishing Hegemony; or, Is Mark Twain Really Dead?", *International Organization*, vol. 39, no. 2 (Spring 1985), p. 207-231; Strange, Susan: "The Persistent Myth of Lost Hegemony", *ibid.*, vol. 41, no. 4 (Autumn 1987), pp. 551-574.
- <sup>25</sup> Nye, Joseph S. Jr.: "The Changing Nature of World Power", *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 105, no. 2 (Summer 1990), pp. 177-192; Keohane, Robert: "The Theory of Hegemonic Stability and Changes in International Regimes, 1967-1977", excerpted in C. Roe Goddard, John T. Passé-Smith & John G. Conklin (eds.): *International Political Economy. State-Market Relations in the Changing Global Order* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1996); idem: *After Hegemony* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), *passim*; Lake, David A.: "British and American Hegemony Compared: Lessons for the Current Era of Decline", in Jeffrey A. Frieden & idem (eds.): *International Political Economy. Perspectives on Global Power and Wealth*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (London: Routledge, 1995), pp. 120-133; Knutsen, Torbjørn L.: *The Rise and Fall of World Orders* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), pp. 41-72.
- <sup>26</sup> Gramsci: *op. cit.* (note 22), p. 350.
- <sup>27</sup> Olson, Mancur: *The Logic of Collective Action* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965); Riker, William H.: *The Theory of Political Coalitions* (New Haven, NJ: Yale University Press, 1962).
- <sup>28</sup> On the concept of public goods see, for instance, Kaul, Inge, Isabelle Grunberg & Marc A. Stein: "Defining Global Public Goods", in idem, idem & idem (eds.): *Global Public Goods. International Cooperation in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 2-19; Desai, Maghnad: "Public Goods: A Historical Perspective", in Inge Kaul, Pedro Conceicao, Katell le Goulven & Ronald U. Mendoza (eds.): *Providing Public Goods. Managing Globalization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 63-77.
- <sup>29</sup> Eichengreen, Barry: "Hegemonic Stability Theories of the International Monetary System", in Frieden & Lake (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 25), pp. 230-254. On the Bretton-Woods system see Eckes, Alfred E. Jr.: *A Search for Solvency: Bretton Woods and the International Monetary System, 1941-1971* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975). On its successors see Keohane, Robert O.: "The Theory of Hegemonic Stability and Changes in International Economic Regimes, 1967-1977", in C. Roe Goddard, John T. Passé-Smith & John G. Conklin (eds.): *International Political Economy. State-Market Relations in the Changing Global Order* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1996), pp. 89-108.
- <sup>30</sup> Adebajo, Adekeye & Landsberg, Christopher.: "South Africa and Nigeria as Regional Hegemons", in Mwesiga Baregu & Christopher Landsberg (eds.): *From Cape to Congo. Southern Africa's Evolving Security Challenges* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2003), pp. 171-204; Legum, Colin: "Balance of Power in Southern Africa", in York Bradshaw & Stephen N. Ndegwa (eds.): *The Uncertain Promise of Southern Africa* (Bloomington, IA: Indiana University Press, 2000), pp. 12-23.
- <sup>31</sup> Hasenclever & al.: *op. cit.* (note 13), pp. 86-104; Zartman, I. William: "Negotiating the Rapids: The Dynamics of Regime Formation", in Bertram I. Spector & idem (eds.): *Getting It Done. Post-Regime Negotiation and International Regimes* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2003), pp. 13-50.
- <sup>32</sup> Recent studies include Fawcett, Louise & Andrew Hurrell (eds.): *Regionalism in World Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), *passim*; Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver & Jaap de Wilde: *The New Security Studies: A Framework for Analysis* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998), pp. 9-20, 42-45 & *passim*; Buzan, Barry & Ole Wæver: *Regions and Powers. The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Lake, David A. & Patrick M. Morgan (eds.): *Regional Orders. Building Security in a New World* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997); Wriggins, Howard (ed.): *Dynamics of Regional Politics. Four Systems on the Indian Ocean Rim* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992); Daase, Christopher, Susanne Feske, Bernhard Moltmann & Claudia Schmid (eds.): *Regionalisierung der Sicherheitspolitik. Tendenzen in den internationalen Beziehungen nach dem Ost-West-Konflikt* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1993); Tow, William T.: *Subregional Security Cooperation in the Third World* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990); Adler & Barnett (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 19); Keating, Michael & John Loughlin (eds.): *The Political Economy of Regionalism* (London: Frank Cass, 1997); Hettne, Inotai & Sunkel (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 8), *passim*.
- <sup>33</sup> Calleya, Stephen C.: *Navigating Regional Dynamics in the Post-Cold War World. Patterns of Relations in the Mediterranean Area* (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1996). On the Middle East and Persian Gulf regions see Møller, Bjørn: "Introduction: Regional Security from Conflict Formation to Security Community", in idem (ed.): *Oil and Water. Cooperative Security in the Persian Gulf* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2001), pp. 1-54. On regionalism in Asia see idem: "Introduction: Defence Restructuring in Asia", in idem (ed.): *Security, Arms Control and Defence Restructuring in East Asia* (Aldershot: Ashgate,

1998), pp. 1-38. On the Nordic (sub)region see idem: "The Nordic Model of Regionalism", in Stephen C. Calleya (ed.): *Regionalism in the Post-Cold War World* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), pp. 45-70.

<sup>34</sup> Boulding, Elise: "States, Boundaries and Environmental Security", in Dennis J.D. Sandole & Hugo van der Merwe (eds.): *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice. Integration and Application* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), pp. 194-208. On water basins see, for instance, Wolf, Aaron T., Shira B. Yoffe & Mark Giordano: "International Waters: Identifying Basins at Risk", *Water Policy*, vol. 5, no. 1 (2003), pp. 29-60; Kerstin Stahl & Maria F. Macomber: "Conflict and Cooperation within International River Basins: The Importance of Institutional Capacity", *Water Resources Update*, vol. 125 ([www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/publications/Wolf\\_2003.pdf](http://www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/publications/Wolf_2003.pdf)); and Giordano, Meredith A. & idem: "Sharing Waters: Post-Rio International Water Management", *Natural Resources Forum*, no. 27 (2003) ([www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/publications/narf\\_051\\_Giordano.pdf](http://www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/publications/narf_051_Giordano.pdf)), pp. 163-171. See also the chapter on the Nile Basin in Elhance, Arun P.: *Hydropolitics in the 3<sup>rd</sup> World. Conflict and Cooperation in International River Basins* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1999), pp. 53-84; and the website of the Nile Basin Initiative: [www.nilebasin.org/](http://www.nilebasin.org/).

<sup>35</sup> Homer-Dixon, Thomas F.: "Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict. Evidence from Cases", *International Security*, vol. 19, no. 1 (Summer 1994), pp. 5-40; idem: "Environmental Scarcity and Intergroup Conflict", in Michael T. Klare & Yogesh Chandrani (eds.): *World Security. Challenges for a New Century*. 3rd ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), pp. 342-365; Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment and Security: *Water: Facts, Trends, Threats, and Solutions* at [www.pacinst.org/pacific\\_institute\\_water\\_factsheet.pdf](http://www.pacinst.org/pacific_institute_water_factsheet.pdf); Gleick, P.H., A. Singh & H. Shi: *Threats to the World's Freshwater Resources* (Oakland, CA: Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security, 2001), at [www.pacinst.org/reports/freshwater\\_threats.htm](http://www.pacinst.org/reports/freshwater_threats.htm). A list of conflicts over water is Gleick, Peter: *Water Conflict Chronology*, at [www.worldwater.org/conflict.htm](http://www.worldwater.org/conflict.htm).

<sup>36</sup> Huntington, Samuel: *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), pp. 26-27 *et passim*. The nine civilizations are the Western, Latin American, African, Islamic, Sinic, Hindu, Orthodox, Buddhist and Japanese. An earlier version of the "cultural approach" was Wallerstein, Immanuel: *Geopolitics and Geoculture. Essays on the Changing World-System* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 139-237.

<sup>37</sup> Neumann, Iver B.: "Self and Other in International Relations", *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 2, no. 2 (June 1996), pp. 139-175. See also Lapid, Yosef & Friedrich Kratochwill (eds.): *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1995).

<sup>38</sup> Anderson, Benedict: *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991); Adler, Emanuel: "Imagined (Security) Communities: Cognitive Regions in International Relations", *Millennium*, vol. 26, no. 2 (1997), pp. 249-278; idem & Barnett (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 19), *passim*.

<sup>39</sup> See, for instance, Bach, Daniel C.: "Regionalism versus Regional Integration: The Emergence of a New Paradigm in Africa", in Jean Grugel & Will Hout (eds.): *Regionalism across the North-South Divide. State Strategies and Globalization* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 152-166. See also ECA (Economic Commission for Africa): *Assessing Regional Integration in Africa. ECA Policy Research Report* (Addis Ababa: ECA, 2004).

<sup>40</sup> Buzan, Barry: *People, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1991), pp. 186-229 (quotation from p. 190). The delimitation of security complexes is illustrated by the map on p. 210.

<sup>41</sup> Wæver, Ole: "Securitization and Desecuritization", in Ronnie D. Lipschutz (ed.): *On Security* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), pp. 46-86; Buzan, Wæver & de Wilde: *op. cit.* (note 32), pp. 15-19 *et passim*; Buzan & Wæver: *op. cit.* (note 32), *passim*.

<sup>42</sup> See Commission on Human Security: *Human Security Now* (New York: Commission on Human Security, 2003); Thomas, Caroline & Peter Wilkin (eds.): *Globalization, Human Security, and the African Experience* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1999); Zacarias, Agostinho: *Security and the State in Southern Africa* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1999), pp. 139-160.

<sup>43</sup> *Africa at a Glance. Facts and Figures 2001/2* (Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 2002), p. 7.

<sup>44</sup> The Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic, also known as West Sahara was recognised by most other African states and therefore granted representation in both the OAU and the AU. However, as Morocco lays claim to the territory, it neither recognises Sarawi nor accepts other states to do so, which explains why Morocco has neither joined the OAU nor the AU.

<sup>45</sup> OAU, Council of Ministers, 26th ordinary session in Addis Ababa (23 February-1 March 1976): Resolution CM/Res.464 (XXVI) at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/oau/com/7CoM\\_1976a.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/com/7CoM_1976a.pdf). The communication from the following session (24 June-3 July 1976) made no mention of the issue.

<sup>46</sup> ISS: "Profile: African Union", at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/regions.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/regions.pdf).

<sup>47</sup> Buzan & Wæver: *op. cit.* (note 32), pp. 230-231.

<sup>48</sup> Based on *CIA World Factbook 2003*, Appendix B.

<sup>49</sup> On the Greater Middle East see, for instance, Dietl, Gulshan: "Iran in the Emerging Greater Middle East", in Møller (ed.): *Oil and Water* (*op. cit.*, note 34), pp. 55-93.

<sup>50</sup> See Barnett, Michael N.: *Dialogues in Arab Politics: Negotiations in Regional Order* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998); Tibi, Basam: "From Pan-Arabism to the Community of Sovereign Arab States: Redefining the Arab and Arabism in the Aftermath of the Second Gulf War", in Michael C. Hudson (ed.): *Middle East Dilemma. The Politics and Economics of Arab Integration* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), pp. 92-106.

<sup>51</sup> See, for instance, Achah, William B.: *Pan-Africanism: Exploring the Contradictions. Politics, Identity and Development in Africa and the African Diaspora* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999); Prah, Kwesi Kwaa: "The Wish to Unite: The Historical and Political Context of the Pan-African Movement", in Mammo Muchie (ed.): *The Making of the Africa-Nation. Pan-Africanism and the African Renaissance* (London: Adonis & Abbey, 2003), pp. 13-39; Clapham, Christopher: *Africa and the International System. The Politics of State Survival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 106-133; Nadubere, Dani Wadada: "African Unity in Historical Perspective", in Eddy Maloka (ed.): *A United States of Africa* (Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 2001), pp. 9-28; Ndi-Zambo, Benoit: "African Unity: Looking Back, Looking Forward, and a Recipe for Failure", *ibid.*, pp. 29-40; Duffield, Ian: "Pan-Africanism since 1940", in A.D. Roberts (ed.): *The Cambridge History of Africa*, vol 7: *From 1905 to 1940* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 95-141.

<sup>52</sup> One manifestation of this is the eight-volume *General History of Africa*, published by UNESCO. On the back flap of the first volume the intention is expressed to "shed light (...) on the historical unity of Africa". See Ki-Zerbo, J. (ed.): *General History of Africa. Abridged ed., vol. I: Methodology and African Prehistory* (Nairobi: Heineman Kenya, 1990). See also the chapters on African historiography *ibid.* pp. 10-28.

<sup>53</sup> Young, Crawford: "The Heritage of Colonialism", in John W. Harbeson & Donald Rothchild (eds.): *Africa in World Politics. The African State System in Flux*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview, 2000), pp. 23-42.

<sup>54</sup> The website of the Rastafarian movement, for instance, begins with the following "Greetings in the Name of His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie: King of Kings, Lord of Lords, Conquering Lion of the Tribe of Judah". See [www.rastafari.org/](http://www.rastafari.org/). For an outline of rastafarian "theology" see another website by the movement at [www.swagga.com/rasta.htm](http://www.swagga.com/rasta.htm). See also Mack, Douglas R.A.: *From Babylon to Rastafari: Origin and History of the Rastafarian Movement* (Frontline Publications, 1999); Yawney, Carole: "Exodus: Rastafari, Repatriation, and the African Renaissance", in Maloka (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 51), pp. 133-185; Homiak, John P.: "Never Trade a Continent for an Island: Rastafari Diasporic Practice, Globalisation, and the African Renaissance", *ibid.*, pp. 234-244.

<sup>55</sup> Muchie, Mammo: "Re-framing Pan-Africanism", in idem (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 51), pp. 40-59; idem: "Civil Society and Pan-Africanism", *ibid.*, pp. 69-81.

<sup>56</sup> Mbeki, Thobo: *Africa. The Time Has Come* (Cape Town: Mafube, 1998); Makgoba, Magegapuru William (ed.): *African Renaissance* (Cape Town: Mafube, 1999); Maloka, Eddy & Elizabeth La Roux (eds.): *Problematising the African Renaissance* (Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 2000).

<sup>57</sup> Quoted in Schraeder, Peter J.: *African Politics and Society. A Mosaic in Transformation* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000), p. 127.

<sup>58</sup> Nkrumah, Kwame: *Africa Must Unite* (London: Heinemann, 1963); Nyerere, Julius: *Africa Must Unite* (Nairobi: Oxford University Press, 1969).

<sup>59</sup> "Charter of African Unity", in *Africa's Development Thinking since Independence* (Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 2002), pp. 19-29.

<sup>60</sup> On the Westphalian system see Watson, Adam: *The Evolution of International Society* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 182-213; Krasner, Stephen D.: "Westphalia and All That", in Judith Goldstein & Robert O. Keohane (eds.): *Ideas and Foreign Policy. Beliefs, Institutional, and Political Change* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), pp. 235-264.

<sup>61</sup> Anderson, Malcolm: *Frontiers. Territory and State Formation in the Modern World* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996), pp. 78-87. See also Pakenham, Thomas: *The Scramble for Africa* (London: Abacus, 1991); Förster, Stig, Wolfgang J. Mommsen & Ronald Robinson (eds.): *Bismarck, Europa, and Africa. The Berlin Africa Conference 1884-1885 and the Onset of Partition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); Herbst, Jeffrey: *States and Power in Africa. Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 58-80, 103-106. On the legal aspects of the division see Korman, Sharon: *The Right of Conquest. The Acquisition of Territory by Force in International Law and Practice* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 41-44, 65-66, 118.

<sup>62</sup> On African democratisation see Bratton, Michael & Nicholas van de Walle: *Democratic Experiments in Africa. Regime Transitions in Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Conteh-Morgan, Earl: *Democratization in Africa. The Theory and Dynamics of Political Transitions* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997); Joseph, Richard (ed.): *State, Conflict and Democracy in Africa* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1999); Villalón, Leonardo & Phillip Huxtable



(eds.): *The African State at a Critical Juncture* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998); Thomson, Alex: *An Introduction to African Politics* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 215-241; Schraeder: *op. cit.* (note 57), pp. 267-290; Hyden, Goran & Denis Venter (eds.): *Constitution-Making and Democratisation in Africa* (Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 2001); Akinrade, Sola: "The Re-democratization Process in Africa: *plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose?*", in idem & Sesay (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 8), pp.73-94; Kieh, George Klay, Jr.: "Democratization in Africa: a Balance Sheet", in John Mukum Mbaku (ed.): *Preparing Africa for the Twenty-First Century. Strategies for Peaceful Coexistence and Sustainable Development* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 99-118; Harbeson, John W.: "Externally Assisted Democratization: Theoretical Issues and African Realities", in idem & Rothchild (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 53), pp. 235-259; Bratton, Michael: "International versus Domestic Pressures for Democratisation in Africa", in William Hale & Eberhard Kienle (eds.): *After the Cold War. Security and Democracy in Africa and Asia* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1997), pp. 156-193; Cheru, Fantu: "New Social Movements: Democratic Struggles and Human Rights in Africa", in James H. Mittelman (ed.): *Globalization. Critical Reflections* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1996), pp. 145-164; Fattou, Robert Jr.: "Africa in the Age of Democratization: The Civic Limitations of Civil Society", *African Studies Review*, vol. 38, no. 2 (September 1995), pp. 67-99; Knack, Stephen: "Does Foreign Aid Promote Democracy?", *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 48 (2004), pp. 251-266.

<sup>63</sup> "African Charter on Human and People's Rights", in *Africa's Development Thinking* (*op. cit.*, note 59), pp. 137-150. See also Welch, Claude E. Jr.: "The OAU and Human Rights: Regional Promotion of Human Rights", in Yassin El-Ayouty (ed.): *The Organization of African Unity After Thirty Years* (Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 1994), pp. 53-76; Odinkalu, Chidi Anselm: "Back to the Future: The Imperative of Prioritizing for the Protection of Human Rights in Africa", *Journal of African Law*, vol. 47, no. 1 (2003), pp. 1-37; Enonchongh, Nelson: "The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights: Effective Remedies in Domestic Law", *ibid.*, vol. 46, no. 2 (2002), pp. 197-215.

<sup>64</sup> "Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights on the Establishment of an African Court on Human and Peoples' Right", at [www.dfa.gov.za/for-relations/multilateral/treaties/court.htm](http://www.dfa.gov.za/for-relations/multilateral/treaties/court.htm).

<sup>65</sup> "Human Rights: African Court", *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 41, no. 1 (January 2004), pp. 15589-90). See also Eno, Robert: "The Place of the African Commission in the New African Dispensation", *African Security Review*, vol. 11, no. 2 (2002), pp. 63-74.

<sup>66</sup> "Treaty Establishing the African Economic Community", in *Africa's Development Thinking* (*op. cit.*, note 59), pp. 337-382.

<sup>67</sup> On the links between trade and peace see Mansfield, Edward D.: *Power, Trade and War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994); Barbieri, Katherine & Gerald Schneider: "Globalization and Peace: Assessing New Directions in the Study of Trade and Conflict", *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 36, no. 4 (July 1999), pp. 387-404; Morrow, James D.: "How Could Trade Affect Conflict?", *ibid.*, pp. 481-489; O'Neal, John R. & Bruce Russett: "Assessing the Liberal Peace with Alternative Specifications: Trade Still Reduces Conflict", *ibid.*, pp. 423-442. On interdependence see note 19 above. On democracy as a hedge against intrastate conflict see Newman, Saul: *Ethnoregional Conflict in Democracies. Mostly Ballots. Rarely Bullets* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996); Gowa, Joanne: *Ballots and Bullets. The Elusive Democratic Peace* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999). On the much more dubious theory that democracy prevents international wars see Gleditsch, Nils Petter: "Democracy and Peace", *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 29, no. 4 (November 1992), pp. 369-376; Russett, Bruce: *Grasping the Democratic Peace. Principles for a Post-Cold War World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993); Elman, Miriam Fendius: *Paths to Peace. Is Democracy the Answer?* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997); MacMillan, John: *On Liberal Peace. Democracy, War and the International Order* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1998); Brown, Michael E., Sean Lynn-Jones & Steven E. Miller (eds.): *Debating the Democratic Peace* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1996); Gowa, Joanne: *Ballots and Bullets. The Elusive Democratic Peace* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999); Gaubatz, Kurt Taylor: *Elections and War. The Electoral Incentive in the Democratic Politics of War and Peace* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999); Ray, James Lee: *Democracy and International Conflict. An Evaluation of the Democratic Peace Proposition* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995); Weart, Spencer R.: *Never at War: Why Democracies Will Not Fight One Another* (New Haven, NJ: Yale University Press, 1998).

<sup>68</sup> Salim, Salim Ahmed: "The OAU Role in Conflict Management", in Olara A. Otunnu & Michael W. Doyle (eds.): *Peacemaking and Peacekeeping for the New Century* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998), pp. 233-244; Gomes, Solomon: "The OAU, State Sovereignty, and Regional Security", in Edmond J. Keller & Donald Rothchild (eds.): *Africa in the New World Order* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1996), pp. 37-51.

<sup>69</sup> Kufuour, Kofi Oteng: "The OAU Convention for the Elimination of Mercenarism and Civil Conflicts", in Abdel-Fatau Musah & J. Kayode Fayemi (eds.): *Mercenaries. An African Security Dilemma* (London: Pluto Press, 2000), pp. 198-209. The central conventions are reprinted *ibid.*, pp. 275-288. On the actual use of mercenaries in African conflicts see Appendix I: "Mercenaries: Africa's Experience 1950-1990", *ibid.*, pp.265-274; and O'Brien, Kevin A.: "Private Military Companies and African Security 1990-1998", *ibid.*, pp. 43-75. On Angola and Sierra Leone see Shearer,

David: "Private Armies and Military Intervention", *Adelphi Papers*, no. 316 (1998), pp. 46-53; Cleary, Sean: "Angola—A Case Study of Private Military Involvement", in Jakkie Cilliers & Peggy Mason (eds.): *Peace, Profit or Plunder? The Privatisation of Security in War-Torn Societies* (Halfway House: Institute for Security Studies, 1999), pp. 141-174; Douglas, Ian: "Fighting for Diamonds—Private Military Companies in Sierra Leone", *ibid.*, pp. 175-200; Reno, William: *Warlord Politics and African States* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998), pp. 61-67 and 113-146; Spicer, Tim: *An Unorthodox Soldier. Peace and War and the Sandline Affair* (Edinburg: Mainstream Publishing, 1999), pp. 189-202.

<sup>70</sup> The text is available at [www.dfa.gov.za/for-relations/multilateral/treaties/anwfs.htm](http://www.dfa.gov.za/for-relations/multilateral/treaties/anwfs.htm); and in "The African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (The Treaty of Pelindaba)", *Security Dialogue*, vol. 27, no. 2 (June 1996), pp. 233-240. See also Adeniji, Olu: "The Pelindaba Text and Its Provisions", *Disarmament*, vol. 19, no. 1 (1996), pp. 1-12; Selassie, Tilahun: "The African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone and Sustainable Development on the Continent", *ibid.*, pp. 39-52; Ogunbanwo, Sola: "History of the Efforts to Establish an African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone", *ibid.*, pp. 13-20; idem: "The Treaty of Pelindaba: Africa is Nuclear-Weapon-Free", *Security Dialogue*, vol. 27, no. 2 (June 1996), pp. 185-200; Oyebo, Adebayo: "African Security and Nuclear Weapons", in idem & Abiodun Alao (eds.): *Africa after the Cold War* (Trenton: Africa World Press, 1998), pp. 91-115.

<sup>71</sup> Rabert, Bernhard: "South Africa's Defused Nuclear Weapons—Trend Reversal in the Third World?", *Aussenpolitik. English Edition*, vol. 46, no. 1 (First Quarter 1995), pp. 71-81; Reiss, Mitchell: *Bridled Ambitions. Why Countries Constrain Their Nuclear Capabilities* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1995), pp. 7-44; Fig, David: "Apartheid's Nuclear Arsenal: Deviation from Development", in Jacklyn Cock & Penny Mckenzie (eds.): *From Defence to Development. Redirecting Military Resources in South Africa* (Cape Town: David Philip, 1998), pp. 163-180; Fischer, David: "Reversing Nuclear Proliferation: South Africa", *Security Dialogue*, vol. 24, no. 3 (1993), pp. 273-286; Howlett, Darryl & John Simpson: "Nuclearisation and Denuclearisation in South Africa", *Survival*, vol. 35, no. 3 (Autumn 1993), pp. 154-173; Muller, Marie: "South Africa Crisscrosses the Nuclear Threshold", in William Gutteridge (ed.): *South Africa's Defence and Security into the 21st Century* (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1996), pp. 29-48; Liberman, Peter: "The Rise and Fall of the South African Bomb", *International Security*, vol. 26, no. 2 (Fall 2001), pp. 45-86; Purkitt, Helen E., Stephen Burgess & idem: "Correspondence: South Africa's Nuclear Decisions", *ibid.*, vol. 27, no. 1 (Summer 2002), pp. 186-194.

<sup>72</sup> Olonisakin, Funni: "Conventional Arms Control in post-Cold War sub-Saharan Africa: Problems and Prospects", *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, vol. 21, no. 1 (June 1999), pp. 1-20.

<sup>73</sup> [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/oau/keydocs/Bamako\\_Declaration.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/keydocs/Bamako_Declaration.pdf).

<sup>74</sup> [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/oau/treaties/Algiers\\_convention.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/treaties/Algiers_convention.pdf).

<sup>75</sup> Cairo Declaration on the Establishment of a Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, 1993, at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/oau/hog/3HoGAssembly1993.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/hog/3HoGAssembly1993.pdf); "The OAU Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution and Conflict Situations in Africa" (Addis Ababa: OAU, no year); Berman, Eric G. & Katie E. Sams: *Peacekeeping in Africa: Capabilities and Culpabilities* (Geneva: UNIDIR/Pretoria: ISS, 2000), pp. 61-68.

<sup>76</sup> Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 47-56; Massey, Simon & Roy May: "Chad", in Oliver Furley & Roy May (eds.): *Peacekeeping in Africa* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), pp. 105-141.

<sup>77</sup> Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 58-61; Tekle, Amare: "The OAU: Conflict Prevention, Management, and Reslution", in [Howard Adelman & Astri Suhrke \(eds.\): \*The Path of a Genocide. The Rwanda Crisis from Uganda to Zaire\* \(New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2000\)](#), pp. 111-130; Adelman, Howard, Astri Suhrke & al.: "Early Warning and Conflict Management", Study 2 in *The International Response to Conflict and Genocide: Lessons from the Rwanda Experience. Synthesis Report* (Copenhagen: Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda, 1996), pp. 21-28. See also the OAU's report, *Rwanda The Preventable Genocide*, written by an "international panel of eminent personalities", which is available at [www.visiontv.ca/RememberRwanda/Report.pdf](http://www.visiontv.ca/RememberRwanda/Report.pdf).

<sup>78</sup> Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 68-72; Aboagye, Festus: "Towards New Peacekeeping Partnerships in Africa? The OAU Liaison Mission in Ethiopia-Eritrea", *African Security Review*, vol. 10, no. 2 (2001), pp. 19-33. On the links of these with UN missions see Mulikita, Njunga-Michael: "The United Nations Security Council and the Organisation of African Unity: Conflict or Collaboration", *African Security Review*, vol. 11, no. 1 (2002), pp. 27-39.

<sup>79</sup> "Organization of African Unity: Algiers Summit", *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 36, no. 7 (July 1999), pp. 13606-7.

<sup>80</sup> For an overview see ISS: "Profile: African Union (AU)", at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/oau/OAUProfile.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/OAUProfile.pdf). See also Mwanasali, Musifky: "From the Organisation of African Unity to the African Union", in Baregu & Landsberg (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 30), pp. 205-224.

<sup>81</sup> "Organisation of African Unity: Gadaffy Seeks United Africa", *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 36, no. 9 (September 1999), pp. 13677-8. On Libya's role see also Ronen, Yehudit: "Libya's Diplomatic

Success in Africa: The Reemergence of Qadhafi on the International Stage”, *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, vol. 13, no. 4 (December 2002), pp. 60-74; Sturman, Kathryn: “The Rise of Libya as a Regional Player”, *African Security Review*, vol. 12, no. 2 (2003), pp. 109-112; Huliaras, Aseris: “Qadhafi’s Comeback: Libya and Sub-Saharan Africa in the 1990s”, *African Affairs*, no. 100 (2001), pp. 5-25; Tiekou, Thomas Kwasi: “Explaining the Clash and Accommodation of Interests of Major Actors in the Creation of the African Union”, *ibid.*, no. 103 (2004), pp. 249-267.

<sup>82</sup> “The African Union: Ministers Adopt Draft Union Charter”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 37, no. 6 (June 2000), p. 13999-14000.

<sup>83</sup> “Constitutive Act of the African Union”, in *Africa’s Development Thinking (op. cit., note 59)*, pp. 415-427; and at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/oau/treaties/Constit\\_Act\\_of\\_AU\\_2000.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/treaties/Constit_Act_of_AU_2000.pdf). See also “Organisation of African Unity: Lomé Summit”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 37, no. 7 (July 2000), p. 14034; Cilliers, Jakkie: “Commentary: Towards the African Union”, *African Security Review*, vol. 10, no. 2 (2001) pp. 105-108;

<sup>84</sup> “African Union/OAU: Decisive Step” *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 38, no. 2 (February 2001), p. 14289.

<sup>85</sup> Melber, Henning: “The New African Initiative and the African Union. A Preliminary Assessment and Documentation,” *Current African Issues*, no. 25 (Uppsala: Nordiske Afrikainstitutet, 2001).

<sup>86</sup> “Organization of African Unity: African Union Is Born,” *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 38, no. 7 (July 2001), p. 14471-74.

<sup>87</sup> “African Heads of State: Dakar Summit on Anti-Terrorism” *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 38, no. 10 (October 2001), p. 14581-82. Washington’s approval was, for instance, obvious in the State Department’s *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, 2002), pp. 5 and 169.

<sup>88</sup> “African Union (AU): Action Plan against Terrorism”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 39, no. 9 (September 2002), p. 14994-5.

<sup>89</sup> “In Brief: AU”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 39, no. 10 (October 2002), p. 15030.

<sup>90</sup> Sturman, Kathryn: “The AU Plan on Terrorism. Joining a Global War or Leading an African Battle”, *African Security Review*, vol. 11, no. 4 (2002), pp. 103-108.

<sup>91</sup> Cilliers, Jakkie: “From Acronyms to Action. The Seminal Assembly of the African Union”, *African Security Review*, vol. 11, no. 1 (2002), pp. 97-100; idem: “Peace, Security and Democracy in Africa? A Summary of Outcomes from the 2002 OAU/AU Summits in Durban”, *ISS Paper*, no. 60 (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2002); Schoeman, Maxi: “Imagining a Community—The African Union as an Emerging Security Community”, *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, vol. 24, no. 1 (June 2002), pp. 1-26.

<sup>92</sup> “Lomé Declaration on Unconstitutional Changes of Government” (2000) at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/oau/hog/10HoGAssembly2000.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/hog/10HoGAssembly2000.pdf).

<sup>93</sup> “African Union: First Ever Summit”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 39, no. 7 (July 2002), pp. 14922-25 (quote on p. 14922).

<sup>94</sup> See note 84 above. See also Maluwa, Tiyanjana: “The Constitutive Act of the African Union and Institution-Building in Post-Colonial Africa”, *Leiden Journal of International Law*, vol. 16 (2003), pp. 157-170.

<sup>95</sup> Cilliers, Jakkie & Kathryn Sturman: “The Rights Intervention. Enforcement Challenges for the African Union”, *African Security Review*, vol. 11, no. 3 (2002), pp. 29-39; Baimu, Evarist & Kathryn Sturman: “Amendment to the African Union’s Right to Intervene. A Shift from Human Security to Regime Security?”, *ibid.*, vol. 12, no. 2 (2003), pp. 37-45.

<sup>96</sup> Sturman, Kathryn & Jakkie Cilliers: “ECOSOCC. Bringing People’s Power to the African Union?”, *African Security Review*, vol. 12, no. 1 (2003), pp. 71-80.

<sup>97</sup> Based on the organograms of ISS at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/oau/figstructure1.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/figstructure1.pdf), [figstructureec.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/figstructureec.pdf) and [figchair.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/figchair.pdf).

<sup>98</sup> “African Union: Contiental Parliament Inaugurated”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 41, no. 3 (March 2004), pp. 15666.

<sup>99</sup> Assembly of the African Union, First Ordinary Session: “Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union” (9 July 2002) at [www.au2002.gov.za/docs/summit\\_council/secprot.htm](http://www.au2002.gov.za/docs/summit_council/secprot.htm). See also “African Union (AU): A Giant Step Towards Unity”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 40, no. 2 (February 2003), p. 15183.

<sup>100</sup> The “Mechanism” has been formally incorporated into the AU. See “Decision on the Implementation Of The Sirte Summit Decision on The African Union”, art. 8A, at [www.au2002.gov.za/docs/key\\_oau/sirte\\_au.pdf](http://www.au2002.gov.za/docs/key_oau/sirte_au.pdf).

<sup>101</sup> The structure of the PSC is illustrated in [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/oau/figstructure.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/figstructure.pdf).

<sup>102</sup> Nathan, Laurie: "Mediation and AU's Panel of the Wise", in Shannon Field (ed.): *Peace in Africa. Towards a Collaborative Security Regime* (Johannesburg: Institute for Global Dialogue, 2004), pp. 63-80.

<sup>103</sup> For a list of countries which had by that time ratified the protocol see [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/PSCratif.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/PSCratif.pdf).

<sup>104</sup> Kent, Vanessa & Mark Malan: "The African Standby Force. Progress and Prospects", *African Security Review*, vol. 12, no. 3 (2003), pp. 71-81; Malan, Mark: "New Tools in the Box?: Towards a Stand-by Force for the AU", in Field (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 102), pp. 193-224; Kibasomba, Roger M-B.: "Financing a Credible Stand-by Force via the AU's Peace Fund", *ibid.*, pp. 225-250; Motuni, Tsepe: "Logistical and Capacity Considerations Surrounding a Stand-by Force", *ibid.*, pp. 251-264.

<sup>105</sup> See "Meeting of Experts on a Common African Defence and Security Policy, March 2003: Report" ([www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/cadsApr03.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/cadsApr03.pdf)); "Africa Standby Force (ASF): Concept Paper" ([www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/ASFConceptApr03.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/ASFConceptApr03.pdf)); and "Africa Standby Force (ASF): Annexe to Concept Paper" ([www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/ASFAnnexApr03.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/ASFAnnexApr03.pdf)).

<sup>106</sup> See "Policy Framework for the Establishment of the African Standby Force and the Military Staff Committee", at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/ASFPolicy1May03.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/ASFPolicy1May03.pdf). The annexes to the framework are available at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/ASFPolicy2May03.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/ASFPolicy2May03.pdf).

<sup>107</sup> See "Draft Framework for a Common African Defence and Security Policy" at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/cadspjan04frm.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/cadspjan04frm.pdf); "Solemn Declaration on a Common African Defence and Security Policy", at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/assembly/sirtefeb04/cadsdecl.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/assembly/sirtefeb04/cadsdecl.pdf).

<sup>108</sup> See Western European Union, Council of Ministers: *Petersberg Declaration* (19 June 1002), at [www.weu.int/documents/920619naen.pdf](http://www.weu.int/documents/920619naen.pdf), Chapter II, art. 5.

<sup>109</sup> Boshoff, Henri & Dara Francis: "The AU Mission in Burundi. Technical and Operational Dimensions", *African Security Review*, vol. 12, no. 3 (2003), pp. 41-44. On ONUB see [www.un.org/Depts/dpko/missions/onub/](http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/missions/onub/).

<sup>110</sup> "Sudan: African Union to Send Protection Force to Sudan", *IRIN News*, 6 July 2004; "Sudan: AU Warns over Continuing Crisis in Darfur", *ibid.*, 9 July 2004; On the crisis see See ICG: "Darfur Rising: Sudan's New Crisis", *ICG Africa Reports*, no. 76 (Brussels: ICG, March 2004); Human Rights Watch: "Sudan: Massive Atrocities in Darfur", *Human Rights News*, 2 April 2004, at <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2004/04/02/sudan8389.htm>; idem: "Sudan: Darfur in Flames: Atrocities in Western Sudan", *Human Rights Watch*, vol. 16, no. 5A (April 2004), at <http://hrw.org/reports/2004/sudan0404/sudan0404.pdf>.

<sup>111</sup> See also Nieuwkerk, Anthoni van: "The Role of AU and NEPAD in Africa's New Security Regime", in Field (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 102), pp. 41-62.

<sup>112</sup> South African Department of Foreign Affairs: "Background on the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)", at [www.au2002.gov.za/docs/background/nepad.htm](http://www.au2002.gov.za/docs/background/nepad.htm).

<sup>113</sup> UN General Assembly High Level Plenary Meeting on NEPAD, 16 September 2002: "United Nations Declaration on the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)", at [www.dfa.gov.za/docs/unnepad.htm](http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/unnepad.htm). See also United Nations Economic Commission for Africa: "The African Peer Review Mechanism", *African Security Review*, vol. 11, no. 4 (2002), pp. 7-13.

<sup>114</sup> 38th Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU: "African Peer Review Mechanism" (8 July, 2002), at [www.au2002.gov.za/docs/summit\\_council/aprm.htm](http://www.au2002.gov.za/docs/summit_council/aprm.htm). On subsequent developments see the "Guidelines for Countries to Prepare for and Participate in the APRM" passed in November 2003 [[www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/nepad/aprmguide.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/nepad/aprmguide.pdf)]; the "Memorandum of Understanding on the APRM, March 2003" [[www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/nepad/aprmmou.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/nepad/aprmmou.pdf)]; and the "Objectives, Standards, Criteria and Indicators for the APRM" [[www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/nepad/aprmobject.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/nepad/aprmobject.pdf)]. On the APRM see also Cilliers, Jakkie: "NEPAD's Peer Review Mechanism", *Occasional Paper*, no. 64 (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2002); Cilliers, Jakkie: "Peace and Security through Good Governance. A Guide to the NEPAD African Peer Review Mechanism", *ISS Paper*, no. 70 (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2003); Chabal, Patrick: "The Quest for Good Government and Development in Africa: Is NEPAD the Answer?", *International Affairs*, vol. 78, no. 3 (July 2002), pp. 447-462; Cornwell, Richard: "A New Partnership for Africa's Development?", *African Security Review*, vol. 11, no. 1 (2002), pp. 91-95; Anon.: "NEPAD: Yet another Plan, Initiative and New Partnership?", in Lawrence O.C. Agubuzu & al.: *African Development and Governance Strategies in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Looking Back to Move Forward. Essays in Honour of Adebayo Adedeji at Seventy* (London: Zed Books, 2004), pp. 231-255; Waal, Alex de: "What's New in the 'New Partnership for Africa's Development'?", *International Affairs*, vol. 78, no. 3 (July 2002), pp. 463-476; Hope, Kempe Ronald: "From Crisis to Renewal: Towards a Successful Implementation of the New Partnership for Africa's Development", *African Affairs*, no. 101 (2002), pp.387-402; Taylor, Ian: "Commentary: The New Partnership for Africa's Development and the Zimbabwe Elections: Implications and Prospects for the Future", *African Affairs*, no. 101 (2002), pp. 403-412.

<sup>115</sup> At [www.avmedia.at/cgi-script/csNews/news\\_upload/NEPAD\\_2dCORE\\_2dDOCUMENTS](http://www.avmedia.at/cgi-script/csNews/news_upload/NEPAD_2dCORE_2dDOCUMENTS).

<sup>116</sup> “The New Partnership for Africa’s Development” (October 2001), art. 73-74, at [www.avmedia.at/cgi-script/csNews/news\\_upload/NEPAD\\_2dCORE\\_2dDOCUMENTS](http://www.avmedia.at/cgi-script/csNews/news_upload/NEPAD_2dCORE_2dDOCUMENTS).

<sup>117</sup> For an overview of the process see Deng, Francis M. & I. William Zartman: *A Strategic Vision for Africa. The Kampala Movement* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002). One of the authors of which (Deng) was also a central participant in the process and an appointee of Obasanjo to head the ALF, and is thus not exactly unbiased.

<sup>118</sup> Nathan, Laurie: “Towards a Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Co-Operation in Southern Africa”, *Southern African Perspectives*, no. 13 (Bellville: Centre for Southern African Studies, University of the Western Cape, 1992); Schimmelfennig, Frank: “The CSCE as a Model for the Third World? The Middle East and African Cases”, in Michael R. Lucas (ed.): *The CSCE in the 1990s: Constructing European Security and Cooperation* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1993), pp. 319-334; Ferdowski, Mir A.: “Die KSZE als Modell? Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Anwendung in der Dritten Welt”, *Europa-Archiv*, vol. 47, no. 3 (10.02.92), pp. 76-84; Møller, Bjørn: “NATO, the OSCE and the EU: Role Models for Africa?”, in Field (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 102), pp. 119-162. For an overview of the CSCE and the OSCE see *OSCE Handbook* (Vienna: OSCE, 2000), pp. 6-19. The various documents adopted along the way are all available at [www.osce.org/docs/english/chronos.htm](http://www.osce.org/docs/english/chronos.htm). On the CSCE process see also Lucas *op. cit.*, passim; Bredow, Wilfred von: *Der KSZE-Prozess. Von der Zähmung zur Auflösung des Ost-West-Konflikts* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992); Schlotter, Peter, Norbert Ropers & Berthold Meyer: *Die neue KSZE. Zukunftsperspektiven einer regionalen Friedensstrategie* (Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 1994).

<sup>119</sup> At [www.au2002.gov.za/docs/key\\_oau/cssdca.htm](http://www.au2002.gov.za/docs/key_oau/cssdca.htm).

<sup>120</sup> Deng & Zartman: *op. cit.* (note 117), pp. 117-119. For an elaboration on this idea see also Deng, Francis M., Sadikiel Kimaro, Terrence Lyons, Donald Rothchild & I. William Zartman: *Sovereignty as Responsibility. Conflict Management in Africa* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1996).

<sup>121</sup> “Solemn Declaration on the CSSDCA”, Lomé, July 2000, at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/oau/hog/10HoGAssembly2000.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/oau/hog/10HoGAssembly2000.pdf).

<sup>122</sup> Ministerial Review Meeting on the Calabashes of the CSSDCA: “Memorandum of Understanding on Security, Stability, Development and Cooperation in Africa” at [www.iss.org.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/G1\\_MoU.pdf](http://www.iss.org.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/G1_MoU.pdf).

<sup>123</sup> For an overview of the security debate see Møller, Bjørn: “National, Societal and Human Security—A General Discussion with a Case Study from the Balkans”, in *What Agenda for Human Security in the Twenty-first Century. First International Meeting of Directors of Peace Research and Training Institution. Proceedings* (Paris: UNESCO, 2001), pp. 36-57. See also notes 33 and 41-43 above.

<sup>124</sup> On the general theory of CBMs see Alford, Jonathan: “Confidence-Building Measures in Europe: The Military Aspects”, *Adelphi Papers*, no. 149 (1979), pp. 4-13; Holst, Johan Jørgen: “Confidence and Security Building in Europe. Achievements and Lessons”, *NUPI Paper*, no. 436 (Oslo: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, 1990). See also Borawski, John: *From the Atlantic to the Urals: Negotiating Arms Control at the Stockholm Conference* (Washington, D.C.: Brassey’s, 1988); idem: *Security for a New Europe. The Vienna Negotiations on Confidence and Security-Building Measures 1989-90 and Beyond* (London: Brassey’s, 1992); Freeman, John: *Security and the CSCE Process. The Stockholm Conference and Beyond* (London: Macmillan, 1991); Brauch, Hans Günter (ed.): *Vertrauensbildende Maßnahmen und Europäische Abrüstungskonferenz. Analysen, Dokumente und Vorschläge* (Gerlingen: Bleicher Verlag, 1987); Lutz, Dieter S. & Erwin Müller (eds.): *Vertrauensbildende Maßnahmen. Zur Theorie und Praxis einer sicherheitspolitischen Strategie* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1982); Desjardin, Marie-France: “Rethinking Confidence-Building Measures”, *Adelphi Papers*, no. 397 (1996); Ghébaldi, Victor-Yves: “Confidence-Building Measures within the CSCE Process: Paragraph-by-Paragraph Analysis of the Helsinki and Stockholm Regimes”, *Research Paper*, no. 3 (Geneva: UNIDIR, 1989); idem: “Les négociations de Vienne sur les forces armées conventionnelles et les mesures de confiance”, *Arès*, vol. 12 (1990/91), pp. 32-63; Rittberger, Volker, Manfred Efinger & Martin Mendler: “Toward an East-West Security Regime: The Case of Confidence- and Security-Building Measures”, *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 27, no. 1 (1990), pp. 55-74.

<sup>125</sup> See “Africa moves to launch a Conference on Security, Stability, Development & Co-operation in Africa (CSSDCA)”, at [www.au2002.gov.za/docs/key\\_oau/cssdca.htm](http://www.au2002.gov.za/docs/key_oau/cssdca.htm); and “Decision on the Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Cooperation (CSSDCA)”, at [www.au2002.gov.za/docs/summit\\_council/oaudec1.htm#175](http://www.au2002.gov.za/docs/summit_council/oaudec1.htm#175).

<sup>126</sup> See “Policy Framework for the Establishment of the African Standby Force and the Military Staff Committee”, submitted by African Military Experts to African Chiefs of Defence Staff (Addis Ababa, 12-14 May 2003, Document Exp/ASF-MS/2 (1)). See also note 107.

<sup>127</sup> See, for instance, ECA: *op. cit.* (note 39); Mistry, Percy S.: “Africa’s Record of Regional Co-operation and Integration”, *African Affairs*, no. 99 (2000), pp. 553-573; Kennes, Walter: “African Regional Economic Integration and the European Union”, in Daniel C. Bach (ed.): *Regionalisation in Africa. Integration and Disintegration* (Oxford: James Currey, 1999), pp. 27-40 (with a table of memberships of organisations on p. 40); Ropiva, Marc-Louis: “Failing Institutions and Shattered Space. What Regional Integration in Central Africa?”, *ibid.*, pp. 125-128; Pourtier, Roland: “The Renovation of UDEAC. Sense and Nonsense in Central African Integration”, *ibid.*, pp. 129-138; Lelart, Michel: “The Franc Zone and European Monetary Integration”, *ibid.*, pp. 139-149; Chazan, Naomi, Peter Lewis, Robert A. Mortimer, Donald Rothchild & Stephen John Stedman: *Politics and Society in Contemporary Africa*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1999), Inter-african relations, pp. 361-419; Agubuzu, Lawrence O.C.: “Regional Economic Integration: a Development Paradigm for Africa”, in idem & al.: *African Development and Governance Strategies in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Looking Back to Move Forward. Essays in Honour of Adebayo Adedeji at Seventy* (London: Zed Books, 2004), pp. 191-205.

<sup>128</sup> Söderbaum, Fredrik: “The Role of the Regional Factor in West Africa”, in Hettne & al. (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 8), pp. 121-143; Ojo, Alatunde B.J.: “Integration in ECOWAS”, in Bach (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 127), pp. 119-124; Kaciwicz, Arie M.: *Zones of Peace in the Third World. South America and West Africa in Comparative Perspective* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998), pp. 125-176; ISS: “ECOWAS Profile”, at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/ecowas/2ECOWASProfile.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/ecowas/2ECOWASProfile.pdf).

<sup>129</sup> Kwesi-Aning, Emmanuel: *Security in the West-African Subregion. An Analysis of ECOWAS's Policies in Liberia* (Copenhagen: Institute of Political Studies, University of Copenhagen, 1999); idem: “Towards the New Millennium: ECOWAS’s Evolving Conflict Management System”, *African Security Review*, vol. 9, no.5/6 (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2000), pp. 50-63; Adebajo, Adekeye: *Building Peace in West Africa. Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea-Bissau* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2002), pp. 23-42 & *passim*; Adibe, Clement E.: “Muddling Through: An Analysis of the ECOWAS Experience in Conflict Management in West Africa”, in Liisa Lakso (ed.): *Regional Integration for Conflict Prevention and Peace Building in Africa. Europe, SADC and ECOWAS* (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Political Science, 2000), pp. 103-169; Aboagye, Festus: “The ECOWAS Security Regime and Its Utility for Africa”, in Field (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 102), pp. 163-192; Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 75-149.

<sup>130</sup> [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/ecowas/14ProtNonAggre.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/ecowas/14ProtNonAggre.pdf).

<sup>131</sup> [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/ecowas/13ProtMutualDefAss.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/ecowas/13ProtMutualDefAss.pdf).

<sup>132</sup> Alao, Abiodun, John Mackinlay & ‘Funni Olonisakin: *Peacekeepers, Politicians, and Warlords: The Liberian Peace Process* (Tokyo: UN University Press, 1999); Barclay, Anthony: “Consolidating Peace Through Governance and Regional Cooperation: The Liberian Experience”, in Adebayo Adedeji (ed.): *Comprehending and Mastering African Conflicts. The Search for Sustainable Peace and Good Governance* (London: Zed Books, 1999), pp. 297-316; Aning, Emmanuel Kwesi: “Peacekeeping under ECOMOG: A Sub-regional Approach”, in Jakkie Cilliers & Greg Mills (eds.): *From Peacekeeping to Complex Emergencies. Peace Support Missions in Africa* (Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs and Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 1999), pp. 75-96; Cleaver, Gerry: “Liberia: Lessons for the Future from the Experience of ECOMOG”, in Furley & May (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 76), pp. 223-238; Howe, Herbert: “Lessons of Liberia. ECOMOG and Regional Peacekeeping”, *International Security*, vol. 21, no. 3 (Winter 1996/97), pp. 145-176; Mortimer, Robert A.: “ECOMOG, Liberia, and Regional Security in West Africa”, in Keller & Rothchild (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 68), pp. 149-164; Vogt, Margaret Aderinsola: “The Involvement of ECOWAS in Liberia’s Peacekeeping”, *ibid.*, pp. 165-183; Wippman, David: “Enforcing the Peace: ECOWAS and the Liberian Civil War”, in Lori Fisler Damrosch (ed.): *Enforcing Restraint. Collective Intervention in International Conflicts* (New York: Council of Foreign Relations Press, 1994), pp. 157-204; Jonah, James O.C.: “ECOMOG: A Successful Example of Peacemaking and Peacekeeping by a Regional Organization in the Third World”, in Winrich Kühne (ed.): *Blaubelme in einer Turbulenten Welt. Beiträge internationaler Experten zur Fortentwicklung des Völkerrechts und der Vereinten Nationen* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1993), pp. 303-326; Sesay, Amadu: “West African Military Interventions in the 1990s: The Case of ECOWAS in Liberia and Sierra Leone”, in Louis Du Plessis & Michael Hough (eds.): *Managing African Conflicts: The Challenge of Military Intervention* (Pretoria: HSRC Publishers, 2000), pp. 193-254; Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 83-110; Adibe: *loc.cit.* (note 129), pp. 115-124, 139-146; Adebajo: *op. cit.* (note 129), pp. 43-78.

<sup>133</sup> Mortimer, Robert: “From ECOMOG to ECOMOG II: Intervention in Sierra Leone”, in Harbeson & Rothchild (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 53), pp. 188-207; Sesay: *loc. cit.* (note 132); Malan, Mark: “‘Layered Response’ to an African Conflict. Or Muddling Through in Sierra Leone?”, *African Security Review*, vol. 10, no. 2 (2001), pp. 75-88; Noyes, Fred: “Preventive Diplomacy in Sierra Leone”, in Hussein Solomon (ed.): *Towards Sustainable Peace. Reflections on Preventive Diplomacy in Africa* (Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 2003), pp. 44-101; Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 111-128; Adibe: *loc. cit.* (note 129), pp. 125-133 and 145-153; Adebajo: *op. cit.* (note 129), pp. 79-110.

<sup>134</sup> Dowyaro, E.T.: “ECOMOG Operations in West Africa”, in Mark Malan (ed.): *Boundaries of Peace Support Operations: The African Dimension*, ISS Monograph Series, no. 44 (Pretoria: ISS, February 2000), pp. 122-143;; Ero, Comfort:

“ECOMOG: A Model for Africa”, in Jakkie Cilliers & Annika Hilding-Nordberg (eds.): *Building Stability in Africa: Challenges for the New Millennium*. ISS Monograph Series, no. 46 (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2000), pp. 97-120; Khobe, Mitikishe Maxwell: “The Evolution and Conduct of ECOMOG Operations in West Africa”, in Mark Malan (ed.): *Boundaries of Peace Support Operations: The African Dimension*, ISS Monograph Series, no. 44 (Pretoria: ISS, February 2000), pp. 103-121; Howe, Herbert M.: *Ambiguous Order. Military Forces in African States* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2001), pp. 129-186; Sesay, Max Ahmadu: “Collective Security or Collective Disaster? Regional Peace-keeping in West Africa”, *Security Dialogue*, vol. 26, no. 2 (June 1995), pp. 205-222; Aning, Emmanuel Kwesi: “War to Peace: Dilemmas of Multilateral Intervention in Civil Wars”, *African Security Review*, vol. 9, no. 3 (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2000), pp. 19-33; Ero, Comfort: “The Future of ECOMOG in West Africa”, in Cilliers & Mills (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 132), pp. 55-74.

<sup>135</sup> Adebajo: *op. cit.* (note 129), pp.111-136, quote from p. 112; Adibe: *loc. cit.* (note 129), pp. 133-136, 153-157; Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 128-138.

<sup>136</sup> ISS: “ECOWAS Profile”, at [www.iss.org.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/ecowasprof.htm](http://www.iss.org.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/ecowasprof.htm). On the background see ICG (International Crisis Group): “Liberia: Security Challenges”, *Africa Report*, no. 71 (Brussels: ICG, 3 November 2003); idem: “Côte d'Ivoire: The War Is Not Yet Over”, *ibid.*, no. 72 (Brussels: ICG, 28 November 2003).

<sup>137</sup> See “Executive Secretary's Report 2000”, at [www.sec.ecowas.int/](http://www.sec.ecowas.int/), art. 310-319.

<sup>138</sup> [www.sec.ecowas.int/sitecedeo/english/stat-1.htm](http://www.sec.ecowas.int/sitecedeo/english/stat-1.htm).

<sup>139</sup> The various documents are available at [www.ecowas.int/](http://www.ecowas.int/). See also Adibe: *loc. cit.* (note 129), pp. 110-113.

<sup>140</sup> “In Brief: ECOWAS”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 37, no. 11 (November 2000), p. 14176.

<sup>141</sup> “Protocol Relating to the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, Resolution, Peace-keeping and Security”, at [www.sec.ecowas.int/sitecedeo/english/ap101299.htm](http://www.sec.ecowas.int/sitecedeo/english/ap101299.htm). See also “ECOWAS. Peacekeeping Approved”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 36, no. 12 (December 1999), p. 13786. See also Adibe: *loc. cit.* (note 129), pp. 157-165; Akinrinade, Sola: “Sub-Regional Security Co-operation in West Africa: The ECOWAS Mechanism for Conflict Management in Perspective”, *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, vol. 23, no. 1 (May 2001), pp. 1-21; Adebajo: *op. cit.* (note 129), pp. 137-163; Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 138-145.

<sup>142</sup> “ECOWAS. 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Summit”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 37, no. 5 (May 2000), pp. 13962.

<sup>143</sup> “ECOWAS: Kufuor Urges Crisis Prevention”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 40, no. 4 (April 2003), p. 15259.

<sup>144</sup> “ECOWAS: Peace Fund”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 41, no. 1 (January 2004), p. 15589.

<sup>145</sup> Adibe: *loc. cit.* (note 129), p. 145.

<sup>146</sup> Adebajo: *op. cit.* (note 129), p. 141.

<sup>147</sup> On the “Black Hawk Down” incident in Somalia see Findlay, Trevor: *The Use of Force in Peace Operations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 200-202; Lyons, Terrence & Ahmed I. Samatar: *Somalia. State Collapse, Multilateral Intervention, and Strategies for Political Reconstruction* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1995), p. 59; Hirsch, John L. & Robert B. Oakley: *Somalia and Operation Restore Hope. Reflections on Peacemaking and Peacekeeping* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute for Peace Press, 1995), p. 127; Peterson, Scott: *Me Against My Brother. At War in Somalia, Sudan, and Rwanda* (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 137-155. On the killing of Belgian UNAMIR troops see Melvern, Linda: *A People Betrayed. The Role of the West in Rwanda's Genocide* (London: Zed Books, 2000), pp. 125-127. On the general phenomenon see Luttwak, Edward N.: “Post-Heroic Warfare”, *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 74, no. 3 (May/June 1995), pp. 109-122; idem: “A Post-Heroic Military Policy”, *ibid.*, vol. 75, no. 4 (July-August 1996), pp. 33-44; idem: “The Crisis of Classic Military Power and the Possible Remedy of ‘Post-Heroic’ Intelligence-Based Warfare”, in Ryan Henry & C. Edward Peartree (eds.): *The Information Revolution and International Security* (Washington, DC: CSIS Press, 1998).

<sup>148</sup> Saliu, Hassan A.: “Nigeria and Peace Support Operations: Trends and Policy Implications”, *International Peacekeeping*, vol. 7, no. 3 (Autumn 2000), pp. 105-119.

<sup>149</sup> See, for instance, Hutchful, Ebo: “Peacekeeping under Conditions of Resource Stringency: Ghana's Army in Liberia”, in Cilliers & Mills (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 132), pp. 97-118.

<sup>150</sup> On the Francophonie see Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie: “Charte de la Francophonie”, at [http://agence.francophonie.org/doc/txt-reference/charte\\_franco.pdf](http://agence.francophonie.org/doc/txt-reference/charte_franco.pdf).

<sup>151</sup> Landgren-Bäckström, Signe: *Southern Africa. The Escalation of a Conflict. A Politico-Military Study* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976); Berridge, Geoff R.: “The Superpowers and Southern Africa”, in Roy Allison & Phil Williams (eds.): *Superpower Competition and Crisis Prevention in the Third World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp.

- 206-226; Potter, David: "Superpower Rivalry in South Asia and Southern Africa", in Tony G. McGrew & Paul G. Lewis & al.: *Global Politics. Globalization and the Nation State* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), pp. 45-60; Mills, Greg: *The Wired Model. South Africa, Foreign Policy and Globalisation* (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 2000), pp. 220-253.
- <sup>152</sup> Ngoma, Naison: "SADC: Towards a Security Community?", *African Security Review*, vol. 12, no. 3 (2003), pp. 17-28; Vale, Peter: "Regional Security in Southern Africa", *Alternatives*, vol. 21, no. 3 (July-Sept. 1996), pp. 363-391; Spanger, Hans-Joachim & Peter Vale: "Towards a Security Regime in Southern Africa: Some Working Suggestions", in idem & idem (eds.): *Peace and Security in Southern Africa. Prospect for Peace and Security in Southern Africa* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995), pp. 167-187; Aardt, Maxi Schoeman van: "The Emerging Security Framework in Southern Africa: Regime or Community", *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, vol. 19, no. 1 (May 1997), pp. 1-30; Cilliers, Jakkie: "The Evolving Security Architecture in (Southern) Africa", in William Gutteridge & J.E. Spence (eds.): *Violence in Southern Africa* (London: Frank Cass, 1997), pp. 124-155; Cawthra, Gavin: "Prospects for Common Security in Southern Africa", in idem & Bjørn Møller (eds.): *Defensive Restructuring of the Armed Forces in Southern Africa* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), pp. 145-162; idem: "Subregional Security: The Southern African Development Community", *Security Dialogue*, vol. 28, no. 2 (June 1997), pp. 207-218; Swart, Gerrie & Anton du Plessis: "From Apartheid Destabilisation to a Southern African Security Community", in Hussein Solomon (ed.): *Towards a Common Defence and Security Policy in the Southern African Development Community* (Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 2004), pp. 14-43.
- <sup>153</sup> On the FLS see Moorcraft, Paul L.: *African Nemesis. War and Revolution in Southern Africa 1945-2010* (London: Brassey's, UK, 1994), pp. 163-167; Omari, Abillah H.: "Regional Security: One View from the Front Line States", *The Arusha Papers. A Working Series on Southern African Security*, no. 5 (Belville: Centre for Southern African Studies, University of the Western Cape, 1995); Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 151-154. On the SADCC see Tow: *op. cit.* (note 32), pp. 64-70; Kapungu, Leonard T.: "Southern Africa and the Role of SADCC in Subregional Development", in El-Ayoutu (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 63), pp. 43-52.
- <sup>154</sup> On SACU see McCarthy, Colin: "The Southern African Customs Union in Transition", *African Affairs*, no. 102 (2003), pp. 605-630; idem: "SACU and the Rand Zone", in Bach (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 127), pp. 159-168; Takirambudde, Peter: "The Rival Strategies of SADC and PTA/COMESA in Southern Africa", *ibid.*, pp. 151-158; Sidaway, James & Richard Gibb: "SADC, COMESA, SACU: Contradictory Formats for Regional Integration in Southern Africa?", in David Simon (ed.): *South Africa in Southern Africa. Reconfiguring the Region* (Oxford: James Currey, 1998), pp. 164-184.
- <sup>155</sup> "Declaration and Treaty of SADC", at [www.sadc.int/english/protocols/declaration\\_and\\_treaty\\_of\\_sadc.html](http://www.sadc.int/english/protocols/declaration_and_treaty_of_sadc.html), Preamble.
- <sup>156</sup> "Communique" from the Summit of the Heads of State and Government, meeting in Blantyre, 8 August 1997, at [www.sadc.int/english/archive/communiques/summit97.html](http://www.sadc.int/english/archive/communiques/summit97.html).
- <sup>157</sup> Madagascar was, strictly speaking, merely accorded "candidate membership" for one year. See "2004 SADC Summit Final Communiqué", Mauritius, 16-17 August 2004, art. 43, at [www.iss.org.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/sadc/communiques/HoS%2004.pdf](http://www.iss.org.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/sadc/communiques/HoS%2004.pdf).
- <sup>158</sup> Ropp, Klaus Baron von der: "The Challenge of Change: Comparative Lessons from the Experiences of the EU and SADC", *African Security Review*, vol. 9, no. 2 (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2000), pp. 27-38.
- <sup>159</sup> "Agreement Amending the Treaty of the Southern African Development Community", at [www.sadc.int/english/protocols/agreement\\_amending\\_the\\_treaty\\_of\\_the\\_sadc.html](http://www.sadc.int/english/protocols/agreement_amending_the_treaty_of_the_sadc.html). See also Isaksen, Jan & Elling N. Tjønneland: *Assessing the Restructuring of SADC—Positions, Policies and Progress. A Report Commissioned by the Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation., NORAD* (Bergen, Norway: Christian Michelsen Institute, December 2001).
- <sup>160</sup> See the "Communique" from the Summit of the Heads of State and Government, Gaborone, 28 June 1996, at [www.sadc.int/english/archive/communiques/summit96.html](http://www.sadc.int/english/archive/communiques/summit96.html); and "Protocol on Politics, Defence and Security Co-operation", at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/sadc/1Protocol\\_on\\_Defence\\_Organ.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/sadc/1Protocol_on_Defence_Organ.pdf). See also Cilliers, Jakkie & Mark Malan: "SADC Organ on Politics, Defence and Security: Future Development", *Strategic Analysis*, vol. 20, no. 2 (New Delhi: IDSA, May 1997), pp. 201-222; Osei-Heide, Bertha Z.: "The Quest for Peace and Security: The Southern African Development Community (SADC) Organ on Politics, Defence and Security", in Dominic Milazi, Munyae Mulinge & Elizabeth Mukamaambo (eds.): *Democracy, Human Rights and Regional Co-operation in Southern Africa* (Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 2002), pp. 154-172; Nathan, Laurie: "'Organ Failure': A Review of the SADC Organ on Politics, Defence and Security", in Lakso (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 129), pp. 62-102; Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 163-166.
- <sup>161</sup> Cilliers, Jakkie: "Building Security in Southern Africa. An Update on the Evolving Architecture", *ISS Monograph Series*, no. 43 (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 1999), pp. 37-45. On the SCDSC see Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 160-161, 166-167.



<sup>162</sup> Isaksen & Tjønneland: *op. cit.* (note 159), pp. 15-16. See also the chart at [www.sadc.int/english/about/organogram.html](http://www.sadc.int/english/about/organogram.html).

<sup>163</sup> “Protocol on Politics, Security and Defence Cooperation” (Blantyre, 14 August 2001), at [www.iss.org.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/sadc/1Protocol\\_on\\_Defence\\_Organ.pdf](http://www.iss.org.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/sadc/1Protocol_on_Defence_Organ.pdf). The protocol had apparently not yet been ratified by the time of writing (October 2004). See Isaksen & Tjønneland: *op. cit.* (note 159), pp. 15-16; and SADC: “Status of Protocols”, at [www.sadc.int/index.php?action=a1001&page\\_id=protocols\\_status](http://www.sadc.int/index.php?action=a1001&page_id=protocols_status). See also Williams, Rocklyn: “Ensuring Strategic and Institutional Interoperability: The Organ on Politics, Defence and Security Cooperation”, in Solomon (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 152), p. 197-210.

<sup>164</sup> [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/sadc/3Protocol\\_on\\_Firearms.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/sadc/3Protocol_on_Firearms.pdf). On the general problem see, for instance, Oosthuysen, Glenn: “Shooting the Golden Goose: Small-Arms Proliferation in Southern Africa”, in Robert I. Rotberg & Greg Mills (eds.): *War and Peace in Southern Africa. Crime, Drugs, Armies, and Trade* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1998), pp. 64-88; Cock, Jacklyn: “The Legacy of War: The Proliferation of Lighth Weapons in Southern Africa”, *ibid.*, pp. 89-121; Vines, Alex: “Small Arms Proliferation: a Major Challenge for Post-Apartheid South and Southern Africa”, in Simon (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 154), pp. 36-53.

<sup>165</sup> Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 167-169; de Coning, Cedric: “Towards a Common Southern African Peacekeeping System”, in Solomon (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 152), pp. 140-182.

<sup>166</sup> Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 169-172.

<sup>167</sup> On the SADC mandate see the “Communique” from the summit in Grand Bay, Mauritius, 13-14 September 1998 [[www.sadc.int/english/archive/communiques/summit98.html](http://www.sadc.int/english/archive/communiques/summit98.html)], according to which “the Summit (...) commended the Governments of Angola, Namibia and Zimbabwe for timorously providing troops to assist the Government and people of the DRC defeat the illegal attempt by rebels and their allies to capture the capital city, Kinshasa, and other strategic areas”. On the intervention see Matthee, Heinrich: “Central African Military Interventions in the 1990s: The Case of the DRC”, Du Plessis & Hough (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 132), pp. 253-286; Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 175-184; Turner, Thomas: “Angola’s Role in the Congo War”, in John F. Clark (ed.): *The African Stakes of the Congo War* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 75-92; Rupiya, Martin R.: “A Political and Military Review of Zimbabwe’s Involvement in the Second Congo War”, *ibid.*, pp. 93-105. On the economic motives for the intervention see *Report of the Panel of Experts on Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo* (S/2001/357). See also Shearer, David: “Africa’s Great War”, *Survival*, vol. 41, no. 2 (Summer 1999), pp. 89-106; International Crisis Group: “Scramble for the Congo: Anatomy of an Ugly War”, *ICG Africa Report*, no. 26 (Brussels: ICG, 1999); Seybolt, Taylor B.: “The War in the Democratic Republic of Congo”, *SIPRI Yearbook 2000*, pp. 59-76; Ngoma, Naison: “Hawks, Doves or Penguins. A Critical Review of the SADC Military Intervention in the DRC”, *ISS Paper*, no. 88 (2004).

<sup>168</sup> See the “Communique” from the summit in Maputo, 18 August 1999, which referred to a “SADC military intervention in the form of Botswana and South African forces, in response to a request from the Lesotho government” [[www.sadc.int/english/archive/communiques/summit99.html](http://www.sadc.int/english/archive/communiques/summit99.html)]. See also Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 184-190; Neetling, Theo: “Southern African Military Interventions in the 1990s. The Case of SADC in Lesotho”, in Plessis & Hough (eds.) *op. cit.* (note 132), pp. 287-332; Makoa, F.K.: “Foreign Military Intervention in Lesotho’s Elections Dispute: Whose Project?”, *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, vol. 21, no. 1 (July 1999), pp. 66-87; Matlosa, Khabele & Neville W. Pule: “The Military in Lesotho”, *African Security Review*, vol. 10, no. 2 (2001), pp. 63-74.

<sup>169</sup> “SADC Mutual Defence Pact”, at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/sadc/defpact.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/sadc/defpact.pdf). See also “In Brief: SADC”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 40, no. 9 (September 2003), p. 15443.

<sup>170</sup> On the South African arms industry see Simpson, Graeme: “The Politics and Economics of the Armaments Industry in South Africa”, in Jacklyn Cock & Laurie Nathan (eds.): *War and Society. The Militarisation of South Africa* (Cape Town: David Philip, 1989), pp. 217-231; Batchelor, Peter & Susan Willett: *Disarmament and Defence Industrial Adjustment in South Africa* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); Huck, Burckhardt: “Südafrikanische Republik”, in Veronika Büttner & Joachim Krause (eds.): *Rüstung statt Entwicklung. Sicherheitspolitik, Militärausgaben und Rüstungskontrolle in der Dritten Welt* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1995), pp. 513-553

<sup>171</sup> On the role of South Africa see Schoeman, Maxi: “South Africa as an Emerging Middle Power”, *African Security Review*, vol. 9, no. 3 (2000), pp. 47-58; Mills, Greg: “South Africa’s Foreign Policy: from Isolation to Respectability?”, in Simon (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 154), pp. 72-86; Barber, James: *Mandela’s World. The International Dimension of South Africa’s Political Revolutionj 1990-1999* (Oxford: James Currey, 2004), pp. 182-195; Makoa, Francis K.: “Making Sense of South Africa’s Africa Policy and the South Africa/Africa Leadership Thesis”, *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, vol. 23, no. 1 (May 2001), pp. 43-57; Venter, Denis: “South Africa and Africa: Relations in a Time of Change”, in Walter Carlsnaes & Marie Muller (eds.): *Change and South African External Relations* (Johannesburg: International Thomson Publishing, 1997), pp. 73-101. On the ambivalent attitude towards regional peacekeeping see Heinecken, Lindy: “Regional

Involvement: Attitudes of SANDF Officers towards Future Military Missions”, *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, vol. 21, no. 1 (June 1999), pp. 44-65; Heineken, Lindy: “Preparing for Operations other than War: How Equipped Is the SANDF to Deal with ‘Soft Missions?’”, *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, vol. 24, no. 1 (June 2002), pp. 63-90; Nhlapo, Welile: “South Africa and Peacekeeping: Looking to the Future”, in Cilliers & Mills (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 132), pp. 127-132; Kent, Vanessa & Mark Malan: “Decisions, Decisions. South Africa’s Foray into Regional Peace Operations”, *ISS Paper*, no. 72 (Pretoria: ISS, 2003); Heitman, Helmoed-Römer: “Crisis Response Capability. A Role for South Africa”, *African Security Review*, vol. 11, no. 1 (2002), pp. 61-71.

<sup>172</sup> Figures from the CIA: *World Factbook 2001* and IISS: *The Military Balance 2001-2002* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 302-303. [to be updated].

<sup>173</sup> *Africa at a Glance. Facts and Figures 2001/2* (Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 2002), pp. 59-60.

<sup>174</sup> Gambari, Ibrahim A.: “The Character, Fundamental Issues and Consequences of the Conflict in the Horn of Africa”, in George Nzongola-Ntalaja (ed.): *Conflict in the Horn of Africa* (Atlanta, Georgia: African Studies Association Press, 1991), pp. 7-18.

<sup>175</sup> See “History of IGAD” at [www.igad.org/about](http://www.igad.org/about) and “Agreement Establishing the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)” at [www.igad.org/library/docs/agreement\\_establishing\\_igad.pdf](http://www.igad.org/library/docs/agreement_establishing_igad.pdf). See also Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 207-210; Assefa, Hizkias: “A Lack of Visionary Statesmanship and Democratic Leadership”, in Monique Mekenkamp, Paul van Tongeren & Hans van de Veen (eds.): *Searching for Peace in Africa. An Overview of Conflict Prevention and Management Activities* (Utrecht: European Platform for Conflict Prevention/European Centre for Conflict Prevention, 1999), pp. 115-119; Juma, Monica Kathina: “The Intergovernmental Authority on Development and the East African Community”, in Baregu & Landsberg (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 30), pp. 225-252.

<sup>176</sup> See “Operational Structure of IGAD” at [www.igad.org/about/op.html](http://www.igad.org/about/op.html).

<sup>177</sup> See art. 3.2 in the “Khartoum Declaration” of the 8th Summit of Heads of State and Government, 23 November 2000, at [www.igad.org/library/docs/8th\\_summit\\_declaration\\_khartoum.pdf](http://www.igad.org/library/docs/8th_summit_declaration_khartoum.pdf).

<sup>178</sup> See “Protocol on the Establishment of a Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism for IGAD Member States” at [www.igad.org/library/docs/cewarn\\_protocol.pdf](http://www.igad.org/library/docs/cewarn_protocol.pdf). See also Mwaura, Ciru & Susanne Schmeid (eds.): *Early Warning and Conflict Management in the Horn of Africa* (Lawrenceville, NJ: Red Sea Press, 2002); “CEWARN: Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism”, *IGAD News*, no. 1 (March-April 2002), p. 4.

<sup>179</sup> On the establishment of a CEWERU in Eritrea see *IGAD News*, no. 11 (February 2000), p. 5.

<sup>180</sup> IGAD: “Organisational Structure of IGAD” at [www.igad.org/about/op.html](http://www.igad.org/about/op.html) and idem: “Organisational Chart of IGAD Secretariat”, at [www.igad.org/about/or.html](http://www.igad.org/about/or.html).

<sup>181</sup> See “Political and Humanitarian Affairs Section”, at [www.igad.org/sectors/ph/](http://www.igad.org/sectors/ph/).

<sup>182</sup> See “Draft Protocol for the Establishment of the Eastern Africa Standby Brigade (EASBRIG)”, at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/igad/easbrigfeb04prot.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/igad/easbrigfeb04prot.pdf); “Policy Framework for the Establishment of the Eastern Africa Standby Brigade (EASBRIG)” [[./easbrigfeb04frm.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/igad/easbrigfeb04frm.pdf)]; and “Proceedings of the Meeting of Eastern Africa Chiefs of Defence Staff on the Establishment of the Eastern Africa Standby Brigade (EASBRIG), Kampala, February 2004” [[./easbrigfeb04.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/igad/easbrigfeb04.pdf)]; and “Report of the First Meeting of Ministers of Defence and Security of the Eastern Africa Region on the Establishment of the Eastern Africa Standby Brigade (EASBRIG)” [[./easbrigjul04.pdf](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/igad/easbrigjul04.pdf)].

<sup>183</sup> The agreement is available at [www.igad.org/pressroom/machakos%20agreement.doc](http://www.igad.org/pressroom/machakos%20agreement.doc), and the protocol in *IGAD News*, Special Issue (December 2002), pp. 7-8. See also “The Sudan Peace Process” at [www.igad.org/sectors/ph/sup.html](http://www.igad.org/sectors/ph/sup.html); Adar, K.G.: “Conflict Resolution in a Turbulent Region: the Case of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) in Sudan”, *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, vol. 1, no. 2 (2000), pp. 39-68; ICG: “Sudan’s Best Chance for Peace: How Not to Lose It”, *ICG Africa Reports*, no. 51 (Brussels: ICG, September 2002); ICG: “Power and Wealth Sharing: Make or Break Time in Sudan’s Peace Process”, *ICG Africa Reports*, no. 55 (Brussels: ICG, December 2002); ICG: “Sudan Endgame”, *ICG Africa Reports*, no. 65 (Brussels: ICG, July 2003); “Sudan: 50/50 Deal”, *Africa Research Bulletin. Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 40, no. 12 (December 2003), pp. 15577-15578; African Security Analysis Programme: “The Sudan/IGAD Peace Process. Signposts for the Way Forward”, *ISS Paper*, no. 86 (2004).

<sup>184</sup> See [www.igad.org/pressroom/web%20site%20communique%20sudan1.htm](http://www.igad.org/pressroom/web%20site%20communique%20sudan1.htm), and [www.igad.org/pressroom/web%20site%20addendum%20sudan.htm](http://www.igad.org/pressroom/web%20site%20addendum%20sudan.htm).

<sup>185</sup> [www.igad.org/pressroom/PS%201-2.pdf](http://www.igad.org/pressroom/PS%201-2.pdf).

<sup>186</sup> [www.igad.org/pressroom/agreement.doc](http://www.igad.org/pressroom/agreement.doc).

<sup>187</sup> [www.igad.org/pressroom/POWER%20SHARING.pdf](http://www.igad.org/pressroom/POWER%20SHARING.pdf).

<sup>188</sup> [www.igad.org/pressroom/RESOLUTION%20OF%20ABYEI%20CONFLICT.pdf](http://www.igad.org/pressroom/RESOLUTION%20OF%20ABYEI%20CONFLICT.pdf).

<sup>189</sup> [www.igad.org/pressroom/RESOLUTION%20OF%20%20SOUTHERN%20KORDOFAN%20-%20](http://www.igad.org/pressroom/RESOLUTION%20OF%20%20SOUTHERN%20KORDOFAN%20-%20).

<sup>190</sup> “Declaration on the Final Peace Phase” (5 June 2004), at [www.splmtoday.com/myInc/downloads/all\\_protocols\\_declaration.doc](http://www.splmtoday.com/myInc/downloads/all_protocols_declaration.doc).

<sup>191</sup> See above, note 110.

<sup>192</sup> Anonymous: “Government Recognition in Somalia and Regional Political Stability in the Horn of Africa”, *Journal of Modern African Studies*, vol. 49, no. 2 (2002), pp. 247-272, especially pp. 252-254; Streleau, Susanne & S’Fiso Ngesi: “Somalia: Beginning the Journey from Anarchy to Order”, in Erik Doxtader & Charles Villa-Vicencio (eds.): *Through Fire with Water. The Roots of Division and the Potential for Reconciliation in Africa* (Cape Town: David Philips Publishers, 2003), pp. 154-185, especially pp. 155-156. See also Jan, Ameen: “Somalia: Building Sovereignty or Restoring Peace?”, in Elizabeth M. Cousens & Chetan Kumar (eds.): *Peacebuilding as Politics. Cultivating Peace in Fragile Societies* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2001), pp. 53-88; Lortan, Fiona: “Africa Watch. Rebuilding the Somali State”, *African Security Review*, vol. 9, no.5/6 (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2000), pp. 94-103

<sup>193</sup> ICG: “Salvaging Somalia’s Chance for Peace”, *Africa Briefing*, 9 December 2002 (Brussels: ICG), *passim*; ICG: “A Blueprint for Peace in Somalia”, *ICG Africa Report*, no. 59 (March 2003), *passim*. See also “The Somalia Peace Process” at [www.igad.org/sectors/ph/sop.html](http://www.igad.org/sectors/ph/sop.html). The various documents are available at [www.igad.org/pressroom/sompress.html](http://www.igad.org/pressroom/sompress.html). See also “Somali Reconciliation Process on Track”, *IGAD News*, no. 3-4 (July-August/September-October 2002), pp. 1 and 3; “IGAD, Somalia and Southern Sudan. A Chronology of Events and Achievements, So Far”, *ibid.*, no. 5 (Jan-Feb. 2003), pp. 10-11.

<sup>194</sup> ICG: “Blueprint” (*op. cit.*, note 193), p. 1.

<sup>195</sup> See “Joint Communiqué Issued by the IGAD Special Summit on Somalia, Nairobi, Kenya, 15 October 2004”, at [www.igad.org/pressroom/special\\_summit\\_on\\_somalia\\_communique.pdf](http://www.igad.org/pressroom/special_summit_on_somalia_communique.pdf).

<sup>196</sup> The members of the IPF are Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the UK and the USA as well as the European Community, the UNDP and the World Bank. See “IGAD Partners Forum”, at [www.igad.org/partners/](http://www.igad.org/partners/); and the interview with the IPF chairman, Guido La Tella, in *IGAD News*, no. 3-4 (July-August/September-October 2002), pp. 6-7.

<sup>197</sup> The members of COMESSA were initially Djibouti, the Gambia, Senegal, Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic, Chad, Eritrea, Niger, Mali, Sudan and Libya—the latter traditionally playing a dominant role. In 2001 Egypt, Tunisia, Nigeria, Morocco and Somalia were admitted, and in 2002 Togo and Benin joined as well. See “COMESSA: Security Issues”, *African Research Bulletin. Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 39, no. 3 (April 2002), p. 14771; “In Brief: COMESSA”, *ibid.*, vol. 38, no. 2 (February 2001), p. 14290. Niger was in 1999 excluded from the meeting because of a coup d’état. See “COMESSA. Niger Excluded”, *ibid.*, vol. 36, no. 4 (April 1999), pp. 14498.

<sup>198</sup> ISS: “Profile: Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)”, at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/comesaprof.htm](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/comesaprof.htm).

<sup>199</sup> Takirambudde, Peter: “The Rival Strategies of SADC and PTA/COMESA”, in Bach (ed.): *op. cit.* (note 127), pp. 151-158.

<sup>200</sup> The Comesa Treaty at [www.comesa.int/about/treaty/treaty\\_pdf](http://www.comesa.int/about/treaty/treaty_pdf).

<sup>201</sup> COMESA: *Vision and Strategy*, chapter 7, at [www.comesa.int/about/vision/vision\\_chapter\\_7/view](http://www.comesa.int/about/vision/vision_chapter_7/view). For the formulations about the predecessor of the European Union, the European Coal and Steel Communities, in the Schumann Plan see Schuman, Robert: “The Schuman Declaration”, in Brent F. Nelsen & Alexander C-G. Stubb (eds.): *The European Union. Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1994) pp. 11-12. See also Wæver, Ole: “Integration as Security: Constructing a Europe at Peace”, in Charles Kupchan (ed.): *Atlantic Security: Contending Visions* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1998), pp. 45-63.

<sup>202</sup> COMESA: “How Comesa Operates”, at [www.comesa.int/about/how\\_COMESA\\_operates/view](http://www.comesa.int/about/how_COMESA_operates/view).

<sup>203</sup> See “Profile: Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS / CEEAC)”, at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/eccasprof.htm](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/eccasprof.htm); Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 201-206.

<sup>204</sup> “Treaty Establishing the Economic Community of Central African States”, at [www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/treaty/treaty.pdf](http://www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/treaty/treaty.pdf).

<sup>205</sup> “Pacte d’Assistance Mutuelle entre les États Membres de la CEEAC”, at [www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/treaty/mutualfr.pdf](http://www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/treaty/mutualfr.pdf).

<sup>206</sup> “Protocole relatif au Conseil de Paix et de Sécurité de l’Afrique Centrale (COPAX)”, at [www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/treaty/copaxfr.pdf](http://www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/treaty/copaxfr.pdf).

<sup>207</sup> “Decision to Adopt the Standing Orders of the Defence and Security Commission (DSC)” (*no. 07/ECCAS/CHSG/X/02*), at [www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/dec07x02eng.pdf](http://www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/dec07x02eng.pdf); and “Standing Orders of the Defence and Security Commission”, at [www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/dsceng.pdf](http://www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/dsceng.pdf).

- <sup>208</sup> “Decision to Adopt the Standing Orders of the Central African Multinational Force (FOMAC) (no. 08/ECCAS/CHSG/X/02), at [www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/dec08x02eng.pdf](http://www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/dec08x02eng.pdf); and ‘Standing Orders of the Central African Multinational Force’, at [www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/fomaceng.pdf](http://www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/fomaceng.pdf).
- <sup>209</sup> “Decision to Adopt the Standing Orders of the Central African Early Warning Mechanism (MARAC) (no. 09/ECCAS/CHSG/X/02), at [www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/dec09x02eng.pdf](http://www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/dec09x02eng.pdf); and “Standing Orders of the Central African Early Warning Mechanism, at [www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/maraceng.pdf](http://www.ceeac-eccas.org/docs/hos/malabo02/maraceng.pdf).
- <sup>210</sup> See Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 193-197; ISS: “Profile: Arab Maghreb Union/Union du Maghreb Arabe (AMU/UMA)”, at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/amuprof.htm](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/amuprof.htm). On the background see Chonion, Bédir: “Conceptualisations of Security: A Perspective from the Maghreb”, in Hans Günter Brauch, Peter H. Liotta, Antonio Marquina, Paul Rogers & Mohammed Selim (eds): *Security and Environment in the Mediterranean. Conceptualising Security and Environmental Conflicts* (Berlin: Springer, 2003), pp. 321-331; Calleya, Stephen: *Navigating Regional Dynamics in the Post-Cold War World. Patterns and Relations in the Mediterranean Era* (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1997), pp. 123-137, 187-228.
- <sup>211</sup> “Traité instituant l’Union Magreb Arabe”, at [www.maghrebarabe.org/fr/index3.htm](http://www.maghrebarabe.org/fr/index3.htm).
- <sup>212</sup> “In Brief: AMU”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 36, no. 5 (May 1999), p. 13538.
- <sup>213</sup> “Arab Maghreb Union: Summit Postponed”, *African Research Bulletin. Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 40, no. 12 (December 2003), p. 15555.
- <sup>214</sup> “Libya-Arab League”, *African Research Bulletin. Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 39, no. 10 (October 2002), p. 15060.
- <sup>215</sup> On the EU initiatives and their reception in the Maghreb see Gillespie, Richard (ed.): *The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership. Political and Economic Perspectives* (London: Frank Cass, 1997), *passim*; Köhler, Michael A.: “The Security Concept of the European Union for the Mediterranean”, in Brauch & al. (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 210), pp. 203-233, including central EU documents such as the “Common Strategy of the European Council of 19 June 2000 on the Mediterranean Region” in which the EU declares its intention to “encourage and support subregional cooperation such as within the Arab Maghreb Union” (p. 219). On NATO’s initiatives see Santis, Nicola de: “NATO’s Agenda and the Mediterranean Dialogue”, *ibid.*, pp. 177-180; Said, Mohamed Kadry: “A Southern Perspective and Assessment of NATO’s Mediterranean Security Dialogue”, *ibid.*, pp. 181-194; Sanz, Félix: “A European Perspective and Assessment of NATO’s Mediterranean Security Dialogue”, *ibid.*, pp. 195-198; Laipson, Ellen: “The Future of the NATO-Mediterranean Dialogue”, *ibid.*, pp. 199-202.
- <sup>216</sup> Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 198-201.
- <sup>217</sup> “ANAD. Peace Force”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 36, no. 4 (April 1999), pp. 13498; Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 210-214.
- <sup>218</sup> “Entente Council: Further Integration Urged”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 38, no. 2 (February 2001), p. 14289-90.
- <sup>219</sup> “Mano River Union: Members Agree to Revitalise Union”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 37, no. 3 (March 2000), p. 13894.
- <sup>220</sup> “Guinea-Liberia-Sierra Leone: From Union to Nightmare”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 37, no. 10 (October 2000), pp. 14140-41.
- <sup>221</sup> “Mano River Union: Ground-Breaking Meeting”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 38, no. 8 (August 2001), p. 14509-10.
- <sup>222</sup> “Mano River Countries: Peace Drawing Near?”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 38, no. 10 (October 2001), p. 14582-83.
- <sup>223</sup> “Mano River Countries: Peace Plan Adopted”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 39, no. 3 (March 2002), p. 14773.
- <sup>224</sup> “Mano River Countries: Guinea Implements Rabat Agreement”, *Africa Research Bulletin, Political, Social and Cultural Series*, vol. 39, no. 4 (April 2002), p. 14809.
- <sup>225</sup> Lodgaard, Sverre: “Competing Schemes for Europe: The CSCE, NATO and the European Union”, *Security Dialogue*, vol. 23, no. 3 (September 1992), pp. 57-68; Anderson, Stephanie: “EU, NATO and CSCE Responses to the Yugoslav Crisis: Testing Europe’s New Security Architecture”, *European Security*, vol. 4, no. 2 (Summer 1995), pp. 328-353. On the general phenomenon of buck-passing see Christensen, Thomas J. & Jack Snyder: “Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity”, *International Organization*, vol. 44, no. 2 (1990), pp. 137-168.
- <sup>226</sup> On the Nixon Doctrine (formulated by Kissinger) see Kissinger, Henry: *Years of Upheaval* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1982), pp. 668-669; idem: *Diplomacy* (New York: Rouchstone, 1994), pp. 708-710. See also Garthoff, Raymond: *Detente and Confrontation. American-Soviet Relations From Nixon to Reagan* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution,

1985), pp. 74-75; Sherry, Michael S.: *In the Shadow of War. The United States Since the 1930s* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), pp. 307-334; Klare, Michael T.: "The Development of Low-Intensity-Conflict Doctrine", in Peter J. Schraeder (ed.): *Intervention into the 1990s. U.S. Foreign Policy in the Third World* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1992), pp. 37-53; Gaddis, John Lewis: *Strategies of Containment. A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 298-306.

<sup>227</sup> The term seems to stem from Fred Bergsten, who is quoted in Inoguchi, Takashi: "Four Japanese Scenarios for the Future", in David N. Balaam & Michael Veseth (eds.): *Readings in International Political Economy* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996), pp. 231-246, quote from p. 237.

<sup>228</sup> Pedersen, Thomas: "Cooperative Hegemony: Power, Ideas and Institutions in Regional Integration", *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 2 (October 2002), pp. 677-696 (quote from p. 683).

<sup>229</sup> Malan, Mark: "Debunking Some Myths about Peacekeeping in Africa", in Cilliers & Mills (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 132), pp. 9-26; idem: "Towards and Integrated Doctrine for Peace Support Operations in Africa", in Jakkie Cilliers & Annika Hilding-Nordberg (eds.): *Building Stability in Africa: Challenges for the New Millennium*. ISS Monograph Series, no. 46 (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2000), pp. 46-69; idem: "The Post-9/11 Security Agenda and Peacekeeping in Africa", *African Security Review*, vol. 11, no. 3 (2002), pp. 53-66; Berman, Eric G.: "African Regional Organisations' Peace Operations. Developments and Challenges", *ibid.*, vol. 11, no. 4 (2002), pp. 33-44; Herbst, Jeffrey: "African Armies and Regional Peacekeeping. Are There African Solutions to African Problems?", in Rotberg & Mills (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 164), pp. 231-249; Cleaver, Gerry & Roy May: "African Perspectives: Regional Peacekeeping", in Furley & May (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 76), pp. 29-48; Neethling, Theo: "Maintaining International Peace and Security: Reflections on Peace-support Operations in Africa", *Scientia Militaria. South African Journal of Military Studies*, vol. 28, no. 1 (1998), pp. 111-137; DFI International: *African Capabilities for Peace Operations: An Assessment in Support of the African Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI)* (1997), in Berman & Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 415-457; Landsberg, Chris: "Willing but Unable: Small States and Peacekeeping in Africa", in Cilliers & Mills (eds.): *op. cit.* (note 132), pp. 45-54; Neethling, Theo: "Participation in sub-Saharan Peace Support Operations", in Louis de Plessis & Mike Hough (eds.): *Protecting Sub-Saharan Africa: The Military Challenge* (Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 1999), pp. 183-220.

<sup>230</sup> See "Africa Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI)/African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance", at [www.globalsecurity.org/military/agency/dod/acri.htm](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/agency/dod/acri.htm). See also Howe, Herbert M.: *Ambiguous Order. Military Forces in African States* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2001), pp. 243-268.

<sup>231</sup> "Reinforcement of African Peace-keeping Capacities (RECAMP)", at [www.un.int/france/frame\\_anglais/france\\_and\\_un/france\\_and\\_peacekeeping/recamp\\_eng.htm](http://www.un.int/france/frame_anglais/france_and_un/france_and_peacekeeping/recamp_eng.htm) See also Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 291-315.

<sup>232</sup> Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 317-331. DFID: *The Global Conflict Prevention Pool. A Joint UK Approach to Reducing Conflict* (London: DFID, 2003).

<sup>233</sup> See "Denmark's Africa Programme for Peace" (Copenhagen: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, May 2004).

<sup>234</sup> Berman and Sams: *op. cit.* (note 75), pp. 333-358; Communiqué of the EU-Africa Ministerial Troika Meeting, Dublin, 1 April 2004 at [www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity\\_to\\_union/pdfs/au/euafapr04.htm](http://www.iss.co.za/AF/RegOrg/unity_to_union/pdfs/au/euafapr04.htm).

<sup>235</sup> Available at [www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2004seaisland/peace.html](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2004seaisland/peace.html).