DOI: https://doi.org/10.67203/abulj.2015.sfh5uyo2

APPRAISING THE ROLE OF AFRICAN UNION: THE NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR AFRICA'S DEVELOPMENT IN CONFLICT PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT IN AFRICA*

Abstract.

The New Partnership for Africa's Development is the latest in a long line of initiatives or framework intended by African leaders to place African continent on a path of growth and sustainable development. The development challenges that face Africa are enormous and varied. The crisis of political instability, bad governance, lack of peace and security, poverty and diseases like HIV/AIDs. NEPAD recognized peace and security as condition for good governance and sustainable development. Therefore, in absence of peace and security, democracy and good governance cannot strive and where there is no good governance, we cannot witness sustainable development. This paper argues that peace and security has been elusive in much of Africa. The failure of the Organisation of African Unity to ensure peace and security in Africa and to address Africa's post-cold war logion of challenges, the successor organisation, the African Union and its attendant development programme, the NEPAD were established. The first issue which is critical to NEPAD is, solving armed conflict and civil unrest on the continent. Currently, twenty percent of the people of Africa are living in condition of conflict. These conditions cause terrible suffering and hold back economic development in the affected countries. The extent of conflict is so great that the whole continent is affected and this creates a major barrier to inward investment. On the resolution, NEPAD is in a position to make considerable progress. It was learnt in Sierra Lone that with concentrated international effort, conflict can be successfully ended and institutions of a properly functioning state can begin to be rebuilt. The paper therefore examines the origin of the NEPAD, NEPAD and challenges of peace and security in Africa and involvement of AU/NEPAD in Darfur and Cote D'Ivoire crises. It further discusses the AU/NEPAD conflict mechanism, AU/NEPAD/mechanism for conflict prevention, management and resolution and draw conclusion.

* Hanafi A. Hammed, Ph.D, Faculty of Law, Kogi State University, Anyigba, Email=lawhammed@yahoo.com 08033843685.

1.1. Introduction

NEPAD has been hailed as perhaps the boldest new initiative in recent times on the appropriate path which the African continent should be taking towards its long-term development.[1]

With its successful democratic transition, South Africa emerged during the second half of the 1990s as a new political factor in the continent. In the late 1990s, the South African President Thabo Mbeki coined and popularized the African Renaissance. While the notion never materialized as a fully fledged, concise new paradigm, it managed to rally policy-makers, bureaucrats and intellectuals alike behind an idea still highly relevant as a concept of African self-respect, dignity and pride.[2] Inspired by earlier notion of self reliance in the sense of African ownership over Africa's affairs, the African Renaissance provided a philosophical basis for any policy formulation. Parallel to this philosophical dimension efforts aimed to position South Africa in terms of its foreign and economic policy in a leadership role within the African continent.[3] Within this process, Mbeki's foreign policy approach could be characterized as 'a complicated and sometimes contradictory mixture of ideology, idealism and pragmatism[4]'. This blend competed with ambition for a leading role displayed by other countries, in particular, the agenda by Libya's Col. Gaddafi in transformation of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) into African Union (AU).[5] This latter effort reactivated, though somehow distorted the popular rhetoric of Pan Africanism associated with anti- imperialism during the early days of decolonization- an ideology used to counteract the motion of African Renaissance as the approach reflected in NEPAD. South Africa's Finance Minister, Trevor Manuel, in a keynote address to the German Foundation for International Development as early as December, 1998 characterised the emerging in a revealing way by asserting 'there is a new resilience and a new will to succeed in the African continent' We the South Africa have called it a renaissance, a new vision of political and economic renewal. It takes the global competitive marketplace as point of

---

[1] Olukoshi, B. (2002) "Governing the African Political Space for Sustainable Development: A Reflection on NEPAD." Presented at the African Forum for Envisioning Africa held in Nairobi, Kenya, 26-29 April, 2002. P.4. @http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/108395session1c.pdf. Accessed on 13/04/2011.

[2] Makgoba, W. (ed.) (1999) "African Renaissance." Cape Town: Tafelberg.

[3] Jakobeit, Cord, (2000) "Africkanishe Diskussionen Zur Entwicklung des Kontinents-Beispoin African Renaissance." Journal fur Entwicklundspolitik, 16 (2) Pp 149-160.

[4] Oliver, G. (2003) "Is Thabo Mbeki Africa' Saviour? International Affairs." 79 (4) Pp. 815-828.

[5] Morais, K. and Naidu, S. (2002) "Libya's Africa Policy: What Does it Mean for South Africa and NEPAD?" South African Journal of International Affairs 9 (2) Pp. 109-118. Also see Sturman, K. (2003) "The Rise of Libya as a Regional Player." African Security Review 12 (3) Pp. 109-112.

departure.[6]

The first introduction of preliminary results to the international arena can be dated to the briefing on the 'Millennium Africa Renaissance Programme' (MAP or MARP) can offered by president Mbeki to the World Economy Forum Meeting in Davos on 28th January, 2001. The MAP document originated during a process that begun in 1999 when the South African, Nigerian and Algerian Presidents were mandated by the Exra ordinary OAU Summit in Sirte (Libya) to approach Africa's creditors on the total cancellation of Africa's external debt. The presidents were tasked further in April, 2000 by the South Summit in Havana to convey the concerns of the south to the G8 Summit in Okinawa in July, 2000. The OAU Summit in Togo in July, 2000 mandated the presidents to prepare the Millennium African Recovery Programme. In his presentation at Davos, Thabo Mbeki (who had the support of fellow heads of state Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria, Ben Mkapa of Tanzania and Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal) qualified MAP for the sustainable economic development of the continent.[7]

At the conference of Ministers of the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNESCA) in Algeria (8-10 May, 2001), the South African government presented the Millennium partnership for African Recovery Programme (Pretoria, March, 2001) as the updated and final version of these joint efforts. At same occasion, President Wade presented an Omega Plan for Africa and the UNECA, a Compact for Africa's Recovery. While the Omega Plan was largely a technocratic reduction of the challenges and the Compact, a mainly operational handbook, the MAP resented a comprehensive attempt to bring the developmental challenges into a historical, cultural, political and economic framework. It was decided that the documents should be tabled, in a merged version, at the OAU Summit in Lusaka. This diplomatic compromise prevented the initiative (s) from ending in a cul-de-sac at this early stage.[8] The final draft was adopted by the Heads of state at their OAU

---

[6] Taylor, I. "Globalisation and Regionalisation in Africa: Reactions to Attempts at Neo-Liberalism and Regionalism." Review of International Political Economy, 10 (2) 310-330.

[7] Complete text issued by the Presidency on 28th January, 2001 reproduced in Bunsnis 90/Gunmen 2001, Pp.57-59

[8] Only hard bargaining managed to prevent Wade's Omega Plan from sabotaging African Unity before it had even begun, particularly when Wade began claiming that his plan was 'a pratical initiative for overcoming Africa's economic difficulties', while the MARP was 'more of manifesto'. Yet, Wade's plan was extremely problematic and did not deserve the status that it was given 9though no doubt satisfying the ego of its author.' Also see the full text in Taylor, I. and Nel, P. (2002), "New Africa", Globalisation and the Confines of Elite Reformism: "Getting the Rhetoric Right" Getting the Strategy Wrong, Third World Quarterly, 23 (1) Pp.163-180.

Summit meeting on 11th July, 2001 as a New Africa's Initiative (NAI). Subsequently, at the end of the meeting in Abuja on 23rd October, 2001, an Implementation Committee of the Heads of state renamed the document as the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD).[9] The initiative had by then, matured and consolidated under a sort of powerful-sharing arrangement between the more influential African countries- Nigeria, South Africa, Algeria, Egypt and Senegal, at least nominally uniting the main portion of the continent's total annual GDP.[10]

Since October, 2001, the NEPAD secretariat is based at the Development Bank of Southern Africa in Midrand (South Africa), with President Mbeki's economic adviser Wiseman Nkhulu acting as chief operating officer. NEPAD has sought increasingly close co-operation with existing institutions like the African Development Bank (ADB), the Economic Commission of Africa (ECA and the African Union (AU) secretariat to counteract suspicions of running its own show. It advocates confirmed the aim to ultimately incorporate NEPAD offices into the AU Headquarters.[11] The composition of NEPAD's steering committee confirms the current power-sharing arrangement by uniting Algeria, Egypt, Nigeria, Senegal and South Africa, the five states involved in the initiative since its early stages. Another ten African countries have been appointed to an Implementation Committee and selected on a regional representation basis. More recently, as part of the integration of NEPAD into the newly consolidated AU structures and with the aim of reflecting ownership over the initiative by all African states, more countries and their political leadership from NEPAD critical faction, originally dismissing the initiative as an outward oriented sell-out strategy (such as Libya, but even Zimbabwe) have been either less critical or even co-opted into the NEPAD club, which offers voluntary association.[12]

---

[9] The full text and related information is accessible at the NEPAD web site (http://www.nepad.org). The document and an excellent detailed critical annotation is also included in Bond, P (ed.) (2002b) "Fanon's Warning. A Civil Society Reader on New Partnership for Africa's Development". Trenton, N.J. Africa World Press.

[10] Nigeria, South Africa, alone represented according to World Bank figures in 1999 a total of 57% of the GDP in sub-Saharan Africa (World Bank, 2001). African Development Indicators, Washington DC: The World Bank.

[11] The South African Deputy President Jacob Zuma has in his speech to the African Development Forum III on 8 March, 2002 in Addis Ababa emphasized the close interaction between the initiative and the continental body, thereby endorsing the view that NEPAD is an OAU document and hence an instrument owned by the organisation. @ N(http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/adf113a.htm). During the AU Summit in Maputo in July, 2003 the NEPAD protagonists- despite the emphasis on being an initiative within the AU- managed to reach a temporary arrangement that the NEPAD secretariat will continue to operate from South Africa and only be transferred to Addis Ababa in a few years.

[12] Melber, H. (2004) "NEPAD, Africa and the Wider World." Background paper to a lecture at the African Studies Centre, Leiden/The Netherlands, 14 October, 2004. ASC Seminar Series "Africa and its External

Notwithstanding the permissive structures and pragmatic efforts to compromise, NEPAD remains controversial among leaders of African states. It has equally not being given proper recognition by many stakeholders in African societies like churches and mosques, grassroots organisations, trade unions and part of academia who consider the initiative as ideological plunder of a neo-liberal submission toward the powerful in this world.

1.2. Rationale for the Establishment of the New Partnership for Africa's Development in Africa

All of Africa's regions have been afflicted by political tension, civil unrest or violent conflict. In addition, in task of resolving existing conflicts, the continent is also confronted with the challenge of promoting post-conflict reconstruction and peace building. This paper assesses the policy framework which the African Union (AU) and its programme for economic recovery, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) have developed to address and resolve some security problems confronting most African countries. The African Union has the primary responsibility for peace and security on the continent. NEPAD's role is in supporting post- conflict reconstruction and mobilization of resources for the African Union peace fund.[13]

On a continent where about half of the countries are still at serious risk of violent conflict and instability since decolonization, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) is an African-led programme of action to end Africa's global marginalization a welcome vision for promoting better government, ending Africa' wars and reducing poverty. Good governance is the key focus for ensuring peace and security, without which sustainable development people-centered economic growth is not possible.

It is conceived that through democracy, macro-economic stability and sustainable socio-economic programmes, all Africa's people can benefit through national cooperation and unity and for drawing international investments to uniquely African assets that will enhance locally sustainable development. Major areas to address are democratic governance, conflict resolution and peace keeping with an emphasis on human rights and

---

Relations." P.4.S

[13] Nkhulu, Wiseman, *The New Partnership for Africa's Development: The Journey So Far* Midrand; NEPAD Secretariat, June, 2005.P.9

inclusivity of civil society institutions and diversity of people. The imperative to promote peace and security in Africa is critical. The political and social vulnerabilities on which conflict is premised need to be addressed urgently. African regional institutions need to be unskilled to make and keep peace and to deal with reconciliation, rehabilitation and reconstruction. The combating of illicit proliferation of arms and weapons is critical, as is support for African states to find their own lasting solutions to existing conflicts and threats to security.[14]

Conflicts, with their attendant problems of massive human displacement and destruction of lives and properties, constitute the greatest challenge currently facing the African continent. Issues of identity, governance, resource allocation, State sovereignty and power struggle, sometimes coupled with the personality question, have all conspired, not only to cause staggering losses of human lives and environmental degradation but also to make Africa have the unenviable record of having the biggest numbers of uprooted communities in the world: 7 million refugees, 18 million internally displaced persons.

Of course, conflicts have existed since the beginning of recorded history and there had been various attempts by previous sub-regional Organisation like Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Continental Organisations such as Organisation of African Unity (OAU) and international organisations like United Nations Organisation (UNO) to resolve conflicts in Africa. Therefore, it may not be possible to treat in isolation, the activities of the New Partnership of Africa's Development in ensuring peace and security in Africa, rather in conjunction with its founding father, the Organisation of African Unity now African Union that has been in existence in maintaining peace and security in African states for decades before the birth of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). Therefore, as long as there is interaction between human beings, conflicts will continue to exist. At any rate, most of the good things that people always year for in life generate conflicts either because they are in short supply or because they are badly managed. One example that comes immediately to one's mind is the question of economic reform: a concept that has been prescribed as the best cure for Africa's current economic malaise. But appealing as that concept may be, economic reform can turn societies upside

[14] . NEPAD: Peace and Security in Africa. @http://quaker.org/capetown/report02/nepad.htm. Accessed on 03/09/11.

down. It raises expectations which, if not fulfilled, may widen the gap between rich and poor which, in turn, can generate conflicts between the haves and the have-nots. Sometimes, politicians have opened up closed economies but not policies that go with it. But by so doing, people have come to realize that the only way to win political concessions is not through peaceful negotiations but rather through the power of the gun.[15]

It follows, if you give people a free economy, you will one day have to give them other related freedoms: the freedom to identify their leaders, the freedom to express themselves on issues affecting their lives and the freedom to associate with those they choose to. By offering people those other freedoms, you will be averting the war of unmet expectations; and this is good governance. Democracy is yet another cherished ideal in Africa which, paradoxically, can tear societies apart if not properly handled. As an expression of democracy, elections can, indeed, act as an effective tool for conflict management. But, at the same time, elections can also deepen the degree of dissent and instability, if not properly managed.

The above two examples help to demonstrate four things. Firstly, conflicts are not simply an academic issue. They are a practical reality; and the role of socio-economic forces either in generating them or in helping to resolve conflicts is quite discernible. Secondly, as long as people continue to rub shoulders with one another, conflicts will continue to exist in human institutions. One cannot, therefore, think of eliminating them altogether. But, as a result of their intensity and multiplication, it is imperative for us to create mechanisms for managing conflicts or scaling them down to acceptable proportions. Indeed, as Professor Ali Mazrui put it on one occasion, "... without a minimum of peace, development is impossible; and without development, peace is not durable". Thirdly, all good things in nature have a price tag. If we have to develop, we must be prepared to deal with the trade-offs relating to the process of development, namely conflicts. Fourthly, bad policies or lack of good governance can legitimize the birth of conflicts. It follows building critical capacities in Africa in the area of conflict management have never been as compelling as it is today.

For while increased cooperation between various African countries has, fortunately, helped to reduce inter-State conflicts which were the order of the day during the cold war era, the post-cold war period has ushered in its wake

[15] .Capacity in Support of Good Governance, Political Stability, Peace and Security in Africa: United Nations Economic and Social Council, 20th April, 1994. @http://www.uneca.org/eca resources/major ece website conference of ministers/20/con20.7e.htm. Accessed on 09/06/2010.

an upsurge of conflicts along regional, ethnic, religious, clan and even sub-clan lines within nations. From Liberia to Somalia, we have seen some African nations almost disintegrate. From Angola to Burundi and Rwanda, we have witnessed death and destruction as a result of conflicts and instability. As the twenty-first century approaches, the imperative for Africa itself in alliance with its friends outside the continent to take a hard look at the scourge of armed conflict, and to come up with viable mechanisms for conflict-resolving or management capacities becomes more pressing. Put most simply, for Africa to remain relevant in the new international order, international organizations such as the Organization of African Unity (OAU) now African Union/NEPAD must fill in the vacuum left behind by cold war engagements in tackling the scourge of conflicts.[16]

The Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa pointed out that in May 1993, [17] "The people of Africa have become chronically vulnerable and dependent on international charity, not only for survival, but also for the containment and solution of the conflicts perpetrated by the Africans themselves." Our future generations will not forgive us, when they come to learn of the use of Africa's limited resources for self-destruction. Moreover, we will remain in the intensive care unit (ICU) of the international community if we do not utilize our limited resources for meaningful development or if we fail to create the conditions for peace and justice, by ruling with the consent of the governed; ensuring respect for human rights, equitable distribution of resources, suppression of egoism and, above all, establishing a democratic culture that promotes advancement of mankind on merit. Indeed, we all agree that Africa is a continent in transition but we should not turn this transition into a permanent feature. We must assiduously work towards getting to our destiny as soon as possible. For Africa to achieve economic success and avoid being marginalized by the rest of the world, it is imperative that we build an enabling political environment capable of managing conflicts.

Therefore, it is imperative to examine the involvement of the AU and NEPAD in resolving crises in at least two African countries.

---

[16] Layashi Yaker, Welcoming Address at PA/OAU Consultation on "The OAU and Conflict Management in Africa" in African Hall, 19-21, May, 1993.

[17] Ibid.

1.3. The Role of African Union/NEPAD in Conflict Prevention, Resolution and Management of Conflict

For the purpose of this paper, conflict management will be taken to mean a process embracing three main areas of activity. In their descending order, these areas are: (a) Conflict prevention or peace promotion; (b) Conflict control or abatement; and (c) Conflict resolution. This approach assumes that there is a baseline of relative peace and harmony in inter-personal relations but due to endogenous or exogenous factors such as shortage or mismanagement of resources, causes of friction may be introduced in a social system. It is the duty of the community in question to immediately identify those causes and prevent them from erupting in a conflict. Where prevention fails and a full-blown conflict emerges, then the second stage is reached called conflict management by which efforts aimed at diffusing, controlling or abating the conflict are deployed. If that conflict persists to the extent that people's existence as a harmonious community is visibly threatened, then the third stage is reached called conflict resolution, characterized by peace-keeping efforts as well as intensive and extensive negotiations to settle all the fundamental issues involved in the conflict. Once the fundamental issues are resolved, conflict management is said to have gone full circle, by which the relationship between the individuals concerned is back to tolerable proportions.[18]

Based on the above analysis, it is wrong to think that the majority of the common citizens in Africa are not managing their conflicts. Indeed, everywhere in Africa people on a daily basis are busy addressing situations of domestic tension of immediate concern to them. But the causes of tension have become so many, so complex and so intolerable that without outside assistance, especially in terms of financial resources, conflicts resulting from such tension cannot be meaningfully tackled even with the use of available mechanisms.[19]

It is equally wrong to think that AU/NEPAD has not been concerned with the issues of conflicts. Indeed, as the Secretary-General of OAU as clearly stated in his "Report on the establishment of a mechanism for conflict prevention, management and resolution" [CM/1767(LVIII)] submitted to the fifty-eighth Ordinary Session of the OAU Council of Ministers, held from 21 to 26 June 1993, in Cairo, Egypt, "... conflict resolution and the issue of peace, security

[18] See Imobighe, T .A., "The Role of Sub-Regional Arrangement in Conflict Management (Mimeo)." 1993, P1.
[19] Ibid.

and stability have been a major concern of our Organization from its inception". It is also noted in the same report that the Commission of Mediation, Conciliation and Arbitration, which was set up as the official organ charged with the responsibility for peaceful settlement of disputes among Member States never became fully operational. The question of financing its staff and operations, for instance, remained an academic exercise. Nor were other ad hoc arrangements such as Defence Commission later put in place to deal with inter-State disputes and conflicts without shortcomings. However, one would argue that they did have a positive impact on stabilizing situations of conflict among Member States.[20]

1.3.1. Involvement of African Union in Darfur Crisis

The root of the Darfur conflict is a struggle over controlling an environment that can no longer support all the people who must live in it. Casual observers from around the world will be forgiven for having reached a disjointed picture of events and the root causes of events in Darfur over the past two years. Something which has led to similarly disjointed conclusions and unrealistic solutions. A combination of lazy and often sensationalist media coverage and the activities of an already active anti-Sudanese campaign have sought to reduce the incredibly complex Darfur issue to one of an attempt by an Arab-dominated government in Khartoun to wipe out its black citizens in Darfur. Some, who know a little better, accept the fact that the Darfur rebels are the ones who started the conflict by attacking police stations, army garrisons and nomadic leaders and communities and so doing murdering hundreds of policemen and precipitating a break down in law and order.

As can be ascertained from any reliable source on Darfur, it is a region inhabited by Arabs and non-Arabs alike. They are bound by blood through centuries of intermarriage. The two rebel groups are drawn from three tribes: Zagawa, Fur and Masalit. There are more than eighty different tribes and ethnic communities in Darfur. Any solution that would reward those who carry arms in a deliberate attempt to destabilize Africa's largest country will become a recipe for a full scale war that will spill over the border of Sudan.[21]

The African Union, (AU) formed in 2002 from the vestiges of the

---

[20] Ibid, Pp.1-2.

[21] The Root Causes of the Darfur Conflict: A Struggle over Controlling an environment that can no longer support all the people who must live on it

Organization for African Unity (OAU), aims to protect the security of the continent rather than the sovereignty of individual states. Though, the African Union still is struggling to reform its governing bodies, it plays an increasingly high-profile role in peacekeeping. Most recently, the African Union has sent peacekeepers to Somalia and Darfur, the latter in an unprecedented joint peacekeeping operation with the United Nations. Experts said that the African Union has a long way to go before it is fully functional and expressed concerns about the burdens and expectations that have been placed on the body thus far.[22]

In 2002, the Organization for African Unity transformed itself into the African Union (AU). The OAU, founded in 1963 on the principles of state sovereignty and noninterference, drew criticism throughout the 1990s for its lack of intervention as crises unfolded in Rwanda, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Somalia. Frustration at its ineffectiveness led African leaders spearheaded by Libyan leader, Muammar el-Qaddafi, to launch the African Union, a body with a structure modeled on that of the European Union. Fifty- three countries in Africa are members of the African Union (Morocco is the only African country that does not belong), which is headquartered in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.[23]

The African Union/NEPAD seeks to increase development, combat poverty and corruption and end Africa's many conflicts. "The AU/NEPAD is the world's only regional or international organisation that explicitly recognizes the right to intervene in a member state on humanitarian and human rights grounds." The AU drew these guidelines based on the recommendations of a 2002 report from the International Commission on Intervention and state sovereignty entitled The Responsibility to Protect. The report asserts that "sovereign states have a responsibility to protect their own citizens from unavoidable catastrophe- from mass murder and rape, from starvation but that when they are unwilling or unable to do so, that responsibility must be borne by the broader community of states".[24]
A joint AU/UN peacekeeping force was deployed to Darfur in the beginning

---

[22] See Africa, International Organisations, International Peace and Security @http://www.cfr.org/Africa/african-union/p11616. Accessed on 23/09/11.
[23] Ibid.
[24] See generally Roberta Cohen, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, and Lawyer William G. O'Neill in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists; in Africa, International Organisations, International Peace and Security @http://www.cfr.org/Africa/African-union/p11616. Accessed on 23/09/11.

of 2008. About 13,500 soldiers as of July, 2009 were already present in the region as part of an AU/NEPAD peacekeeping force. They remained in the region and were incorporated into the joint AU/UN force officially deployed in early 2008. That force is still far from its authorized strength of about 20,000 personnel.

The African Union/ NEPAD has had a peacekeeping role in Darfur since 2003, when it helped broker a cease-fire between the government of Sudan and rebel groups. Initially had fewer than one hundred observers in Darfur to monitor the agreement but gradually increased its presence to include soldiers and police. By 2005, The AU/NEPAD had nearly 7,000 troops in Darfur and in September, 2006, with the Sudanese government refusing to accept a 20,000-strong UN-mandated peacekeeping force, the AU/NEPAD extended its mandate.

Prior to the deployment of the joint peacekeeping force, experts had serious reservations about the ability of the AU peacekeepers to work effectively. Everyone knows this has been undermanned, understaffed, undertrained and under-resourced force.[25] With the joint force on the ground, expert s say some of the same problems remain. While the focus has a more robust mandate than the previous AU force, it still lacks important equipment and a critical mass of troops. The United Nations says its goal is to have 97 percent deployment by the end of 2009. Some experts said that even once full deployment is reached, the troops will not be able to end the crisis. Even if the force consisted of the finest elite troops in the world, they could not have resolved the problem.

1.3.2. Crisis in Cote D'Ivoire and AU/NEPAD Intervention

The current crisis in Cote D'Ivoire is a severe test for the regional body, ECOWAS and the much for touted NEPAD. For the umpteen time, the West African sub-region and Africa as a whole have been called to duty to halt the continuing bloodbath and carnage that often plaques the continent. Cote D'Ivoire, the latest in the long list of African countries best with military adventures is still reeling under a mutiny that has led to the death of hundreds of people including a former Head of state, General Robert Guei. Cote d'ivoire's political problems intensified after the death of its founding

[25] Cohen "*What is the African Union's Role in Darfur*"? in Africa, International Organisations, International Peace and Security, 2006.@http://www.cfr.org/africa/african-union/p11616. Accessed on 23/09/2011.

president, Houphouet Boigny, on 7 December 1993. Prior to his death, the country enjoyed relative stability and economic prosperity in a general unstable African continent over a period of three decades after its independence in 1960. The vibrant economy attracted a large number of foreign workers, mainly from Burkina Faso, Mali and Ghana as well as investors. Lacking any political institutional structure, the passing of Houphouet Boigny, plunged the country into period of protracted power struggle, owing to its long one-party rule (despite the presence of his protégé, Konan Bedie). Foermer president Konan Bedie, who replaced the country long term leader, enunciated the policy of Ivoirite and succeeded in eliminating his key political opponents, including Alasssane Quattara of the Rally of Republicans (RD R).The power struggle centred on nationality laws and eligibility criteria for elections which favoured, mainly, inhabitants from southern Cote d'ivoire to the detriment of the northerners. The interplay of complex political issues related to the identity and citizenship, he quest for power and eventual political exclusion of political opponents from elections led to an unconstitutional change in government by late General Robert Guei in 1999. These undercurrents include a revolt from ranks of the General's loyalist, specifically about 800 men who were demobilized from the national army known as Forces Armees nationals de la cote d'ivoire (FAANCI) in September 2002.[26]

The bloody revolt led to the death of General Guei and some members of his family in the process. An ill-equipped and ill-prepared Ivoirian army eventually mobilized its rank and file , and in a few days of fighting repelled the rebels from Abijan but lost the northern cities of Bouake and Korhogo. The conflict has since grown in scope and intensity.

With the emergence of three different rebel groups: the Patriotic Movement of Cote d'Ivoire (MPCI), the movement for justice and peace (MJP) and the movement of Great West (MPIGO) which are, collectively known as the New forces'. The outbreak of the Ivoirian crisis in September 2002 led initially to the signing of two peace agreement under the auspices of ECOWAS. These are the 18 October ceased fire agreement signed in Abidjan

[26] Flying Officer Hakeem Olayiwola Sarki, Nigerian Air Force. "The ECOWAS: Challenge of Sustainable Peace in the Sub-Region-The Journey so far." A Thesis submitted to the UN peace operations training Institute in the partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of certificate of training peace support operations (COTIPSO) at Armed Forces Command and Staff College, (AFCSC), Jaji, Nigeria undated. Pp.72-74.@http://www.peaceopstraining-org/theses/sarkipdf. Accessed on 23/o3/11.

and the Lome Agreement, signed on 1 November 2002 in Lome, Togo. The peace effort leading to the brokering of both agreements were led by Cheikh Tidiane Gadio, Foreign Minister of Senegal, and Gnassigbe Eyadema of Togo respectively. The Abijan ceased fire agreement paved the way for further negotiations and the signing of the Lome peace agreement. Other accords and ceased fire agreements brokered, include the Linas-Marcoussis accord (January, 2003), Accra (March,2003), Accra (July,2004), Pretoria (April, 2005) and Pretoria (June, 2005). President Gbagbo's original mandate as president expired on October 30, 2005 but due to lack of disarmament, it was deemed impossible to hold an election and therefore his term in office was extended for a maximum of one year according to a plan worked out by the African Union, this plan was endorsed by the United Nations Security Council. With the late October deadline approaching in 2006, it was regarded as very unlikely that the election would be held that time, and the opposition and the rebels rejected the possibility of another term extension of Gbagbo's term on November 1, 2006, however, resolution provided for the strengthening of Prime Minister Charles Konan Banny's powers. Gbagbo said the next day that elements of the resolution deemed to be constitutional violations would not be applied. A peace deal between the government and the rebels, or 'New process' was signed on March 4, 2007 and subsequently Guillaume Soro, leader of the 'New Forces', became Prime Minister. These events have been seen by some observers as substantially strengthening Gbagbo's position.[27]

Although, African leaders failed miserably in their bid to resolve the conflict that emerged after the Madagascar elections early that year, the current interest and resolve to come to grips with the Ivorian situation become therefore very heartwarming.[28] What make the present circumstance so stimulating is the resolve of both Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and African Union to push ahead with their new-found desire of riding the continent of poor governance, coups and corruption among others. It also falls in line with their aversion for undemocratic institutions and governments and to champion their commitment to the defence of democracy, good governance and the rule of law. These concerns are explicitly enshrined in the version of the New Partnership for Africa's

[27] Gebrie, Lamsana and Addo, "*Prosper: Challenges of Peace Implementation in Cote d'Ivoire*." Workshop Report, Institute of Security Studies, ISS (Monograph Series No. 105,, August, 2004.
[28] See Problem Tests Africa's Resolve (2002)
@http://www.newsfromafrica.org/newsfromafrica/articles/art825.html. Accessed on 25/09/11.

Development (NEPAD) being forged by African leaders in collaboration with their development partners. The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), adopted by African leaders in 2001, places strong emphasis on achieving the political conditions necessary to help sustain the continent's development. "African leaders", say NEPAD "have learnt from their own experiences that peace, security, democracy, good governance, human rights and sound economic management are conditions for sustainable development. They are making a pledge to work both individually and collectively to promote these principles in their countries, sub-region and the continent."[29]

NEPAD recognizes not only that peace and security can create more favourable conditions for development but also that greater development and reduced poverty can in turn make armed conflict less likely. Long-term condition for ensuring peace and security in Africa require policy measures to address the political and social vulnerabilities on which conflict is premised.

The African continent remains despicably volatile. It is already swirling with hundreds of thousands of refugees from earlier wars in Sierra Leone and Liberia. Even within the otherwise nominal peaceful states, internal conflicts as well as ethnic and religious sentiments are fanning a trend with the potential of tearing these countries apart.

Until recently, Cote D'Ivoire used to be a peace haven, stability and prosperity in the continent. It showcased how stability could lead to prosperity, but this has now been gravely undermined due largely to military insurgency which began in 1999. That was the first time that the country tested the bitter pill associated with the removal of many governments in the continent.[30]

The conflict which began on September 19, 1999 has thrown the country into a bloodbath with ethnic clashes between the people in the south and northerners. It has also pitted political activists against their perceived foes. General Guei, military ruler from December, 1999 to October, 2000 was

---

[29] African Recovery now Called African Renewal, Vol.17, No.3(October, 2003) P.9@http://www.un.org/ecosocdev/genifo/afrec,vol17no3peace.htm,Accessed on 25/09/11.
[30] Ibid.

killed during the action by government forces to suppress the uprising. Guei, had earlier been accused of involvement in the uprising which has brought death to the streets of Abijan, Bouake and the northern town of Korhogo. Guei staged the first and only successful coup d'eta in the country's history in 1999. Until then, it had never experienced military rule. The coup had since changed Ivoirian politics by politicizing soldiers, who got a taste for power. Since then, each year, Cote d'Ivoire has experienced an uprising or attempted coup of some sort.

The uprising which started in Ivory Coast on 19 September has been called both coup and a mutiny. The soldiers who took up arms against the government denied that it was a coup. They claimed that they were fighting against dictatorship and ill-treatment. More than 750 soldiers started the conflict in protest against the decision of the government headed by Laurent Gbagbo, to demobilize them from the Ivorian army.[31]
Following the emergency talks held in Accra on September 29 by ECOWAS members and the then African Union Chairman, Thabo Mbeki of South Africa, a six-nation mediation group has since been formed by ECOWAS to mediate in the conflict in order to help find peaceful solution to the crisis. The group has since prevailed upon the rebels to immediately cease all hostilities in order to restore normalcy to the occupied towns. The emergency meeting provided African Union with an opportunity to protect constitutional governments and help advance democracy in the continent. The opening statements by ECOWAS Chairman, president Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal, who advocated the recourse to dialogue in the bid to resolve the problem and those of the then president Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria who preferred the use of collective military force to crush the rebels were very contrasting. But collectively, it showed that the resort to unconstitutional means to stake a claim to political power on the Africa continent is outmoded, unjustifiable and therefore unacceptable now. Indeed, such disruptions to the constitutional order, many believed, must be rejected because it is in the supreme interest of the continent and its peoples to do so, particularly within the context of the globalization that Africa is functioning.[32]

The then Ghana's president, John Kufuor says, "it is a matter of great distress to leaders of ECOWAS that Cote d'ivoire is being dragged into what may

[31] Massa Washington: The Crisis in Sierra Leone; The Heart of the Matter.
[32] Ibid.

be unhappily described as the 'West African disease' of coups, mutinies and instability." Kufour is emphatic that Africa cannot hope to develop and join the rest of the advanced world unless and until there is peace in all the component nations. Like Kufuor, the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS, Dr Mohammed Ibn Chambas, says; event in Cote d'Ivoire if uncontrolled, will be a major setback for the implementation of NEPAD in the West African sub-region. NEPAD advocates the building of a culture of democracy, respect for human rights and rule of law as essential conditions for creating stable conditions for sustainable development.

Dr Chambas observed as follows:

> *Today, all our lofty objectives of building peace, stability, democracy and integration in the sub-region so as to better fight poverty and improve the lives of our peoples stand threatened by the escalating violence and disloyal activities of certain elements of the Ivorian army. These rebellious troops are in breach of their sacred oath to protect and defend the constitution of Cote D'ivoire."*[33]

Both the Algiers Declaration of the African Union which was affirmed at the Lome Summit of 2009 and the ECOWAS Protocol on Democracy and Good Governance are emphatic that there will be no recognition for any government which comes to power by unconstitutional means. Dr Chambas advocates for zero tolerance for coups and military interventions saying, Africa must remain steadfast in defending the principle as a demonstration of commitment to build democracy and good governance in the respective countries. 'We must set a clear and unambiguous message out, not only to the rebellious troops, but also, to all the armed forces of our sub-region that the days of coup d'états are gone," he stressed.

---

[33] Ibid.

1.4. AU/NEPAD Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution

It may be recalled that since the turn of the 1980s, there has been a growing understanding among the OAU Member States that the Organization must show more responsiveness to new challenges, particularly in the field of economic integration and development on the one hand and, especially, that of conflict prevention, management and resolution on the other. In the case of the former, the decision was reached in 1991 to house the secretariat of the African Economic Community in the then General Secretariat of OAU. In the case of the latter, the Secretary-General's proposal in 1991 for the creation of a Division for Conflict Management in the Political Department was approved. This proposal was based on the July 1990 "Declaration of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity on the Political and Socio-Economic Situation in Africa and the Fundamental Changes Taking Place in the World", in which the Heads of State and Government reiterated their "... determination to work together towards the peaceful and speedy resolution of all the conflicts" in Africa - both internal and inter-State. Such resolution, they stated, would be "... conducive to the creation of peace and stability in the continent", and would "also have the effect of reducing expenditures on defence and security, thus releasing additional resources for socio-economic development". Indeed, they recognized that it is "only through the creation of stable conditions that Africa can fully harness its human and material resources and direct them to development."[34]

Following this, the then OAU Secretary-General submitted to the fifty-sixth Ordinary Session of the Council of Ministers and the twenty-eighth Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, in Dakar, in June/July 1992, a report entitled "Report of the Secretary-General on conflicts in Africa: Proposals for an OAU mechanism for conflict prevention, management and resolution". That report outlined a number of options on the form and nature of such a mechanism. The Assembly then adopted, in principle, such a mechanism for preventing, managing and resolving conflicts in Africa.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General submitted to the fifty-eighth Ordinary Session of the OAU Council of Ministers and the twenty-ninth Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, in June 1993, in Cairo, yet another report reflecting on all aspects relating to the mechanism,

[34] Ibid.

including institutional and operational details, as well as its financing. The report was entitled "Report of the Secretary-General on the establishment, within OAU, of a mechanism for conflict prevention, management and resolution". On the strength of that report, the Assembly adopted its "Declaration ... on the Establishment, within the OAU, of a Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution"[35].

The adoption of such a mechanism signaled Africa's determination to resolve its own problems. Furthermore, by establishing within OAU a Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, the Heads of State and Government have avowedly given concrete expression to their commitment, made in July 1990, to work together towards the peaceful and speedy resolution of conflicts on the continent. This Mechanism, as provided for by the Declaration establishing it, has in brief the following structure:

It is built around a Central Organ composed of the States which are members of the Bureau of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, the State of the outgoing Chairman and, where known, that of the incoming Chairman, with the Secretary-General and the Secretariat as its operational arm. The Central Organ assumes the overall direction and coordination of the activities of the Mechanism, between Ordinary Sessions of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, and functions at the level of the Heads of State and Ministers as well as that of Ambassadors accredited to OAU now AU or duly authorized representatives;

The Secretary-General, under the authority of the Central Organ and in consultation with the parties involved in the conflict, is mandated to focus efforts on conflict prevention, peace-making and peace-building. Indeed, it is much cheaper to concentrate on diffusing tension and instability than to wait for situations of tension to turn into full-blown conflicts and then rush in to put out the flames of war. Peace-keeping, thus, does not constitute a priority activity for OAU then. However, by force of circumstances, the Organization may be compelled to deploy small-scale peace-keeping operations, mainly of an observer-mission character, as exemplified by the OAU/AU Neutral Military Observer Group which was placed in Rwanda in 1993. In his efforts, the Secretary-General may, in consultation with the authorities of their countries of origin, and relying heavily on their cumulative experience and deep-seated knowledge of the African historical, socio-economic and cultural condition, also resort to the use of eminent African personalities.

---

[35] See Organization of African Unity, Resolving Conflicts in Africa (OAU Information Service), 1993. E/ECA/CM.20/7 P.12.

Where necessary, he may make use of other relevant expertise, send special envoys or special representatives as well as dispatch fact-finding missions to conflict areas;
In addition, within the context of the Mechanism, OAU is expected to closely coordinate its activities with African regional and sub-regional organizations and cooperate, as appropriate, with neighbouring countries with respect to conflicts arising in the different sub-regions of the continent, it being understood that these regional organizations and countries are more familiar with the local issues within the sub-region in question;
Similarly, OAU cooperates and works closely with the United Nations, not only with regard to issues relating to peace-making but and especially, also those relating to peace-keeping. In like manner, the Secretary-General of OAU maintains close cooperation with other international organizations;
Finally, an OAU Peace Fund, governed by the relevant OAU Financial Rules and Regulations, has been established for the purpose of providing financial resources to support exclusively OAU operational activities relating to conflict management and resolution. It will be made up of financial appropriations of 5 per cent of the regular budget of OAU, voluntary contributions from Member States as well as from other sources within Africa. The Secretary-General may, with the consent of the Central Organ, and in conformity with the principles and objectives of the OAU Charter, also accept voluntary contributions from sources outside Africa.
With the establishment of the Mechanism, OAU's capacity to deal with conflicts in Africa has been strengthened and enhanced in order for the Organization to make effective contribution to the cause of peace, security and stability on the continent.[36]

Mention may also be made at this point of the fact that AU/NEPAD, at the invitation of the authorities concerned, has also been involved in election monitoring with the objective of assisting Member States in the peaceful management of change and in the building of democratic cultures and institutions capable of diffusing tensions arising from rival political groups. AU/NEPAD has now established an Electoral Unit within the Political Department, following the July 1990 Declaration already referred to in this chapter, which re-affirmed the right of African States to decide which form of democratic government might be most appropriate for them, given the existing socio-cultural values and current socio-economic realities. Since

[36] Organisation of African Unity, Ibid, E/ECA/CM./20/7.P. 11.

1990, OAU has monitored or observed presidential and parliamentary elections/referenda within 24 Member States.

As regards OAU's involvement in the work of the United Nations, it is to be recalled that cooperation between OAU and the United Nations in all fields, including peace and security, has existed since the establishment of OAU in 1963. Indeed, the OAU Charter stipulates in Article 2 one of the purposes of its establishment as the promotion of "international cooperation, having due regard to the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights". Such cooperation derives its existence not only from the complementarily between the purposes and principles of the two organizations but also on the basis of a number of resolutions and decisions adopted by the respective legislative organs of both organizations. In this connection, special reference may be made to the Cooperation Agreement concluded on 9 October 1990, which provided for mutual cooperation in all fields: political, economic and social, scientific and cultural.

It is the understanding of OAU that the coordination of the efforts of regional organizations with those of the United Nations, in the context of pacific settlement of disputes and the maintenance of international peace and security, as provided for in Article 52 of the Charter of the United Nations, implies that that relationship must be conducted in such a way that the comparative advantage of the regional organization on the one hand, and that of the United Nations on the other, optimally come into play. Thus, though OAU recognizes that the United Nations, being the world body, has the primary responsibility for international peace and security and that it is endowed with greater material and financial resources, OAU brings to such a partnership its political salience as the pre-eminent, continent-wide regional organization in Africa, deriving from its proximity to and better knowledge of local African conflict situations, the shared historical experience and culture of its Member States and the political will to resolve its own problems.

A review of recent developments in Africa clearly demonstrates that the respective roles of AU/NEPAD and the United Nations have been complementary and mutually reinforcing. To this end, special reference may be made to the successful mediation efforts relating to the Liberian conflict jointly conducted by the two organisations through the OAU Eminent Person

and the United Nations Secretary-General's Special Representative, together with the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS whose collective efforts culminated in the signing of a Peace Agreement for Liberia, in Cotonou, Benin, on 25 July 1993, by the parties concerned. In the case of South Africa, Mozambique and Burundi, the observer missions deployed by the two organizations cooperated closely in efforts to facilitate the reduction of political violence and the democratization process in those countries. In the case of Rwanda, the Neutral International Force set up in 1993 by the United Nations to implement the Arusha Peace Agreement on Rwanda incorporated the OAU Neutral Military Observer Group (NMOG II) in its structure, which it found on the ground. As regards Somalia, OAU has fully cooperated with the United Nations in the efforts to bring about an end to the conflict and, in particular, in support of the process of national reconciliation. It has to be noted that President Meles Zenawi of Ethiopia was designated by the OAU Heads of State and Government to facilitate the peace process in that country on behalf of OAU. Indeed, on this issue of coordination, it is pertinent to note that the Mechanism requires OAU to cooperate and work closely with the United Nations not only with regard to issues relating to peace-making but, and especially, also those relating to peace-keeping. Further, where necessary, recourse could be taken to the United Nations to provide the necessary financial, logistical and military support for the OAU's activities relating thereto, in keeping with the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations on international peace and security.[37]

It is also to be noted that although OAU is short of logistical, material and financial resources, it is well disposed to providing, through its Member States, human resources for peace-keeping operations in Africa to add to the efforts deployed by the United Nations.

Furthermore, attention should be drawn to the need to strengthen AU/NEPAD's capacity to deal with conflict situations in Africa. In this respect, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government in their Declaration on the Mechanism directed the Council of Ministers "... in consultation with the Secretary-General, to examine ways and means in which the capacity within the General Secretariat can be built and brought up to a level commensurate with the magnitude of the tasks at hand and the responsibilities expected of the Organization".

[37] Ibid.

Concerning the level of cooperation between AU/NEPAD, on the one hand, and sub-regional organizations on the other, within the context of the AU/NEPAD Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, it must be noted that the establishment of that Mechanism is not aimed at marginalizing those sub-regional organisations and arrangements. On the contrary, AU/NEPAD works in close coordination and cooperation with those sub-regional organizations and arrangements, which it sees as constituting building blocks for its Mechanism. The reasoning behind that cooperation is that the interrelationship between human rights, democracy, security stability and development in Africa necessitates effective networking and cooperative action between AU/NEPAD and the sub-regional groupings. Those groupings are at close proximity with conflict situations; they have innate knowledge of the local conflict situations; they have shared historical experience and culture; and they have the political will to resolve their local problems because being in the region of the conflict, they too, in one way or the other, can be affected.

Two recent examples may help. Firstly, OAU's cooperative action in Liberia through its Eminent Person in the name of Professor Canaan Banana of Zimbabwe was not aimed at supplanting ECOWAS but rather supplementing the commendable efforts of that sub-regional grouping. Similarly, under the flag of OAU and through H.E. Mr. Daniel Arap Moi, President of Kenya, the conflict in the Sudan is now being addressed by the Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development (IGADD).[38]

It should be noted that the main focus of the existing sub-regional groupings in Africa is economic development. However, quarrels, disputes and conflicts within and even between the member States of those sub-regional groupings have slowed down their pace of integration. For those sub-regional organizations to serve as useful instruments for a conflict management network in Africa, they need to be properly structured for such a role. There is, therefore, the need to identify specific and cost-effective ways to assist sub-regional organizations in their efforts to enhance their capacity to maintain peace, security and stability within their respective member States.

---

[38] See http://www.uneca.org/ecaresources/major eca website Conference of Ministers/20/cm 20.7 e.htm. Accessed on 9th June, 2010.

1.5. Conclusion

The failure of the Organisation of African Unity and previous development programmes to ensure peace and security in Africa has placed high expectation on the African Union and the New Partnership for Africa's Development[39]. NEPAD is said to represent a new development agenda based on partnership with other organisations like African Union, ECOWAS (ECOMOG) and other donor or creditor countries to ensure peace in Africa. The question still remains can peace and security be ensured and maintained in Africa where over 80% of its occupants are living in abject poverty, where there are no good leadership and people are afflicted with various diseases? It is therefore believed that the practice of good governance/ democratic government reduces the occurrence of violent conflicts and ensures peace and security.

Furthermore, African Union and the New Partnership for Africa's Development can do more in terms of ensuring peace and security in Africa if our teaming youths can be gainfully employed and there is remarkable improvement in the provision of social amenities in our continent. Various African countries must seriously tackle security challenges facing them like terrorism, proliferation of arms, poverty, unemployment, corruption, bad governance, neocolonialism, military incursion, diseases like HIV/AIDs and other forms of impediments to good governance. If this is not done, most of African's resources will be expended on peace and security which will eventually be a mirage to accomplish.

[39] Akokpari, J.K. "The AU, NEPAD and the Promotion of Good Governance in Africa." Nordic Journal of African Studies, University of Cape Town, South Africa, 13 (3) 2004, pp. 243-263.