

**AN ALYSIS OF PEACEKEEPING STRATEGIES IN AFRICA: THE CASE OF THE
AFRICAN UNION MISSION IN SOMALIA (AMISOM)**

**BY
AMADI ISHAHILIDZA AMADI**

G52/81075/2012

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS IN
INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT MANANGEMENT (ICM) TO THE INSTITUTE OF
DIPLOMACY AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (IDIS), UNIVERSITY OF
NAIROBI**

SEPTEMBER 2014

DECLARATION

This project is my original work and has not been submitted for another Degree in any other University

Signature

Date.....

Amadi Ishahilidza Amadi

This project has been submitted for examination with my permission as University Supervisor

Signature.....

Date.....

Dr. Ibrahim Farah

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It could not be possible to undertake and conclude these studies and the project without the will of God. I therefore thank God for availing the opportunity, blessings, good health and the enabling environment. Further, I recognize the efforts of the lecturers at the faculty who toiled to generate the right material to enrich my understanding of the nature of conflicts in the international environment and its management. I extend my sincere appreciation to all of them. To generate this project, it required a lot of wisdom, modeling and guidance. I wish to register my sincere thanks to my supervisor, Dr Ibrahim Farah, for his wisdom, timeliness and invaluable input that contributed not only to the backbone of the project but to the wider understanding of ICM and its application in the municipal and global setting.

The Institute of Diplomacy International Studies is an entity that has established itself as a central body in Africa and the globe contributing to education and understanding of diplomacy and international relations to guarantee cooperation between nations and the civilized community of the world pursuance of peace and security. I am proud to be a student and a beneficiary of the wealth of knowledge and experience residing in the institute. I salute the institute.

DEDICATION

To my parents Daniel Etema Amadi and Diana Musamuku Inyanya.

ABSTRACT

This study explored the peacekeeping strategies in Africa with a special emphasis to AMISOM in Somalia. The main objective of this Research Paper was to understand and examine the main aspects and challenges facing AMISOM. The study employed qualitative approach and sought to cover the exploratory, descriptive and explanatory elements of the research process. The first part of the study gives a background of AMISOM intervention in Somalia conflicts. The second part provides details of the theoretical overview of peacekeeping by different authors, it covers peace enforcement, peacekeeping, humanitarian intervention and complex mission concepts. In the third part, the Somalia conflict, Africa peace and security framework, and the role of third party actors in Somalia conflict are discussed. Lastly, the fourth part of the paper presents a critical analysis of AMISOM peacekeeping strategies, challenges and opportunities.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFS	-	African Stand by Force
AIDS	-	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
AMISOM	-	African Mission in Somalia
APF	-	African Peace Facility
APSA	-	African Peace and Security Architecture
ARPCT	-	Alliance for the Restoration of Peace and Counter- Terrorism
ARS	-	Alliance for the Re-liberation of Somalia
ARS-A		Alliance for Re- Liberation of Somalia- Asmara
ARS-D	-	Alliance for Re- Liberation of Somalia- Djibouti
AU	-	African Union
BBC	-	British Broadcasting Corporation
CARE	-	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
COMESA	-	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CRD	-	Centre for Research and Dialogue
CVDF	-	Captured and Voluntary Disengaged Fighters
DRC	-	Democratic Republic of Congo
ECOWAS	-	Economic Community of African State
ENDF	-	Ethiopian National Defense Forces (ENDF)
EU	-	European Union
EU.NAVFAR- Atlanta-		European Naval Force Somalia- Operation Atlanta
FAO	-	Food and Agriculture Organization
G8	-	The Group of Eight
HIV	-	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ICISS		International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty
ICU	-	Islamic Courts Union
IEDs	-	Improvised Explosive Devices
IGAD	-	Intergovernmental Authority on Development

IGASOM	-	IGAD Peace Support Mission in Somalia
IR	-	International Relations
KDF	-	Kenya Defense Forces
NATO	-	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGOs	-	Non -governmental Organizations
OAU	-	Organization of Africa Unity
OCHA	-	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OLMEE	-	OAU Liaison Mission in Ethiopia Eritrea
ONUMOZ	-	United Nations Operations in Mozambique
OXFAM	-	Oxford Committee for Famine Relief
PKO	-	Peace Keeping Operations
PSC	-	Peace and Security Council
R2P	-	Responsibility to Protect
RECS	-	Regional Economic Community
SADC	-	Southern African Development Community
SC	-	Security Council
TB	-	Tuberculosis
TCCs	-	Troop Contributing Countries
TFG	-	Transition Federal Government
TFG	-	Transitional Federal Government
TNG	-	Transitional National Government
UK	-	United Kingdom
UN	-	United Nations
UN DPKO	-	United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations
UN PKO	-	United Nations Peace Keeping Operations
UNDP	-	United Nations Development Programme
UNEF	-	United Nations Emergency Force
UNOSOM	-	United Nations Operation in Somalia
UNPOS	-	United Nations Political Office for Somalia
UNSC	-	United Nations Security Council

UNSOA	-	United Nations support Office for AMISON
UNTAG	-	United Nations Transition Assistance Group
US	-	United States
USA	-	United States of America
USAID	-	United States Agency for International Development
USSR	-	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WFP	-	World Food Programme
WHO	-	World Health Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	7
1.3 Objective of the Study	8
1.4 Hypothesis	8
1.5 Justification of the Study	8
1.6 Literature Review	9
1.6.2 The Concept of Peacekeeping.....	10
1.6.3 Origins and Early Development of Peacekeeping.....	16
1.6.4 A People Centered Peacekeeping Approach.....	17
1.6.5 The Responsibility to Protect (R2P).....	22
1.6.6 The R2P Verge for Military Intervention	22
1.7 Theoretical Framework	24
1.8 Research Methodology.....	25
1.9 Chapters Outline.....	26
CHAPTER TWO: PEACEKEEPING STRATEGIES IN AFRICA: AN OVERVIEW	27
2.0 Introduction.....	27
2.1 Peace Operations	27
2.2 Approaches to Peace Keeping	28
2.2.1 Humanitarian Intervention.....	28
2.2.2 Social Order necessitated by State	29
2.2.3 Westphalia Privilege as Universalism	34
2.3.1 African Peace and Security Framework	38
2.3.2 The African Union Protocol on Peace and Security.....	43
2.4 The Role of AMISOM in Peace Keeping.....	46
2.5 Challenges facing AMISOM	49
2.6 Conclusion	51
CHAPTER THREE: PEACEKEEPING STRATEGIES IN AFRICA: THE CASE OF THE AFRICAN UNION MISSION IN SOMALIA (AMISOM)	52
3.1 Introduction.....	52
3.2 External Actors in the Somali Conflict	52

3.3 The Role of State and Non-State Actors in Peace Keeping.....	53
3.3.1 Eritrea	53
3.3.2 Ethiopia.....	54
3.3.3 Djibouti, the Sudan, Kenya and Yemen	56
3.3.4 The United Nations (UN)	57
3.3.5 The African Union, IGAD and the Arab League.....	58
3.3.6 Non-Regional External Powers.....	59
3.3.7 Non-State Actors.....	61
3.4 Conclusion.....	62
CHAPTER FOUR: PEACEKEEPING STRATEGIES IN AFRICA; A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF AMISOM AND ITS WORK IN SOMALIA.....	63
4.1 Introduction.....	63
4.2 Emerging Issues	63
4.2.1 The role of history in Somali Conflict.....	63
4.2.2 Realities and Challenges of AU military intervention.....	67
4.3 Other Strategic challenges	70
4.3.1 Scurity Challenges.....	70
4.3.2 Internal Coordination.....	76
4.3.3 Initial International pessimism	79
4.3.4 Strategic coordination among external partners.....	80
4.3.5 Problematic local partners.....	84
4.3.6 Al-Shabaab: A challenging enemy.....	88
4.3.7 Lack of Exit Strategy.....	92
4.4 Opportunities and a Challenges for AMISOM in Enhancing Security.....	93
4.4.1 Challenges.....	94
4.4.2 Opportunities.....	98
4.5 Conclusion	104
CONCLUSION	106
5.1 Summary.....	106
5.2 Key Findings.....	110
5.3 Recommendations	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY	113

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

Whereas the origin of peacekeeping missions exist in Africa referencing the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) following the Suez crisis in 1956 closely followed by the Congo crisis leading to the formation of the United Nations Organization in the Congo (UNOC) in 1960 and then other missions to date,¹ there have little efforts in generation of strategies for African peacekeeping operations. Consequently there is no threshold or standards, other than UN guidelines², to guide for peacekeeping missions in the emerging conflict environment on the continent. Peacekeeping in Africa has been mainly a United Nations Security Council (UNSC) strategy³ which, except in a few cases, has inspired Africanism in its design, approach and implementation. The trend of the developed world to consign the African affairs to the bottom of the ranking order gives credence for the establishment of Peacekeeping architecture for Africa with associated retinue of policies, strategies and resource capital. The developing peacekeeping strategies in Africa are informed and motivated by the standalone intervention of peace enforcement operations in Liberia and Sierra Leone by ECOMOG, several IGAD efforts to intervene in Somalia and subsequently by OAU Liaison Mission in Ethiopia Eritrea (OLMEE) then hybrid AU/UN missions namely African Mission to Burundi (AMIB), United Nation African Mission to Darfur (UNAMID) and African Mission to Somalia (AMISOM).⁴ These developments in peacekeeping have

¹ UN Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines PDF
pbpu.unlb.org/PBPS/Library/Capstone_Doctrine_ENG.pdf

² Ibid

³ Human Security Centre. "The Human Security Report 2005"

⁴ Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations". United Nations.

occasioned unique peacekeeping strategies and structures to adapt to the changing environment for international peace and security though peculiar to African environment. Considerably the shape and styling of African conflicts revolve and gravitate around ethno politics, ethno government and ethno institutions of power coupled with inequality in the distribution of natural resource leading to irregular type of conflicts inviting unique methodologies in its mitigation and strategies for peacekeeping.⁵ These developing challenges and gaps have motivated AU under its organ of AU peace and security to craft African Standby Force (ASF) taking on the regional block structures to provide it with the necessary capacity and capability to respond to the emerging regional and continental conflicts and the accompanying peacekeeping mechanisms. The standby force projects to establish five standby lists on the continent, each with about 5,000 troops, 720 police officers and 60 civilians.⁶ The ASF is envisioned to respond to six different crisis scenarios ranging from small-scale observation at one end of the range to active military intervention at the other end.⁷ These arrangements will espouse peacekeeping strategies to address matters peculiar to each region similar to that obtaining in the Horn of Africa especially the Somali conflict.⁸ Concerning Somalia conflict and AMISOM, in March 2005, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) accepted to shoulder responsibility for fielding a peacekeeping mission in Somalia on behalf of the African Union (AU) and in support of the peace process in the country. In March 2006 the IGAD efforts of deploying a peacekeeping mission in Somalia were considered to have failed, a confirmation that was made by the then Kenya's foreign affairs minister, who mentioned three specific reasons for the failure to field the peacekeeping operation: "*a fragmented political approach; the lack of funding; and the*

⁵ Bureš, Oldřich (June 2006). "Regional Peacekeeping Operations: Complementing or Undermining the United Nations Security Council?". *Global Change, Peace & Security* 18 (2)

⁶ Fortna, Virginia Page (2004). "Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War". *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (2): 269–292.

⁷ Ibid

⁸ Ibid

existence of a UN arms embargo on Somalia". Throughout 2006, IGAD members continued pursuing solutions to these problems until the African Union (AU) assumed direct responsibility for the peacekeeping mission and fielded the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) in January 2007. The aim of this paper is to analyze the peacekeeping strategies in Africa in general and Somalia in particular considering the challenges IGAD faced. The development and assigning of the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) should be understood in the context of the unrelenting failure to deploy IGASOM after the March 2006 IGAD meeting. IGAD did not abandon IGASOM post March 2006 but continued to seek ways to solve its problems and deploy contingents to Somalia. The United Nations on the other hand, did not exhibit tangible interest in Somalia conflict especially given the views of the UNSG Mr. Ban Ki-moon in 2007 that "deploying UN peacekeepers to Somalia was neither realistic nor practical".⁹ Nonetheless, the worsening of the Somali peace process, increased Western backing for a peacekeeping mission, and the inability of IGAD to solve IGASOM's problems combined to give birth to AMISOM.¹⁰ March 2006 witnessed an increase in the Somali civil war. Western states, in particularly the United States, were concerned about the growing strength of the Islamic Courts Union (ICU), an alliance of Islamic-based factions, which reportedly harbored terrorists including those who bombed the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998. The United States also avowed that the ICU maintained ties with the Al-Qaeda terrorist network. In response, the United States funded a second alliance of Somali factions known as the Alliance for the Restoration of Peace and Counter-Terrorism (ARPCT) established in February 2006. Street fighting escalated in March 2006 as the ICU initiated a more aggressive offensive against its rivals. By early June 2006, the

⁹ Pushkina, Darya (June 2006). "A Recipe for Success? Ingredients of a Successful Peacekeeping Mission". *International Peacekeeping* 13 (2): 133–149.

¹⁰ Ibid

ARPCT were on the retreat and the ICU confirmed that it held the upper hand in Mogadishu and other areas outside the capital. The collapse of the political situation in Somalia meant bantam opportunity existed for the deployment of a peacekeeping mission in support of the peace process.¹¹ By July 2006, Ethiopia grew increasing concern with the movement of ICU military forces along its border and opted, with United States backing, to vigorously intervene in the Somali civil war in support of the factions opposed to the ICU. Ethiopia began discussions with the TFG to deploy troops into Somalia in order to protect the fledgling Somali national government and counter the rapidly growing presence of the ICU.¹² Repeated calls for the deployment of IGASOM arose in September as a means to protect and assist the TFG until it could muster enough strength to assume a greater role in the country and counter the ICU.¹³ In the same month the AU renewed its backing for IGASOM. Despite the symbolic political support, the factors behind IGASOM's failure to deploy by March 2006 existed six months later.¹⁴ Subsequent to the AU meeting, the ICU moved its troops southward to seize the southern port of Kismayo and seal the border with Kenya due to concerns that IGAD peacekeepers might cross the border from Kenya. Ethiopian clashes with the ICU intensified during September and October 2006 as the turmoil and Somalia continued. Notwithstanding the AU's renewed call in September for a deployment of IGASOM to support the TFG, the problems alluded to by IGAD in March 2006 remained unsolved. The situation changed in December 2006 when Ethiopian troops crossed the border in a large scale raid of Somalia to counter the ICU. The UN provided an unequivocal authorization for IGASOM and partly lifted the arms embargo as Western states offered

¹¹ Barry Posen, "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict," in Michael E. Brown, ed., *Ethnic Conflict and International Security* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 103-125.

¹² Ibid

¹³ Ibid

¹⁴ Dersso, S. (2010) 'The Role and Place of the African Standby Force within the African Peace and Security Architecture', *ISS Paper 209*, January 2010, Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies.

greater support for the mission.¹⁵ The authorization for IGASOM also declared that states bordering Somalia should not take part in the mission. This statement in the resolution was a move to help maintain the neutrality of IGASOM and fundamentally an attempt to keep Ethiopian soldiers from officially deploying with IGASOM as an IGAD member since that state was already fighting the ICU. Eritrea, another IGAD member and strong ICU supporter already opposed IGASOM so there was little concern over an interest in Asmara in joining the operation. Consequently, the resolution officially prevented Kenya and Djibouti from participating in IGASOM leaving only Sudan and Uganda as IGAD members eligible for involvement in the peacekeeping mission.

1.1.1 Overview of AMISOM

AMISOM's actual birth can be traced to January 2007 when the AU's Peace and Security Council voted to assume the mandate and responsibility from IGAD for a peacekeeping mission in Africa. Moving the mandate from IGAD to the AU was a result of needing greater African military involvement in the operation.¹⁶ The UN presented its authorization in Security Council Resolution 1725 (2006) for non-IGAD African states to contribute forces to IGASOM in recognition of the few IGAD members available for deploying delegations. In recognition of this statement, the AU assumed responsibility for a peacekeeping mission in Somalia on 19 January 2007 and officially mandated the operation.¹⁷ The AU by this action officially opened the peacekeeping operation to all AU members and not just those of IGAD. Members of IGAD officially backed the transfer of responsibility to the AU on 28 January. Nevertheless, this left one possible legal technicality, the United Nations authorization of December 2006 explicitly named IGAD and IGASOM in reference to a peacekeeping

¹⁵ Ibid

¹⁶ Karen Ballentine, Heiko Nitzschke, *'Beyond Greed and Grievance: Policy Lessons from Studies in the Political Economy of Armed Conflict.'* The PA Policy Report, October 2003.

¹⁷ Ibid

mission in Somalia. To remove any possible question of international authorization, Resolution 1744 (2007) was approved by the UN Security Council on 20 February 2007. In the same resolution, the UN provided a specific partial exemption to the 1992 arms embargo for AMISOM. A small advance element of Ugandan peacekeepers arrived in Somalia on March 2007 and was quickly followed by a battalion sized unit under the banner of AMISOM.

The AU's founding documents foresee an organization empowered to play a major role in resolving Africa's armed conflicts. The former chairperson of the AU Commission, Alpha Oumar Konare, described the AU's advent as a shift from the old norm of "noninterference" in armed conflicts to a new stance of "non indifference" to member states internal affairs.¹⁸ The AU's member states, bureaucrats, and external donor states are building a set of institutions and instruments—commonly referred to as the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA)—that enables the AU to play a much greater role in conflict management. Compared to its predecessor, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), there has been an enormous change in the new union's ambition, the tempo of its peace operations and conflict management initiatives, and its embrace of new and controversial political values.¹⁹

Closing capability gaps in the AU's conflict management portfolio requires both political commitment and technical reform across a variety of issue areas. Technical reforms are urgently needed to strengthen the AU Commission, particularly its Peace Support Operations Division and the Peace and Security Council's secretariat; to enrich the AU's capacity to

¹⁸ Nowrojee Binaifer. 2004. "Africa on its own: Regional intervention and human rights." *Human Rights Watch World Report*

¹⁹ Magosi, Peter, Col. 2007. "What are the challenges facing the future of African Standby Force?" Thesis, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania

undertake effective early warning and response, mediation initiatives, as well as targeted sanctions; and to guarantee the African Standby Force becomes genuinely operational. Such reforms will only succeed, however, if complemented by more proactive and sustained high-level political support. Most urgently, the AU's senior leadership need to forge a strong and creative relationship with the UN's new Office to the African Union and encourage more AU member states to develop and prioritize their own peacekeeping and mediation skills.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The UNSC has played an important role in in mediating peace agreements and assisting in their implementation, helping to reduce the level of conflict in several regions particularly in Africa. Nevertheless, some of those operations failed to take grip. This has resulted in unembellished internally displaces persons (IDPs) and refugee problems further complicating the security situation in and around such conflict areas. Statistics indicate that roughly half of all countries that emerge from war lapse back into violence within five years due to some challenges. Most of the conflicts in Africa have shown a contagious trend and thus have spill-over effects to other nations while new ones are also unfolding. The case of Somalia opens totally a new dimension to PKO given the complexity of the problem in Somalia: piracy, terrorism, collapsed government system and diverse humanitarian situation. Additionally, players in the processes may have vested interests impeding the peace process. The endless conflicts in Africa cry out for peace keeping intervention. This research paper mainly tries to examine the strategies of peace keeping intervention waged by the AU under AMISOM and the main security challenges to its activities in Somalia.

1.3 Objective of the Study

The main objective of this research project is to examine peacekeeping strategies in Africa; and with a case study of the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM). More specifically, the study aims to:

- i. Establish the challenges facing AMISOM in its peace-keeping mission in Somalia;
- ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies adopted by AMISOM in Somalia;
- iii. Assess the role of international actors, States and Non-State Actors (NSAs) in peace-keeping mission in Africa.

1.4 Hypotheses

The study tested the following hypotheses:

- i) There are more challenges than opportunities for AMISOM operations in Somalia;
- ii) The strategies adopted by AMISON are not as effective compared with other peace-keeping missions in Africa;
- iii) International actors as well as Non-State Actors (NSAs) have played a significant role in AMISOM's operations in Somalia.

1.5 Justification of the Study

This paper tries to understand and examine the security and political situation in Somalia with a focus on post-Ethiopian occupation of the country which was followed by the peace-keeping deployment of AMISOM. There has been a growing interest to study Somalia for varied reasons: Somalia has become a play-ground of different political forces including international organizations like the AU, the US as 'imperial' power, Ethiopia (playing the role of a regional 'power'), the Al Shabaab and many other actors engaged in the conflict in one way or the other. The players' interests and influences differ according to the changing context and the scope of their engagement. The ability to attain sustainable peace in Somalia

carries a range of policy implications at both local and international levels. However, there are diverse problems surrounding the existence of AMISOM. This study therefore contributes to the growing body of knowledge on the capabilities of the international community to extend protection to populations in the so-called “failed state” environments. The study also adds to the larger study of peacekeeping operations by providing a redefinition of peacekeeping practice that can be reviewed and compared to similar studies. These broader lessons are deemed to be important to the dialogue on Chapter VI and Chapter VII peacekeeping operations and humanitarian intervention.

1.6 Literature Review

This section presents a review of the related literature on the subject under study as presented by various researchers, scholars, analysts and authors. The research has drawn materials from books and journal articles, which are closely related to the theme and the objectives of the study. Models by writers are used as illustrations on some of the subtopics mentioned in the objectives of the study. The relevant concepts that will be used in the analysis – peace enforcement, peacekeeping, humanitarian intervention and complex mission- are described and the relationship between them established. This is followed by a section that aims to demonstrate that liberal and instrumentalist peacekeeping theorists share a number of AU peacekeeping assumptions.

1.6.1 The Concept of Peacekeeping

Peacekeeping comprises the coordinated presence of military, police and civilian personnel responsible for a wider range of task such as humanitarian assistance, policing, human rights and electoral monitoring, social and economic restoration and reconstruction.²⁰ There are the

²⁰ Kofi Annan, ‘Peace Operations and the UN’, paper delivered at Conflict Resolution Monitor 1, Centre for Conflict Resolution, Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford, (1997) pp. 25-32.

traditional and multidimensional peacekeeping operations. Although it is an activity undertaken by many different actors, peacekeeping history and development is intimately tied to the UN. Indeed, it is often seen as being synonymous with UN operations.²¹ “Peacekeeping, in all its facades, reflects a desire to limit the scourge of war”. Nonetheless, given the many differing conceptions concerning the nature and causes of violent conflict and variable levels of political will to address these matters, debate about what peacekeeping is for and what strategies should be adopted continue to rage.²²

Peacekeeping cuts to the core of many concerns which lie at the heart of our modern society and purportedly matter a great deal to the world’s major powers – peace and security; justice; state sovereignty and political independence; socio-economic development; and, human rights – and is therefore somewhat debated. An Indian Army while taking part in a peacekeeping operation notes *“in spite of several efforts, the term ‘peacekeeping’ has still not been formally defined. This lack of clear definition provides a measure of elasticity that serves political and operational purposes. But, there are corresponding disadvantages in that the term can be slackly used and vaguely understood”*.²³

The conventional peacekeeping operation was developed during the Cold War era as a means to resolve conflicts between states. It was by deploying not heavily armed military personnel from a number of countries, under UN command, between the armed forces of the former belligerent parties.²⁴ The accords could be called in when the major international powers tasked the UN with bringing to and end conflicts threatening regional stability and

²¹Bellamy, A.J., Williams, P. & Griffin. 2004. *Understanding Peacekeeping*. Cambridge: Polity Press. pp. 15-23.

²² Ibid.

²³Rikhye, I.J. 1984. *The Theory and Practice of Peacekeeping*. London: C. Hurst & Co.

²⁴ Kofi Annan, ‘Peace Operations and the UN’, paper delivered at Conflict Resolution Monitor 1, Centre for Conflict Resolution, Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford, (1997) pp. 25-32.

international peace and security.²⁵ Peacekeepers were deployed when a truce was in place and the parties to the conflict had given their consent. UN troops observed from the ground and reported impartially on adherence to the truce, troop withdrawal or other elements of the peace agreement. This gave time and breathing space for diplomatic efforts to address the fundamental causes of a conflict. An example of this was the UNEF operation in response to invasion of Egypt by Israel, France and UK in 1956.²⁶

The end of the Cold War prompted a paradigm shift in the UN and brought about the multidimensional peacekeeping in a new spirit of cooperation. In the multidimensional peacekeeping, the Security Council established larger and more complex UN PKOs, often to help implement inclusive peace agreements between protagonists in intra-state conflicts. The UN DPKO was created in 1992 to support this growing demand for complex peacekeeping.²⁷ Example of this was UNTAG which was the first of such missions and a resounding success.²⁸ The success has been documented to be due to the full cooperation of the warring parties, the contributory support of the UNSC and the timely provision of the necessary financial resources.²⁹

Another illustration of multidimensional PKO was ONUMOZ. The then UNSG described the accomplishment of its mandate as an outstanding achievement.³⁰ A number of factors contributed to its success, among them being the strong commitment to peace and reconciliation demonstrated by the Mozambican people and their leaders. Other factors

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ 'United Nations Peacekeeping an Indispensable Weapon in International Community's Arsenal Secretary-General Says in Anniversary Message of First Mission' pasted as www.un.org

²⁷ Ibid

²⁸ Liu FT, *The History of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Following the Cold War: 1988 to 1997* (New York: UNITARPOCI, 1998) p. 13.

²⁹ Ibid

³⁰ Ibid

included the clarity of the ONUMOZ mandate, the consistent support provided by the UNSC and the international community's significant political, financial and technical support for the peace process. ONUMOZ represented an example of what could be achieved through the UN when all forces join together towards a common goal.

Maj Gen Lawrence Onoja speaking on the conduct of peacekeepers emphasizes that *“UN forces must above all behave in such a way as not to take part in a conflict. It must not be used either to protect certain positions or one of the parties or to oblige one part to accept a certain political result or to influence the political balance.”*³¹

From the above literature, it can be said that the concept of peacekeeping was born out of necessity as an improvised response on the part of the international community to address conflict.³² Marten³³ points out that, the concept of peacekeeping does not appear in the Charter of the United Nations and it was only in 1965, after eight peacekeeping missions had already been deployed by the UN that the term was finally formalized with the establishment of the UN's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.³⁴

The concept has evolved so considerably over the course of its history and has therefore been used as somewhat of a 'catch-all' or umbrella term for an exceptionally wide spectrum of activities. Bellamy³⁵ pinpoints five different 'types' of peacekeeping operation, each conceptualized independently of one another. These are: traditional peacekeeping; managing

³¹Lawrence AOnojaMaj Gen, Peacekeeping and International Security in a Changing World, (Jos: Mono Expressions Ltd, 1996) p.91.

³²United Nations. 1996. The Blue Helmets: a Review of United Nations Peace-keeping. 3rd Edition. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information.

³³Marten, K.Z. 2004. Enforcing the Peace: Learning From the Imperial Past. New York: Columbia University Press.

³⁴Rikhye, I.J. 1984. The Theory and Practice of Peacekeeping. London: C. Hurst & Co.

³⁵Bellamy, A.J., Williams, P. & Griffin. 2004. Understanding Peacekeeping. Cambridge: Polity Press.

transition; wider peacekeeping; peace enforcement; and, peace-support operations. Other scholars seek to distinguish in broad terms between first and second generation peacekeeping conducted during and after the Cold War respectively. Francis, Faal, Kabia & Ramsbotham³⁶ Richmond³⁷ reconnoiters the concept further and includes the recent development of so-called “third generation quasi-enforcement” operations to the collection or definitions. Furthermore, Wiseman³⁸ traces the development of the concept through five separate phases: the nascent phase, the assertive phase, the dormant phase, the resurgent phase, and the maintenance phase.

The UN³⁹ documents that “over the years, peacekeeping has evolved from a primarily military model ... to incorporate a complex model of many elements ... working together to lay the foundation for sustainable peace”. Other authors echo the UN’s stand and they argue that, “categorization also creates the impression that operations had clear, specific objectives” when in reality mandates were, and are, fluid.⁴⁰

1.6.2 Origins and Early Development of Peacekeeping

The tragic loss of life and physical devastation caused by the world war, coupled with the discovery of the atomic bomb, persuaded international leaders that international organization

³⁶Francis, D.J., Faal, M., Kabia, J. & Ramsbotham, A. 2005. *Dangers of Co- Deployment: UN Co-Operative Peacekeeping in Africa*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

³⁷ Richmond, O.P. 2001. *The Limits of UN Multidimensional Peace Operations*. In *The United Nations and Human Security*, Newman, E. & Richmond, O.P. (eds.). New York: Palgrave.

³⁸ Wiseman, H. 1984. *The OAU: Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution*. In *The OAU After Twenty Years*, El-Ayouty, Y. & Zartman, I.W. (eds.). New York: Praeger.

³⁹United Nations. 2008. *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Principles and Guidelines*. [Online]. Available at:

http://pbpu.unlb.org/PBPS/Library/Capstone_Doctrine_ENG.pdf.

⁴⁰O’Niell, J.T. & Rees, N. 2005. *United Nations Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*. Abingdon: Routledge.

was more necessary than ever. Bellamy and Griffin⁴¹ To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, the UN was established with a principle aim of “maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of antagonism or other breaches of the peace”⁴². The United Nation’s overriding concern is that all differences between states be settled by peaceful means as is stated in Article 2.3 that “all members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered”.⁴³

The Security Council is empowered to call upon parties to settle their dispute through negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, or judicial settlement; or to recommend any other appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment with a view to the pacific settlement of the dispute.⁴⁴ The primary objective of the UN was and remains peaceful relations between states. Its founders had foreseen that the organization should nonetheless represent a strong and viable military force capable of combating any threat. The goal at this stage was that the UN “would deploy military power as a forceful instrument in a global system of collective safety”, exercising direct control over international armed forces.⁴⁵

MacQueen⁴⁶ notes that the ambition of a global collective security arrangement was, however, simply unsuited with the bipolarity that came to characterize international relations

⁴¹Bellamy, A.J., Williams, P. & Griffin. 2004. Understanding Peacekeeping. Cambridge: Polity Press.

⁴²United Nations. 1945. Charter of the United Nations. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/>.

⁴³ Ibid

⁴⁴ Ibid

⁴⁵MacQueen, N. 2002. United Nations Peacekeeping in Africa since 1960. Great Britain: Pearson Education.

⁴⁶ Ibid

in the post-war years. It is noted that during the early days of the UN the Cold War between East and West prevented the Security Council from wholly developing and employing its potential to implement the peace. The major stumbling block in this respect was the use of the veto accorded to the five permanent members which blocked a number of such efforts and all but paralyzed the Security Council.⁴⁷

The UN Charter had foreseen that unanimity of purpose, namely the desire to avoid a reoccurrence of the extreme levels of violence and destruction observed during the two World Wars, would provide sufficient political will to empower the organization to keep and enforce the peace when necessary.⁴⁸ The unanimity of purpose soon succumbed to the pressure of rivaling ideological interests. With the world's two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, at opposite ends of this spectrum any hope of viable collective security was severely weakened. In the prevailing circumstances, virtually all crises were viewed through the opposed ideological lenses of the two sides and neither consensus nor cooperation could be realized.⁴⁹

Against the backdrop of the above mentioned fiasco the notion of peacekeeping was born. Former UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld, a central figure in the development of the practice, famously described peacekeeping as characterizing Chapter VI and a half of the UN Charter.⁵⁰ The United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) was the first force level mission specifically characterized as a peacekeeping operation.⁵¹

⁴⁷Rikhye, I.J. 1984. *The Theory and Practice of Peacekeeping*. London: C. Hurst & Co.

⁴⁸ Ibid

⁴⁹MacQueen, N. 2002. *United Nations Peacekeeping in Africa since 1960*. Great Britain: Pearson Education.

⁵⁰Francis, D.J., Faal, M., Kabia, J. & Ramsbotham, A. 2005. *Dangers of Co- Deployment: UN Co-Operative Peacekeeping in Africa*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

⁵¹ Ibid

Peacekeeping, as represented by UNEF took a markedly diverse approach to addressing conflict than that of enforcement by means of collective military action. This model is based on three central principles. Namely: the consent of the protagonists to a UN mission, political impartiality on the part of the UN forces, as well as the non-use of armed force except in self-defence.⁵² At the core of this traditional model of peacekeeping is the premise that an impartial presence on the ground can ease tensions between hostile parties and create space for political dialogues to ensue.⁵³ Indeed, peacekeeping allows for fresh avenues towards peace to be explored.⁵⁴

1.6.3 A People Centered Peacekeeping Approach

The practice of peacekeeping can best be labeled as precautions or measures taken to provide security and thus ensure peace. According to the UN Human Development Report ⁵⁵(1994:1), however, “the world will never be secure from war if men and women have no security in their daily lives”. The peculiarity attempting to be drawn at this stage is between goal and method. Integrally, in the debate of peacekeeping is the issue of peace enforcement and the international community’s ‘right’ to intervene in conflict circumstances. The form of intervention referred to here is that for humanitarian drives or in defence of human security mostly. Humanitarian intervention is one of the single most debatable issues in the debate regarding peacekeeping. The practice has courted debate both when it has happened (i.e. Kosovo and Somalia) as well as when it has failed to happen (i.e. Rwanda and Bosnia)⁵⁶.

⁵² Ibid

⁵³United Nations. 2003. Handbook on United Nations Multidimensional Peacekeeping Operations.[Online]. Available at: <http://www.peacekeepingbestpractices.unlb.org>.

⁵⁴United Nations. 1996. The Blue Helmets: a Review of United Nations Peace-keeping. 3rd Edition. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information.

⁵⁵ <http://www.un.org>

⁵⁶ International Commission on Intervention and States Sovereignty, The Responsibility to Protect, at VIII (2001), available at <http://www.iciss.ca/report-en.asp>

Inconsistency continues to rage as to whether or not such a right exists, as well as how and when it should be exercised, and under whose authority.⁵⁷

1.6.4 The Responsibility to Protect (R2P)

Whenever there is a debate on sovereignty, an impasse arises on whether sovereignty is a right or a responsibility: The traditional philosophy of “sovereignty as a right”, that has held sway since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, has been that a country’s inside affairs are its own and that other states do not interfere unless it threatens them, or breaches a treaty, or triggers an obligation of alliance. At the conclusion of World War one for what would now be known as ‘crime against humanity’, an illustration of the traditional sovereignty is presented when the United States Secretary of State Robert Lansing who, when declining to take action against the leaders of Germany, Austria and Turkey said “the essence of sovereignty is the absence of responsibility”.⁵⁸ In so concluding, it can be inferred that then, sovereign leaders were immune from prosecution.

Nevertheless, responsible sovereignty requires that states provide the appropriate standard of political goods and services to ensure the protection and well-being of their citizens.⁵⁹ If states refuse to protect its citizens then there is a responsibility by the international community to react. Humanitarian intervention and state sovereignty remained a dilemma for a long time till the year 2000 when the Canadian-sponsored International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) was set up to resolve the dilemma. When the ICISS published its report on the Responsibility to Protect in December 2001, three pillars were developed: prevent, react, and rebuild.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ Ibid

⁵⁸Power, □a Problem from Hell□ America and the Age of Genocide., 14.

⁵⁹Stuart Croft, □International Relations and Africa,□ African affairs 96, no. 385 (1997).

⁶⁰International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), The Responsibility to Protect (Ottawa: IDRC, 2001).

In the view of Gareth Evans, co-chair of ICISS, R2P has made four main contributions to the humanitarian intervention contest: first, turning the focus of the debate from humanitarian intervention to a responsibility to protect people trapped in conflict situations; secondly, developing a new understanding of sovereignty where the state does not control but primarily protects its citizens; thirdly, setting up clear criteria of what the R2P, in practice, should mean, clarifying that it consists of much more than just military intervention; and finally, mandating that if coercive action is seen as necessary, it must be legal and legitimate.⁶¹ It was imperative for the proponents of R2P to sell their idea to the global south especially Africa which had suffered most conflicts.⁶² In 2003, the Constitutive Act of the AU drastically altered Africa's efforts concerning conflict management.⁶³

In September 2005 Kofi Annan opened the largest gathering of world leaders in history at the UN headquarters in New York dubbed "World Summit". By the end of the summit, the Outcome Document, which explicitly endorsed R2P in paragraphs 138 and 139, was adopted with the consent of all heads of states. However, the principle of R2P was restructured from the original ICISS proposal and was divided into two parts. First, the obligation of the state to protect those living within its own borders was emphasized. The second part of R2P addressed the case in which a third-party state fails to protect its own citizens from the threat of mass atrocities within its borders or represents the cause of the threat itself.⁶⁴

⁶¹Gareth Evans, *The Responsibility to Protect: Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and for All* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2008), 41–43.

⁶²Jeremy Sarkin, "The Role of the United Nations, the African Union and Africa's Sub-Regional Organizations in Dealing with Africa's Human Rights Problems: Connecting Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect," *Journal of African Law* 53, no. 1 (2009)

⁶³Paul D. Williams, "From Non-Intervention to Non-Indifference: The Origins and Development of the African Union's Security Culture," *African Affairs* 106, no. 423 (2007).

⁶⁴Aidan Hehir, *Humanitarian Intervention After Kosovo: Iraq, Darfur and the Record of Global Civil Society* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008)

The notion that human beings matter more than sovereignty radiated brightly, even though briefly, across the international political horizon of the 1990s. The wars on terrorism and in Iraq – the current obsession both in the United Nations and in the United States⁶⁵ – suggest that the political will for humanitarian intervention evaporated at the outset of the new millennium.⁶⁶

In its 2001 report the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty developed the concept of responsibility to protect with a central theme of an idea that sovereign states have a responsibility to protect their own citizens from avoidable 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.⁶⁷ In other words, while the state has a primary responsibility, the international community has a secondary responsibility to protect civilians from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

December 2004, the idea was taken up in the context of a debate on United Nations reform. Pointing to international responses to the "successive humanitarian disasters," the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change stated in its report *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility* that

There is a growing acceptance that while sovereign Governments have the primary responsibility to protect their own citizens from such catastrophes, when they are unable or unwilling to do so that responsibility should be taken up by *the wider*

⁶⁵Weiss, Thomas G., and Don Hubert. *The Responsibility to Protect: Research, Bibliography, Background*. International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001. Available from <http://www.icissciise.gc.ca/menu-e.asp>.

⁶⁶Ibid

⁶⁷INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERVENTION AND STATE SOVEREIGNTY, *THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT*, at VIII (2001), available at <<http://www.iciss.ca/report-en.asp>>

international community - with it spanning a continuum involving prevention, response to violence, if necessary, and rebuilding shattered societies.⁶⁸

In UN's secretary general report in 2005: "In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All," which emphasized the idea that the security of states and that of humanity are indivisible and that threats facing humanity can be solved only through collective action.⁶⁹

Under the concept of responsibility to protect, matters affecting the life of the citizens and subjects of a state are no longer exclusively subject to the discretion of the domestic ruler but are perceived as issues of concern to the broader international community. This development is part of a growing transformation of international law from a state and governing-elite-based system of rules into a normative framework designed to protect certain human and community interests.

The concept of responsibility to protect has risen quickly from an idea to allegedly legal norm raising some suspicions from a positivist perspective. Successful implementation of the principle of responsibility to protect is still elusive as certain issues remain unresolved: First, the concept of responsibility put forward is not one that entails liability. There are no mechanisms developed to hold governments, or individuals, liable for a failure to protect civilians at risk, and the document is thus silent on the fundamental question of how to deal with violations of the principle to protect. Second, there is the problem of duty allocation: who has to contribute how much to an intervention? Third, since the report is mainly concerned with the responsibility to intervene at the level of *ad bellum*, the responsibility to protect the civilian population at the level of *in bello* remains ambiguous in many respects⁷⁰.

⁶⁸A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility, Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, UN Doc. A/59/565/2004, available at <<http://www.un.org/secureworld/report.pdf>>

⁶⁹In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All, Report of the Secretary-General,

UN Doc. A/59/2005, available at. <<http://www.un.org/largerfreedom/contents.htm>>

⁷⁰CarstenStahn, Responsibility to Protect: Political Rhetoric or Emerging Legal Norm?

In summary the responsibility to protect entails three integral and essential components. First, there exists a responsibility to prevent, by means of addressing both the root causes as well as the direct causes of internal conflicts and other man-made crises threatening populations. Next, there is a responsibility to react. This entails responding to situations of compelling human need with appropriate measures, which may include coercive measures such as sanctions, international criminal prosecution, as well as military force. Finally, the international community bears the responsibility to rebuild: to provide, particularly after a military intervention, full assistance with recovery, reconstruction and reconciliation in order to address the original causes of the crisis and prevent a relapse.⁷¹

The stated alacrity to embrace the concept of humanitarian intervention is reinforced by its inclusion in the recent United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Principles and Guidelines,⁷² otherwise known as the Capstone Doctrine. Indicative of the collective security role originally envisaged for the world body at its inception, the notion of peace enforcement is referred to alongside preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding as an integral component of the broader framework of peace operations. It is conceptualized as “the application, with the authorization of the Security Council, of a range of coercive measures, including the use of military force”⁷³, intended to restore international peace and security in situations where the Security Council has determined the existence of a threat to

(American Society of International Law 2007) accessed from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4149826> .

⁷¹ International Commission on Intervention and States Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect*, at VIII (2001), available at <http://www.iciss.ca/report-en.asp>

⁷²United Nations. 2008. *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Principles and Guidelines*. [Online]. Available at: http://pbpu.unlb.org/PBPS/Library/Capstone_Doctrine_ENG.pdf.

the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression. According to the UN⁷⁴, one should be careful not to confuse robust peacekeeping with peace enforcement.

1.6.5 The R2P Verge for Military Intervention

The original proposal by the ICISS that the ‘just cause threshold’ (large-scale loss of life or large-scale ethnic cleansing) must be met for the responsibility to protect to be carried out by the Council appears to limit the authority and powers of the Council in its determination of what constitutes a ‘threat to the peace’ under Article 39 of the UN Charter. A must, obligation or duty for the Council to execute its responsibility to protect when the R2P threshold or criteria are met, arguably does not conform with *lex lata* and neither could it develop into such a legal duty.⁷⁵

There are many situations in the world where such crimes occur, and it would be neither politically nor militarily feasible to take enforcement action or even peace-enforcement action in all such cases, particularly in the territory of a permanent member state, but also in states where major powers have political, military or economic interests. This problem of ‘selectivity’ with the R2P was also acknowledged and discussed in the ICISS report. Council authorization must be on a case-by-case basis, as stated in the Outcome Document.

The Outcome Document’s criteria for R2P, comprising any of the grave crimes (war crimes, genocide, crimes against humanity or ethnic cleansing), with the state concerned manifestly failing to protect its population from those crimes, also set up a threshold, or qualifier, that would appear to limit the Council in its deliberations for future humanitarian interventions.

⁷³ Ibid

⁷⁴ Ibid

⁷⁵ The Security Council has a primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with Article 24 of the UN Charter, but it seems this responsibility has its political and military limitations.

A dilemma on whether the R2P doctrine on military intervention changes the Council's action in humanitarian crises, or if it is more or less the same thing as humanitarian intervention exists. Would it be necessary to distinguish future Council practice authorizing humanitarian interventions for the protection of human rights from military 'R2P authorizations', depending on whether the R2P criteria are present or not.⁷⁶ May the Council authorize humanitarian interventions in situations where the R2P criteria are not present?⁷⁷ The recent decline in authorized humanitarian interventions does not point to a broadening of the conception. Were they to occur, then 'R2P interventions' could arguably constitute a specific or qualified form of 'humanitarian intervention.'

Nevertheless, if the Security Council trend of including civilian protection mandates in its peace support operations, using a double legal basis under Chapter VII and host state consent, becomes a permanent model for the future, the traditional cases of authorized humanitarian interventions that were characteristic in the first half of the 1990s may not appear on the scene again. With such an institutionalization of the protection of human security, there might be need to reformulate the concept of humanitarian intervention or find a new category for describing enforcement action with protection mandates including consent, possibly dropping the 'intervention' element in the terminology. Future consensual UN authorized peace-enforcement measures with a dominant humanitarian purpose and extensive civilian protection mandates would not operate under the principles of humanitarian intervention. It is possible that in such a case, only authorized humanitarian interventions will be referred to as 'humanitarian interventions'.

⁷⁶ICISS, *The Responsibility to Protect*, p. 33

⁷⁷Ibid

It could be argued that the external R2P for the Security Council is thus subsumed under a double qualifier due to the Chapter VII requirements for military enforcement action. The situations do not only have to fulfill the R2P criteria, but also other factors will and must be taken into account. The R2P criteria for military intervention are only necessary but not sufficient criteria for the Security Council to take on its external responsibility to protect when military means are necessary. The question is whether the R2P criteria therefore in fact limit or inhibit Council action for the protection of human security, instead of enabling or triggering such action?

1.7 Theoretical Framework

Well embedded in the just war theory are some principles of the concept peacekeeping operations. The protection of non-combatants has been addressed in connection to both *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*.

In St. Ambrose's lies the endorsement of the protection of the innocent. Later, the protection of the innocent was explicitly formulated as a *jus ad bellum* criterion and more specifically as one of the just causes for resorting to lethal force by authors such as Fransisco de Vitoria and Fransisco Suarez. The commitment to the protection of non-combatants can also be detected in the *jus in bello* criteria and thus the criteria addressing how soldiers should conduct themselves in war. Principles of civilian protection in the just in war theory are that: First, the *jus in bello* criterion of discrimination says that parties to an armed conflict distinguish at all times between combatants and non-combatants, and it prohibits soldiers to apply direct, intended armed force against non-combatants.

Those who plan and decide upon an attack have the responsibility to consider potential side-effect harm that may follow from their decisions. Moral responsibility for unintended effects of attack also fall on those who carry out the attack: they have a responsibility to abort the

attack if it becomes clear to them that disproportionate harm to civilians will follow. Second, protection may also be seen as the long-term indirect outcome of traditional war fighting through the defeat of an enemy.

Formulated as a negative duty, and in the indirect sense just sketched, protection is not really a new task for the soldier. Michael Walzer suggests that, while protection is a part of soldiering, ‘the “reason” for soldiering is victory, and the “reason” for victory is the protection of one’s own people, not of other people’. Since Walzer conceives of the responsibility to civilians mainly as a kind of agency responsibility, he seems to restrict responsibility and blameworthiness to cases where soldiers directly or indirectly inflict harm through their actions.

1.8 Research Methodology

This study is a qualitative analysis that comprises both descriptive and exploratory aspects. It is based upon an extensive review of related literature in the fields of peace and security, peacekeeping and conflict management more broadly, conflict in Africa, as well as the situation in Somalia. Both primary and secondary sources will be utilized, although emphasis will undoubtedly be placed on incorporating primary texts. Indeed, the research question, whether AMISOM will be able to implement an effective peacekeeping in Somalia, necessarily entails adopting an organizational level approach. Therefore, key UN, OAU and AU documents as well as other official sources will be consulted where appropriate. Secondary sources will consist primarily of academic journal articles, publications and books containing commentaries on and analyses of those topics introduced above, produced by respected authors in their respective fields. No questionnaires, interviews, focus groups or similar forms of fieldwork will be conducted in order to support this research.

The notion that peacekeeping forms an integral part of wider conflict management and resolution strategies is the central analytical framework of this study. In terms of the research hypotheses, then, this argument is duly considered and further extended to the African context. The AMISOM deployment in Somalia has been specifically chosen. Multidimensional peacekeeping operation and an assessment thereof is arguably well-placed to shed light on those issues which are likely to influence the AMISOM's capacity to engage in similar endeavors both in the short- and in the long-term. The unit of analysis is therefore the AMISOM's peacekeeping capability. In terms of the time dimension, this study is very much cross-sectional. While the period of analysis stretches back to the formation of the OAU in 1963 and further looks ahead to what the future may hold for the AU's peacekeeping capability, the findings are written from the perspective of the present.

1.9 Chapters Outline

The study is structured into five (5) chapters.

1. Chapter one: introduction to the study
2. Chapter Two: Peacekeeping strategies in Africa: An Overview,
3. Chapter Three: peacekeeping strategies in Africa: the case of African union mission in Somalia (AMISOM)
4. Chapter four: The peacekeeping strategies in Africa: a critical analysis of AMISOM and its work in Somalia
5. Chapter five: -conclusion and summary

CHAPTER TWO

PEACEKEEPING STRATEGIES IN AFRICA: AN OVERVIEW

2.0 Introduction

The previous chapter was a presentation of a background to the study, problem statement, objectives hypothesis, theoretical framework, literature review and methodology adopted by the study. This chapter historically presents peacekeeping strategies in Africa.

2.1 Peace Operations

The world is no longer the same as it was when the UN was founded and its Charter established. The greatest current threats to international peace and security are no longer traditional interstate wars but international terrorism, violations of human rights and humanitarian law, failed states and civil wars. With new threats, the logical development of the purpose and methods to maintain international peace and security would be to change accordingly. However, there is currently no consensus among scholars on the purpose of peace operations and their role in global politics.

A dynamic debate on potential roles for peace operations has emerged on the international arena. The UN's role in ensuring international peace and security can be seen as a function of how its members understand the international order.⁷⁸ Peacekeeping today occurs in 'complex emergencies', combining elements of civil war, state collapse, human rights violations, 'criminality' and humanitarian crisis. Emergency situations are often formed by local agents with vested interests connected with external powers. Duffield refers to the 'security-development nexus', in which global assemblages of crisis management are connected to the local reproduction of crisis. In his view, the nexus deploys peacekeeping and peacebuilding as alternatives to recognising the impact of neoliberalism and imperialism on

⁷⁸ Ibid

development. The nexus analysis presented by Duffield resonates with the idea of crisis-management in the work of Gayatri,⁷⁹ who portrays crisis as a constant situation in a postcolonial world where the West constantly wards off the traumatic effects of colonialism. The differing views of liberal and instrumentalist peacekeeping theorists on AU peacekeeping assumptions with a special focus on three related liberal theorists: Nicholas Wheeler, C.A.J. Coady and Fernando Tesón are discussed in this chapter.

2.2 Approaches to Peace Keeping

2.2.1 Humanitarian Intervention

These are interventions that aim to alleviate large-scale humanitarian suffering caused by starvation, refugee flows and persecution. Violations of human rights also constitute humanitarian concerns that may trigger sanctions. Such violations include ethnic cleansing, forced labour, executions, rape and illegal detentions. To help populations in distress, the UN Security Council has sanctioned violations of human rights and humanitarian law under Chapter VII. Enforcement measures have been used by peace operations with the aim to ensure humanitarian relief, establish safe havens and uphold law and order. Non-military measures including economic sanctions such as weapon embargoes have also been used, alone or combined with enforcement measures. In defining humanitarian intervention, two concepts emerge: Humanitarian intervention, which implies the use of force, and

⁷⁹Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty *A Critique of Post-Colonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999.

humanitarian assistance, where non-forceful measures are used.⁸⁰ The principle of minimum use of force determines whether force is to be used in humanitarian interventions.

2.2.2 Social Order necessitated by State

The first grouping of assumptions by liberal theorists is about the social role of the state. The theorists contend that the state is identical with or essential to society, and as something without which a decent life is impossible. Day⁸¹ argues that liberal scholars systematically ignore arguments that stateless life might be preferable to life under the state, in what can be argued to be an intellectual doubling of the move of liberal states to ruthlessly suppress movements aspiring to stateless life. Despite these theorists' criticisms of particular state policies, liberals consistently think about social life from the perspective of the state. Day⁸² further explains that liberalism identifies with the state by adopting its subject-position. The fixation on the state manifests itself normatively in the attachment of overriding significance to themes of security, order and stability. On the other hand, metonymic slippage is established between terms like barbarism, statelessness, anarchy, chaos and lawlessness. This conceptual conflation combines into a single concept at least four distinct phenomena: state collapse as such, a societal collapse, the existence of a set of 'lawless' actions similar to criminality and that of a situation of civil war.

Statists have attributed other aspects of a complex emergency to social conflict and 'lawless' actions, to the absence of a state (or of the right kind of state). These aspects however, fail to distinguish between peaceful and warring stateless societies, or between 'lawless' stateless societies and those with some degree of diffuse 'governance'. Societies such as Somalia are stateless hence assumed to be plagued by civil war and social predation. The general

⁸⁰ The International Development Research Centre, *The Responsibility to Protect*

⁸¹ Richard J.F. Day (2005), *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements* (London: Pluto), 54.

⁸² *Ibid* 79

assumption by the liberal theorists is that the response to problems related to civil war and 'lawlessness' must be resolved by the restoration or construction of a proper state. An absence of state is taken as the explanation for various effects, while remaining silent to what specific forces cause these effects. The possibility that the worst problems in complex emergencies could be mitigated instead by moving towards a more peaceful and less predatory type of statelessness - a possibility at the forefront of the empirical literature on Somalia for example - is simply ruled out upfront. Further, the need to establish and engage with contingent causes of intergroup conflict is also excluded in the frame.

Wheeler⁸³ considers 'state breakdown and a collapse of law and order' like is true in Somalia a sufficient justification for intervention. While referring to situations in which 'the target state... had collapsed into lawlessness and civil strife'⁸⁴, he clearly is in agreement with the other theorists that statelessness, 'lawlessness' and civil war: state collapse itself means 'lawlessness and civil strife'; this is what a society becomes when a state collapses. He refers to state-building as the removal of 'the gun' from political life⁸⁵ a position which in itself is controversial because States are not known for their lack of guns⁸⁶. Wheeler further contends that 'disarming the warlords and establishing the rule of law were crucial in preventing Somalia from falling back into civil war.'⁸⁷ He argues that what Somalia needed, was a 'law-governed polity'.⁸⁸ He therefore advocates for the imposition of an international protectorate that could provide a security framework for years to come'.⁸⁹

Wheeler's position is ambiguous in constructing criteria for the success of an intervention. He opines that a successful intervention should establish 'a political order...hospitable to the

⁸³Wheeler, J. C., Meier, D. L., & Wilson, J. R. 2002, ApJ, 568, 865

⁸⁴Ibid 2

⁸⁵Ibid 306

⁸⁶Ibid 41

⁸⁷Ibid 190

⁸⁸Ibid 173

⁸⁹Ibid 306

protection of human rights'.⁹⁰ On the contrary when he discusses Somalia, and faces the problem that humanitarian relief and state-building were contradictory goals, he takes a pro-state building position.⁹¹ This can be deduced to mean that he assumes that only a statist order could possibly be hospitable to human rights, notwithstanding the appalling human rights record of the previous Somali state. Yet there is no reason why local polities could not be assessed in terms of human rights.⁹²

Coady⁹³, just like Wheeler makes a controversial assumption that states exist for benevolent purposes. He suggests that States are perceived as responsible for the protection of citizens, a position that I wish to support. He further contends that peace operations can legitimately be aimed at 'failed or profoundly unstable states'⁹⁴, and that the operations should have the goals of 'ensuring political stability and enduring safety'⁹⁵ which is a liberal code for state-building. It is common in peacekeeping theory to find a distinction drawn between extraordinary human rights (identified with the collapse of legitimate state power) and ordinary human rights (identified with concrete violations), a perspective that voids the very concept of rights by identifying its actualization with a particular social order. In other perspectives, one finds it in differentiations between truly shocking and merely wrong forms of violation, between 'extremely barbarous' and mundane abuses, or between law and order as a primary goal of intervention and human security as a secondary luxury.⁹⁶ This serves to put the denial of rights, or of the state, in the otherwise uncivilized zones (or rather, its crisis-points) in an incommensurable category distinct from human rights abuses in and by the West. While human rights is deemed impossible in a stateless society, rights-violation is excused as 'law-

⁹⁰ Ibid 37

⁹¹ Ibid 189-90

⁹² Menkhaus and Pendergast, 2

⁹³ Coady 2002: 11-12

⁹⁴ Ibid 21

⁹⁵ Ibid 30

⁹⁶ Coady 2002: 16, 28, Tesón 2001: 37, Walzer Just and Unjust Wars 108, Lund 2003: 28-9, 47-8, Paris 2004: 47-8

creating violence', the creation of an order where rights become possible, but which does not require prefigurative recognition of rights in the present, a position supported by the telos of socialism in Stalinist ideology. In effect, theorists like Tesón has transmuted his normative position on what states should do into an essentialist position on what states are, which leaves him with the concept of building a state, without regard for whether the resultant state serves the ascribed goals. As these happen, the patently obvious existence of customary rights in societies such as Somalia is ignored. This leaves us with the belief that, the rights of the 'uncivilized' do not count as fully 'human'.

Tesón, advocates for a Hobbesian position on state collapse, including the identity of state collapse, societal collapse, 'lawlessness' and civil war. 'Anarchy is the complete absence of social order (functional forms of social life), which inevitably leads to a Hobbesian war of all against all'.⁹⁷ The presence of a Hobbesian war prevents people from conducting 'meaningful life in common'.⁹⁸ From the foregoing, it can be argued that state and society are closely linked here as to be indistinguishable; it is however, unclear whether the 'absence of social order' means the absence merely of the state or of other forms of social life. Owing to the fact that contexts such as Somalia do not involve the collapse of all social life, it is therefore assumed that the former is being inferred from the latter. The solution in stateless contexts is taken to be pervasive imposition of liberal social forms. In addition humanitarian aid simply addresses 'the symptoms of anarchy and tyranny', whereas building 'democratic, rights-based institutions... addresses a central cause of the problem' and does 'the right thing' for the society.⁹⁹

It therefore follows that, situations of anarchy lead to barbaric interpersonal behaviour which is seriously unjust, causing a 'moral collapse of sovereignty' and a loss of the right to self-

⁹⁷Tesón, 2001: 7

⁹⁸ Ibid 7

⁹⁹ Ibid 37

government in Teson's view.¹⁰⁰ He clarifies that the difference between statist societies and stateless societies is not, a matter of legitimate dispute but rather a matter of what all 'reasonable' views will accept and what they will not.¹⁰¹ This boundary reproduces the tautological ethical stance of the Western agent. While related to the extreme effects of civil war and predatory violence, this position in effect declares any stateless society to be beyond the pale regardless of whether it displays these characteristics.

Practically, the effects of such a statist frame are to disengage peacekeepers from populations they are ought to be rescuing, constructing them as epistemologically-privileged bearers of a project of social reconstruction which is in the interests, of the wishes, of the locals regardless. Peacekeepers misperceive unfamiliar institutions as an absence of institutions, leading to bigotry effects. Researchers¹⁰² have approached Somalia with a frame distorted by such statism, as when Lyons and Samatar¹⁰³ portray the country as a 'Hobbesian world without law or institutions', divided between 'the most vulnerable' and 'the most vicious'. The Somali intervention was framed by Western insecurities about 'disorder' in the context of global neoliberalism. According to Debrix¹⁰⁴, the intervention in Somalia was an attempt to suture the field of global disorder, acting out a predetermined script in an attempt to create an appearance of fixed order, namely, neoliberalism as the end of history. This suture is necessary because of the lacuna separating neoliberal ideology from the actuality of global disorder.¹⁰⁵ He further adds that the intervention was deemed to fail because an excess of uncontrollable images arising from local difference began to disempower the global order.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁰ Ibid 2-3

¹⁰¹ Ibid 13-14

¹⁰² Lyons, Terrence and Ahmed Ismail Samatar. 1995. *Somalia: State Collapse, Multilateral Intervention and Strategies*. Washington, DC: Brookings.

¹⁰³ Ibid

¹⁰⁴ Debrix 97-9

¹⁰⁵ Ibid 107

¹⁰⁶ Ibid 126

Peacekeepers in Somalia found themselves in a society with very different assumptions about state power. Menkhaus, opines that ‘there is perhaps no other issue on which the worldviews of external and internal actors are more divergent than their radically different understanding of the state’.¹⁰⁷ Menkhaus adds that for many Somalis, the state is an instrument of accumulation and domination, enriching and empowering those who control it and exploiting and harassing the rest of the population.¹⁰⁸ He concludes that, state building in Somalia was misconceived as necessary for peacebuilding in a setting where it was virtually impossible. Menkhaus and Pendergast contend that the ‘radical localization’ of politics in Somalia is often misunderstood as disorder and crisis, when in fact it is part of the functioning of local social life. He challenges the international community to attempt to work with this “stateless” political reality in Somalia rather than against it.¹⁰⁹

2.2.3 Westphalia Privilege as Universalism

The second disturbing assumption is the view that a desituated Western agent can assert and establish the content of a universal ethics. Most often this is constructed in antagonism to a straw-man of relativism. It is not, however, the Universalist stance which is most crucial to their imposing status. But, it is the fact that they believe universally true positions can be established by reference solely to Western experiences and values Western standpoints are privileged by means of a separation between marked and unmarked terms. The unmarked term of the civilized world becomes the exclusive referent for justifications of approaches to the ‘uncivilized’ other. As a result, the ‘civilized’ world is ethically tautological: its relation to its Others is justified by its own values, which are the relevant referent because it is ‘civilized, a status it possesses by virtue of its values. This reinforces the view that, despite the tenuousness of its moral realism, liberal cosmopolitanism is a paradigmatic ‘royal

¹⁰⁷Menkhaus State Collapse 409

¹⁰⁸Menkhaus Governance 87

¹⁰⁹Menkhaus State Collapse 412

science', seeking to give a certain Law to its readers to provide a stable basis for moral order. As Day writes of Kymlicka, liberal theory produces 'an utterance that does not anticipate a rejoinder'.¹¹⁰

Tesón¹¹¹ suggests unreconstituted variant of the Universalist global-local. He accepts a strongly realist moral ontology in which moral truths are absolutely independent of their origins. Despite ontologically asserting that such truths exist, he does not provide a clear guide to the epistemological means by which they can be known. It is however important to note that what he does not say, he shows by his performance as speaker of ethical 'truths'. His reference is to a Northern in-group connected to the dominant fantasy frame.¹¹² We see this for instance when he writes of 'the shock we felt' over the Srebrenica massacre. He suggests that subjects who felt shock at this juncture are of a certain type who tuned into the global media, experiencing the events of Bosnia from the outside, contained in a sphere of safety in which such events are shocking rather than horrifically quotidian and predictable.¹¹³ In essence 'we' excludes by gradations the Srebrenica victims themselves, whose emotions were likely much sharper than mere shock; the solidarity activists, Muslim and secular, who would be angry but unsurprised at the Serbian atrocity and the UN betrayal; and the other recipients of intervention, the Somalis, Rwandans and so on, whose reactions remain opaque.

Wheeler¹¹⁴ gives his view on the normative force of the duty to intervene on a liberal international relations (IR) perspective which is pitted mainly against the Realist view that states are incapable of normative concern. Wheeler's concern aims to show that normative restrictions, even if used or formulated in self-interested ways, can still be binding on

¹¹⁰Day 78

¹¹¹Fernando Tesón 2001, 12

¹¹²Ibid 44

¹¹³Ibid

¹¹⁴Wheeler, 2004: 4, 7, 24

states.¹¹⁵ This avoids the question of how ethical positions should be reached, but has a symptomatic side-effect. His construction of international normativity thus focuses on the emergence of normative communities among states.¹¹⁶ Failed states can be the objects of intervention, but on the other hand are excluded from the formation of the normative community which legitimates it, effectively relegated to terra nullius by the absence of a relevant international claimant, but empty of morally relevant agents, people who 'matter' as normative voices. Things remain the same when Wheeler briefly enters the field of discussion of how positions should be reached, rendering this process the exclusive province of the 'values of... civilized societies'.¹¹⁷ Therefore, 'civilized' societies ask themselves if they are entitled to intervene; nobody thinks to ask the recipients. In practice, this leads to a situation where it was believed that no consent was needed to intervene in Somalia due to the absence of a state able to give such consent.¹¹⁸

Coady is a moral realist is just like Tesón who views ethics as a form of knowledge allowing universal claims and derived from human nature.¹¹⁹ This position is posed in retrospect to a simplified view of relativism,¹²⁰ and again, its ontological firmness is weakened by its silence on epistemology. Coady further opines that no method is provided for distinguishing in practice between relative and universal positions, he is equally aware that such judgements are most definitely made in practice.¹²¹ He contends that truth is established through the 'courts of reason, feeling, experience and conscience', which may or may not produce an obvious answer.¹²² Being internal to the desituated Western observer, these 'courts' do not

¹¹⁵ Ibid

¹¹⁶ Ibid 23, 44

¹¹⁷ Wheeler, 2002: 303

¹¹⁸ Ibid 183

¹¹⁹ Coady, 2002: 13-14, 18

¹²⁰ Ibid 14

¹²¹ Ibid 16

¹²² Ibid 14

require any accountability to non-Western Others or any kind of reflexivity. A Western subject-position is introduced performatively. Therefore for instance, he opines that reactions of Western media viewers are deemed facts of human nature.¹²³ Hence it is clear that, while Others are allowed to make claims in these courts, but the judge remains resolutely Western.

In practice, such universalism, operating as a global-local, provides space for rhetoric dictatorship. Indeed Deleuze and Guattari have contended that the persistence of despotism after the end of absolutist states relies on the despotic functioning of transcendentalist language.¹²⁴ In peacekeeping discourse, this transcendentalism is expressed particularly in the binary between civilized and uncivilized, which creates the conditions for sovereignty and states of exception. We thus think of peacekeeping violence in terms of law-founding violence and a 'just violence', a suspension of ethics in the creation of a statist order. This view is upheld by Hardt and Negri who argue that 'modern sovereignty... does not put an end to violence and fear but rather puts an end to civil war by organizing violence and fear into a coherent and stable political order'. Peacekeeping in the dominant discourse is the war which forms a bridge between 'anarchy' (the demonized Other) and liberal-democracy, cutting through complexity with the simplicity of brute force.¹²⁵ In Razack's¹²⁶ investigation of peacekeeping violence the effects of this discursive asymmetry are made clear. His book addresses instances of torture and murder by Canadian peacekeepers in Somalia, and accounts for such violence as expressions of discourses of superiority.¹²⁷ Razack contends that atrocities were committed by Canadian peacekeepers in Somalia because of their identity as agents of a civilized nation operating in a hostile and uncivilized context. The identity of

¹²³ Ibid 29, 36

¹²⁴ Anti-Oedipus 207

¹²⁵ Debrix 110

¹²⁶ ShereneRazack

¹²⁷ Ibid 10

Canadian peacekeepers as citizens of a civilized nation lead to the denial of personhood to Somali Others and partly explains reason for their failure to achieve peace in Somalia.¹²⁸

The posture as civilized outsiders' leads to violence through the operation of a binary of civilized versus savage which is inherently profiling.¹²⁹ In his view those who claim to be civilized are counter posed to the 'dark corners of the earth' in a narrative which places Western peacekeepers outside history.¹³⁰ They are assigned the task of sorting out problems of the uncivilized at some risk to themselves.¹³¹ Situations such as Somalia thus become viewed as utterly hostile, sites of absolute evil in which anarchy blurs with terrain and climate.¹³² In the attitude of the Westerners in places constituted as an inferior category, peacekeepers enter a space where their ability to relate to others' humanity is impeded.¹³³ He believes that such extraordinary spaces, become sites of exception and emergency.¹³⁴ Canadian peacekeepers involved in abuses were acting on a narrative bearing little resemblance to their actual situation in a largely peaceful town.¹³⁵ Canadian peacekeepers in effect went looking for enemies, scheming to lure and trap Somalis who were then assumed to fit stereotypes.¹³⁶ The narrative of imposing order amidst chaos creates situations in which peacekeepers initiate conflict to provide a context in which to respond.

2.3.1 African Peace and Security Framework

African countries and multinational organizations have been experimenting with conflict management systems and various forms of peacekeeping endeavors over many years, and this has resulted in a common understanding in Africa, at least at the macro-policy level, on the

¹²⁸ Ibid, 9

¹²⁹ Ibid 13

¹³⁰ Ibid 12

¹³¹ Ibid 32

¹³² Ibid 15, 84

¹³³ Ibid 54, 155

¹³⁴ Ibid 44

¹³⁵ Ibid 73

¹³⁶ Ibid 79-81

place of African organizations and institutions in the international peacekeeping system. This common understanding can be said to rest on the following five principles:¹³⁷ The acceptance and recognition that the UN remains the pre-eminent international authority responsible for global security and international peacekeeping. This involves the following: a) The recognition of the need to enhance Africa's capacity to contribute to peacekeeping operations on the continent, and beyond; b) The recognition that peacekeeping operations in Africa should be undertaken with UN authorization, and that there should be close co-operation between Africa and the UN in this regard; c) The acceptance that in exceptional circumstances – when the UN Security Council is unable or unwilling to assume its responsibility – Africa may have to undertake peacekeeping operations on its own; and d) The preference that the various initiatives from the donor community to enhance African capacity in this area should be coordinated by the UN, or at least along UN peacekeeping principles, in close co-operation with African organizations.

The common defense and security policy is a document of much significance: Firstly, as a point of departure, it is premised on the view that the common defense and security of Africa should be based on both the traditional, state-centric notion of the armed forces of states to protect their national sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as the less traditional non-military aspects which are informed by the new international environment and the high incidence of intra-state conflict. In this respect, the point is clearly made that each African state is inextricably linked to other African states, other regions and, by the same token, to the African continent as a whole. Furthermore, it is stressed that the causes of intra-state conflict necessitate an emphasis on the concept of human security.¹³⁸

¹³⁷ Cedric de Coning, "Towards a Common Southern Africa Peacekeeping System", *CIPS Electronic Briefing Paper* 16 (2004), p. 3

¹³⁸ African Union, *Draft Framework for a Common African Defense and Security Policy*, p. 3.

It could be stated that the AU has clearly acknowledged in accordance with the broadening of traditional concepts of security in recent years that appropriate responses to ongoing political, economic and social instability need to include a focus on effective governance, robust democracies, and constant economic and social development. In other words, there has been an acknowledgement that Africa finds itself in a profoundly new and different environment to that of the pre-1990 period, and that re-configured strategies are required to deal with previously ignored sources of insecurity and instability.

The common defense and security framework secondly deals in a comprehensive manner with those security threats that may be deemed to pose a "danger" to the common defense and security interests of the continent, or may undermine the maintenance and promotion of peace, security and stability on the continent. Such threats have been listed under the four main categories: inter-state conflicts and tensions; intra-state conflicts and tensions; unstable post-conflict situations; and other factors that engender insecurity.¹³⁹ Intra-state conflicts and tensions are probably the most interesting and significant of these categories, since conflict resolution and peacekeeping in Africa in the post-Cold War era has been heavily concerned with challenges relating to state failure, civil war and internal strife. To this end, the common defense and security policy lists the following threats under intra-state conflicts or tensions:¹⁴⁰ the existence of grave circumstances, namely war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity; lack of respect for the sanctity of human life, impunity, political assassination, acts of terrorism and subversive activities; coups d'état and unconstitutional changes of government, as well as situations which prevent and undermine the promotion of democratic institutions and structures, including the absence of the rule of law, equitable social order, population participation and electoral processes; improper conduct of electoral

¹³⁹ Ibid, p. 4-5.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid p. 5

processes; lack of commitment by the parties to abide by elections conducted in accordance with the laws of the country; absence of the promotion and protection of human and peoples' rights, individual and collective freedoms, equality of opportunity for all, including women, children and ethnic minorities; Poverty and inequitable distribution of natural resources; corruption and Political, religious and ethnic extremism, as well as racism.

Thirdly, the common security and defense policy outlines a number of principles and values underlying the policy framework. As far as intervention action is concerned, the document confirms the importance of the concept of state sovereignty on which the international system and the AU were founded. Drawing on 'old' OAU principles, respect for borders existing at the achievement of independence is acknowledged and there is a presumption that each state has the power, authority and competence to govern its territory. At the same time, the document reiterates the AU position that intervention may be necessary where a weak state is unable to protect its citizens from war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity, as well as a serious threat to legitimate order, in order to restore peace and stability in a relevant state. The right of any member state to request intervention is also acknowledged.¹⁴¹

Fourthly, the drafters of the common security and defense policy document attended to the objectives and goals of the policy framework. It should be noted that the scope and parameters of the common defense and security policy extend far beyond the need to dovetail conflict resolution and peacekeeping efforts on the continent. Generally speaking, it addresses the need to ensure collective responses to both internal and external threats to Africa in conformity with the principles enshrined in the AU Act. The following objectives and goals of the common defense and security policy could inter alia be noted in this

¹⁴¹ Ibid, p. 6-7.

respect.¹⁴² To serve as a tool for the enhancement of defense co-operation between and among African states; To provide a framework for AU member states to co-operate in defense matters, through the training of military personnel, exchange of military intelligence and information, the development of military doctrine and the building of collective capacity; To serve as a tool for the simultaneous enhancement of defense co-operation between and among African states, and the consolidation of national defense; To provide best practices and develop strategic capabilities through training and policy recommendations in order to strengthen the defense and security sectors in Africa; To develop and enhance the collective defense and strategic capability as well as military preparedness of AU member states. Some of the objectives and goals outlined are of special relevance to the dovetailing of conflict resolution and peacekeeping endeavors on the continent.

In this regard, the following objectives and goals could *inter alia* be noted:¹⁴³ To enhance the AU's capacity for and co-ordination of early action for conflict prevention, containment, management, resolution and elimination of conflicts, including the deployment and sustenance of peacekeeping missions and thus to promote initiatives that will preserve and strengthen peace and development in Africa; to integrate and harmonize regional initiatives on defense and security issues; to provide a framework for post-conflict peacebuilding and reconstruction; to enhance the capacity of the AU to develop and promote common policies in other areas such as foreign relations and trade, to ensure the security of the continent; to provide a framework to establish and operationalize the African Standby Force (ASF) and to promote a culture of peace and peaceful co-existence among AU member states and within the (sub-)regions that could foster an emphasis on the use of peaceful means of conflict

¹⁴² Ibid, p. 9-11.

¹⁴³ Ibid, p. 9

resolution and the non-use of force, such as preventive diplomacy, negotiation, the use of good offices, persuasion, as well as mediation, conciliation and adjudication.

Finally, the common defense and security policy also deals with a number of "implementing organs and mechanisms", i.e. the "Actors or Organs for implementing the Common Defense and Security Policy for the whole African continent". Not surprisingly, a number of sub-regional organizations have been listed, such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the Arab-Maghreb Union, the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), and some others.¹⁴⁴

2.3.2 The African Union Protocol on Peace and Security

The Constitutive Act of AU was initially adopted in July 2000, Lome, Togo. The ratification of the Constitutive Act was accomplished in the Lusaka Summit in July 2001 upon the signing by fifty member states. Since then the AU has come into existence. It was assumed that the new organization would usher a new era of continental integration leading to a greater unity and resolution of its problems. The transformation the OAU into the AU has been heralded as being visionary and timely. The OAU had failed to realize its norms and principles. At the time of the demise of the OAU, Africa was virtually suffering due to the pressures of conflict, poverty and underdevelopment and public health crises like Malaria, TB and HIV/AIDS. The OAU effectively failed because it had not lived up to its ideals of promoting peace, security, and development in Africa. As a result the AU emerged as home-grown initiative, which placed the destiny of the continent in the hands of the people at least in principle.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁴Ibid, p. 8.

¹⁴⁵Melber, H. (2001). "The New African Initiative and the African Union: A Preliminary Assessment and Documentation." **25**(Current African Issues): 36.

The formation of the AU was inspired and influenced by a number of factors ranging from historical to socio-economic, as well as to developments around the world. First, high degree of frustration was expressed with the slow pace of socio-economic integration on the African continent. Secondly, African leaders felt that many problems the continent was confronted will require a new approach which in turn should include building partnerships between governments and all segments of civil society, in particular women, youth and the private sector, as well as strengthening the common institutions and providing them with the necessary powers resources to enable them discharge their respective mandates effectively. More so, the 'new generation' African leaders developed a view that there was an imperative need to look into collective ways and means of effectively addressing the many grave problems of the continent, as well as responding to the challenges posed by a globalizing and integrating world.

According to Kioko,¹⁴⁶ African leaders were generally in agreement on the need to promote and consolidate African unity, and to strengthen and revitalize the continental organization; to enable it play a more active role and keep pace with the political, economic and socio-cultural developments within and outside the continent, to eliminate the scourge of rampant conflicts on the continent, and to accelerate the process of Implementation of the Treaty Establishing the African Economic Community.

The first official inauguration day of the AU was celebrated at the Summit of Heads of State and Government in 2002 in Durban, South Africa. Comprising of 53 member states and run

¹⁴⁶Kioko, B. (2003). "The right of intervention under the African Union's Constitutive Act: From non-interference to non-intervention." IRRC85(852): 18.

by a Commission based in Addis Ababa, AU's underlying purpose is to promote solidarity, cooperation and support among African countries and peoples so as to address the problems of the continent as a whole. One of the main challenges to this solidarity concerns how the AU addresses human security issues and problematic humanitarian situation. "The true expression of Pan-Africanism will be achieved only when member states and societies regard the post-conflict security and well-being of their neighbours as being fundamentally related to their own. Once this has been achieved, political determination will be required to bring about humanitarian interventions in crisis situations". This view was envisioned and reinforced by the Strategic Plan and Vision 2004-2007 issued by the AU Commission. It also reiterates how important it is to realize peace and security as a necessary precondition for post-conflict reconstruction, development and the consolidation of democratic governance.¹⁴⁷

The AU has been mandated with the primary responsibility for establishing and operationalizing the continent's peace and security structure. The ruling Constitutive Act of the organization affirms the application of the right to intervention. This in principle implies that all member states have agreed to give up some of their sovereign powers to enable the AU act as the ultimate guarantor and protector of the rights and well-being of the African people. Consequently, the Peace and Security Council was established as a legal institution of the AU through the Protocol relating to the Peace and Security Council in 2002.¹⁴⁸

The Protocol relating to the Peace and Security Council of the African Union entered into force on 26 December 2003 after being ratified by the required majority of member states of

¹⁴⁷Murithi, T. (2007). "Institutionalizing Pan-Africanism: Transforming the values and principles into policy and practice." Institute For Security Studies(143): 13.

¹⁴⁸Kindiki, K. (2003). "The normative and institutional framework of the African Union relating to the protection of human rights and the maintenance of international peace and security: A Critical Appraisal." AFRICAN HUMAN RIGHTS LAW JOURNAL3: 20.

the AU. It is charged with upholding peace on the continent and it is complemented by the Panel of the Wise, the Continental Early Warning System, the African Standby Force and the Military Staff Committee (Kuwali, 2009: 53).

For this objective, an AU Peace Fund has been established to make sure that there will be enough resources for post-conflict reconstruction efforts. According to the Indicative Work Program of the Peace and Security Council, the AU will endeavour to be present on the ground where there is a need for a peace operation. Whether as a stand-alone AU operation or in partnership with Regional Economic Communities (RECs), the UN and others, the AU has indicated its commitment to being active in post-conflict reconstruction. This actually means that the African Standby Force needs to become operational sooner rather than later to ensure that there is the required enforcement capacity to consolidate peace agreements and intervene when and where necessary.¹⁴⁹

2.4 The Role of AMISOM in Peace Keeping

In March 2007 in the aftermath of the Ethiopian military campaign that had installed the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) in Mogadishu in December 2006 AMISOM was deployed to Somalia. It was originally mandated by the African Union (AU) in January 2007 but was endorsed shortly afterwards by the United Nations (UN) Security Council.¹⁵⁰ AMISOM had an initial authorized strength of 8,000 and was mandated to protect transitional government personnel and institutions, conduct military enforcement operations against anti-government actors, principally *al-Shabaab*, and facilitate humanitarian assistance and civil-military operations. The mission's small police component was mandated to help train,

¹⁴⁹Murithi, T. (2007). "Institutionalizing Pan-Africanism: Transforming the values and principles into policy and practice." *Institute For Security Studies*(143): 13.

¹⁵⁰AU doc. PSC/PR/Comm(LXIX), 19 January 2007 and UN Security Council Resolution 1744, 20 February 2007.

mentor and advise the Somali Police Force, although very few of them deployed to Mogadishu before 2011 because of the dire security situation on the ground. AMISOM's initial deployed strength consisted of approximately 1,600 Ugandan soldiers. The Ugandan soldiers were later joined from December 2007 by a battalion of Burundi troops. After that, the mission grew in size incrementally and evolved, reflecting the changing context in Somalia and international responses to the country's many problems. In early 2009, AMISOM protected key members of the TFG and a number of strategic locations in the city from armed opposition until the last Ethiopian troops withdrew from Mogadishu. These included the air and sea ports, the presidential palace at Villa Somalia, and the K4 junction linking them. The AU originally envisaged that after six months a UN peacekeeping operation would take over from AMISOM. This did not happen for a variety of reasons. Instead, AMISOM was supported by the UN Political Office for Somalia (UNPOS) and from 2009, the UN Support Office for AMISOM (UNSOA), which provided a logistical support package to AMISOM forces in Mogadishu.

The Ugandan and Burundian troops who made up the AU force became the principal barrier preventing the TFG from being overrun by *al-Shabaab* fighters – and AMISOM itself came under increased attack following the Ethiopian withdrawal. During 2009 and 2010, battles raged across the city but they resulted only in stalemate: neither AMISOM nor *al-Shabaab* could decisively defeat the other. Probably in an attempt to weaken Uganda's resolve, *al-Shabaab* carried out two suicide bombings in Kampala in July 2010. Instead of pulling out, Uganda responded by deploying additional troops to Mogadishu. Faced with a growing enemy, *al-Shabaab* launched a major offensive against the TFG and AMISOM during Ramadan of 2010 but the insurgents were repelled and sustained heavy losses. AMISOM then went on the offensive and engaged in many months of bloody street fighting across

Mogadishu in order to expand its areas of control. The result was the withdrawal of *al-Shabaab*'s core fighters from the centre of the city in early August 2011, although fighting continued in the suburbs and outskirts for another nine months.

Kenyan forces launched a unilateral military intervention into southern Somalia in October 2011, ostensibly in retaliation for *al-Shabaab* attacks on Kenyan territory (and the group's alleged involvement in the kidnapping of foreigners), but also reflecting parochial Kenyan politics and interests. Shortly thereafter, Ethiopian forces once again entered Somalia and advanced on *al-Shabaab* positions across Bay, Bakool, and Hiraaan regions. In December 2011, the AU, the UN, and their various partners developed new strategic and military concepts of operations for AMISOM to take account of these major developments.

The new concept of operations outlined a larger AMISOM force of nearly 18,000 uniformed personnel and hugely expanded its theatre of operations across four land sectors covering south-central Somalia. It also included a maritime sector, although AMISOM lacked significant maritime assets. This new posture was endorsed by the AU's Peace and Security Council and the UN Security Council in January and February 2012 respectively.¹⁵¹ In the first half of 2012, Kenya, Djibouti, and Sierra Leone all signed a memorandum of understanding pledging to join AMISOM. During this period, AMISOM also conducted operations to capture from *al-Shabaab* the remaining suburbs and outskirts of Mogadishu, most notably along the 'Afgooye corridor', a critical roadway linking the capital to the agricultural town of Afgooye on the Shabelle river.

¹⁵¹AU doc. PSC/PR/COMM.(CCCVI), 5 January 2012 and UN Security Council resolution 2036

2.5 Challenges facing AMISOM

Prior to the AMISOM, the precarious security situation in Somalia reinforced the call on AU and IGAD to deploy a force in the late 2006. Nonetheless, the restrictions placed on the frontline states to intervene in Somalia as well as other administrative problems inherent in the arrangement of it become necessary to review the original plan of deploying an IGAD force that was expected to hand over to the AU within 6 months.

The Government of Somalia and the Heads of State and government of the Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD) issued a communiqué on the 31 January 2005 meeting in Abuja, Nigeria, on their intentions to deploy a Peace Support Mission to Somalia after realizing the worsening security situation in Somalia. It provided for security support to the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) in order to ensure its relocation to Somalia, guarantee the sustenance of the outcome of the IGAD Peace Process and assist with the re-establishment of peace and security including training of the Police and the Army. The intentions of this communiqué were endorsed by the Fourth Ordinary Session of the African Union and authorized by subsequent decision of the 24th Meeting of the Peace and Security Council (PSC) of the African Union held on 7 February 2005.¹⁵²

In 2005, the AU/IGAD sent a first Fact-Finding and Reconnaissance Mission on to determine the mandate, force size, structure and tasks of the Peace Support Mission. The proposed IGAD Forces for Somalia (IGASOM) Deployment Plan was presented by the Military Experts from the IGAD Member States, refined by the Chiefs of Defense and finally approved by the Ministers of Defense at the 14 March 2005 meeting in Entebbe, Uganda. The IGASOM Deployment Plan was subsequently adopted at the 24th IGAD Council of Ministers on 18 March 2005, in Nairobi, Kenya. Nevertheless, the IGASOM deployment did not take

¹⁵²AMISOM (2008). "AMISOM: Background and Political Developments." [Africa for Peace, Stability and Development](#). Retrieved Aug. 12, 2014.

place in light of extant difficulties which were mainly due to the UN Security Council's inability to lift the arms embargo on Somalia. Hence a request was made for a Joint AU/IGAD Planning Team and the Somali National Security and Stabilization Plan for the deployment of forces to Somalia.

On 20 March 2006, the 11th IGAD Summit of Heads of State and Government held in Nairobi recapped its decision to deploy IGASOM. Subsequently an Extra-Ordinary Council of Ministers Meeting on 13th June 2006 in Nairobi reiterated the need for deployment of IGASOM. On 5 July 2006 a second AU/IGAD mission to Somalia undertook political and technical consultations with the TFG, the Islamic Courts Union (ICU), the Business Community, Civil Society and Traditional Leaders in order to finalize the modalities for deployment of forces to Somalia. Consequently, on 1 August 2006, an Extra-Ordinary Council of Ministers' Meeting in Nairobi directed the Chiefs of Defense Staff of IGAD to prepare a revised Detailed Mission Plan based on the situation in Somalia and in accordance with the Somali National Security Stabilization Plan. It was finally by the PSC, at its Meeting held in Addis Ababa on 19th January 2007 the AU Commission was mandated to establish a Peace Support Mission in Somalia. The decision was therefore taken to deploy an AU Force that incorporated elements from IGAD to be called African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) (ibid).

Since the days the AMISOM became operational, it has been facing numerous attacks on its base in Mogadishu. For instance, on February 22, a double suicide bomb attack on an AU base in Mogadishu left 11 Burundian soldiers dead and another 15 wounded. On September 17, 17 soldiers were killed and 29 wounded in a suicide attack by Islamist rebels on the headquarters of the African Union force in Mogadishu. At least four civilians were also killed and more than 10 wounded. 12 of those killed were Burundian soldiers and five were Ugandan. Among the dead was the AMISOM deputy commander Maj. Gen. Juvenal

Niyonguruza, from Burundi and one of the wounded was AMISOM commander Gen. Nathan Mugisha, from Uganda.

2.6 Conclusion

This section has revealed that there is deep complicity between liberal peacekeeping theory, peacekeeping violence, and colonialism; a situation that has not answered whether a postcolonial position require opposition to peacekeeping interventions. The dilemma of a postcolonial engagement with peacekeeping is the difficulty of the false binary between endorsing colonial action and persisting in an implicitly colonizing inaction as emphasized by Razack's position is that despite the risks, it is sometimes unethical not to support intervention. Hence, she basically carries out a suspension of the performative implications of her own critique, thus rendering her criticism of colonialism 'supplementary' to it. In contrast Zizek carries through the implications of critique, but in a way which leaves the normal operation of neoliberal devastation intact.

The third alternative to supplementary endorsement and inaction is to seek alternative ways of engaging in situations through transversal solidarities, transnational networks and autonomous social action. Such approaches would start from a Levinasian ethics of openness to the call of the Other, rejecting the silencing of 'victims' and starting from concrete engagement with the needs, demands and desires of suffering others while also reflexively questioning colonial privilege and resisting the global frame of neoliberalism.

CHAPTER THREE

PEACEKEEPING STRATEGIES IN AFRICA: THE CASE OF THE AFRICAN UNION MISSION IN SOMALIA (AMISOM)

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter, was a presentation of historical background of peacekeeping strategies in Africa, the current chapter is a contextual presentation of peacekeeping strategies that have been adopted in Africa.

3.2 External Actors in the Somali Conflict

This section presents the roles and motives of different actors in Somali's conflict. It analyses the extent to which these external actors can shape and/ or explain the intricate nature of the conflict in Somali. First, the section outlines geographical proximity as a factor to make an assessment on Somalia's immediate neighbours in the Horn of Africa. In so doing, the roles and intensions of four of Somalia's constituent states, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti and Kenya are discussed. Further, it examines the roles of international organization as a separate category of actors to explain the situation with a focus on the UN and its agencies as well as sub-regional arrangements. The sections also focuses on the involvement of non-regional foreign actors as well as the roles and motives of non-state actors which are also important tools of analysis to understand and examine the dynamic nature of the conflict in Somalia.

3.3 The Role of State and Non-State Actors in Peace Keeping

3.3.1 Eritrea

In mentioning Somalia's conflict, Eritrea's position and role cannot be over-emphasized. There is no documented role of the incumbent regime in Eritrea in the Somali conflict. Eritrea's role in the conflict is analyzed from the perspective of its hostile relationship with the incumbent regime in Ethiopia. Eritrea secured its political independence after thirty years of armed struggle against regimes in Ethiopia in 1991. Moller¹⁵³ contends that after overthrowing the communist dictator in Ethiopia together with the incumbent regime in Ethiopia which the latter officially recognized Eritrea's independence and seemed to create a fertile ground for a new era in the relationships which was almost successful but gradually started to deteriorate till a full-scale border war broke out in the years 1998-2000 between the two countries.

Since then rather than resuming direct warfare, the two countries seem to opt for waging proxy wars against each other. While Ethiopia supports the TFG, Eritrea opted for helping initially the UIC and later the ARS-A wing. Even though Eritrea does not seem to have neither religious nor ideological affinity with the Islamist forces of Somalia, Moller¹⁵⁴ argues that She has been providing the remnants of the UIC with both the right to establish base-like facilities on its territory as well as with arms which both the UN and the US could not welcome. Cornwell¹⁵⁵ furthers the argument by contending that the insurgents have the support of Eritrea, which would no doubt like to see their enemy, Ethiopia, routed in Somalia.

¹⁵³Moller, 2009

¹⁵⁴Ibid

¹⁵⁵Cornwell 2009

3.3.2 Ethiopia

Ethiopia is one of the most important neighbouring states for Somalia and thus assumes to have several reasons for engagement in Somalia's politics, consequently the conflict. First, Somalia and Ethiopia has had long and historical conflict-prone relations since the late 1970s. In 1978 the two countries were at war with each other caused by the aggression of Somalia against Ethiopia. Ethiopia has always been unwelcoming to see in the foreseeable future a potentially aggressive neighbour in case a strong Somali state comes into existence. This is particularly true in as long as there is still claims by Somalia's political forces over Ogaden which seems not to be abandoned.

Secondly, the fear that Somalia may ferment unrest among ethnic Somalis in Ethiopia due to the fact that Ethiopia's ethnic-based federalism can be put in danger. As most analysts argue out of its regions, the so-called 'Somali region' or region five remains marginalized from Ethiopian politics and government's repression has been quite criticized for being severe. As a result there is a fertile ground for any Somali attempts to instigate conflict inside that region and most likely in a form of call for struggle to ensure Muslim rights, perhaps even by proclaiming Jihad, as did the UIC. The main reason for the intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia's conflict is the priority it gives to its national interest.¹⁵⁶Muthuma¹⁵⁷ further contends that Ethiopia never opts to see a strong government in Somalia which might revive demands for the return of the Ogaden province from itself. Therefore, albeit the unpopularity of the Ethiopian troops, President Yusuf dared not have the Ethiopians withdraw, since that would mean the collapse of his government.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶Muthuma, 2007

¹⁵⁷ ibid

¹⁵⁸ Ibid

It appears that because of this same reason that the Ethiopian government was active in the process to bring the TFG to power with an overt influence in the election of its own ally, Abdullahi Yusuf, as the president. Though it denies it is believed that Ethiopia helped the TFG through military support to enable it relocate itself from Nairobi to Somalia. However unclear role on the part of Ethiopia, the ill-fated US attempt to establish the APRCT provoked the rise and subsequent victory of the UIC. Ethiopia took as one reason to fight the UIC not only because it was alarmed by the rhetorical support of the latter for its secessionist movements, also by the rise to prominence of Sheikh Aways, a former leader of AIAI, which Ethiopia viewed as a potential threat.¹⁵⁹

It is claimed that the subsequent intervention on the part of Ethiopia proved to be counterproductive in a sense that it strengthened the extreme forces in the Islamist movement both by allowing militant militias like the Al-Shabaab to gain ground and by promoting more Salafist versions of the Sharia over the more apolitical and moderate Sufism. Considering that Ethiopia is perceived as a historical enemy and a predominantly Christian country, it seems too easy for the Islamists to portray the intervention as a new crusade by the infidels. Further, Ethiopia realizing its lack of legitimacy in the eyes of the Somali population was apparently quite eager to withdraw as soon as possible.

Thirdly, since both states share a very long border any flow of refugees from Somalia will inevitably mean influx into Ethiopia thereby risking upsetting ethnic balances. The last reason could be Ethiopia's concern over the prevalence of extreme lawlessness of Somalia which can be a potential challenge to the law enforcement institutions of Ethiopia. The first two concerns point in the direction of a weak Somali state as Ethiopia's favoured option

¹⁵⁹Moller, 2009

while the last two reasons favour a strong Somalia. Whereas still a strong and hostile Somali state would be the worst option, and a strong and friendly one the preferred one, the Ethiopian government may have opted for the second best option which is a weak state dependent on its support (Moller, 2009).

Despite the above explanations, the Ethiopian government has repeatedly blamed the Islamists for persistently declaring a Jihad or 'holy war' against Ethiopia. This in essence served as a justification to its occupation as a 'legitimate' intervention against the 'extreme' Islamist militias in Mogadishu. According to BBC news critics argue that Ethiopian military occupation of Somalia is just a political manoeuvre used as a cover up to ensure that the AU and the international community at large would be convinced enough in the existence of actual security threats endangering Ethiopia's national interest and political stability in the Horn of Africa.¹⁶⁰

3.3.3 Djibouti, the Sudan, Kenya and Yemen

Compared to Ethiopia and Eritrea which in one way or the other seem to have been strongly engaged in Somali conflict, the roles and motives of Djibouti, the Sudan, Kenya and Yemen are not as such very significant. For instance, there is not much animosity between Somalia and Djibouti despite it like Ethiopia being a target of irredentist Somali national project. Djibouti has tried to play a role of a broker in hosting conferences devoted to Somali-state building and the most recent reconciliation between the TFG and the factions of the ARS-A which did not boycott the event in August 2008. On the same note, the role of Sudan has been quite minor but constructive in the sense that Sudan has remained at least neutral throughout

¹⁶⁰<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6204695.stm>

the conflict except playing the role of an ‘honest’ broker. For instance, Sudan hosted a reconciliation talks between the TFG and the UIC.¹⁶¹

Kenya has been perceived as an anchor of stability in the region. Not until recently when its forces joined the AMISOM, its role has been less crucial albeit receiving a large number of Somali refugees and becoming still target for Somali irredentism. It has in general terms pursued a multilateral track in connivance with sub-regional arrangements particularly the IGAD.

Yemen has also played a minor role in the Somalia conflict. Muthuma¹⁶² argues that there is ample evidence that quite few shipments of arms- to both the TFG and the Islamists- have come from Yemen but with no conclusive evidence as to whether the Yemeni government was involved or not. On the contrary, Muthuma¹⁶³ argues that the insurgents in Somalia have the covert support of some Arab regimes. This may be because the Arabs view the struggle as being primarily between Islam and Christianity, owing to the fact that Ethiopia is largely assumed ‘Christian’.

3.3.4 The United Nations (UN)

The UN operations can be considered is one of the examples of interventions by international organization in the Somalia conflict. Since the beginning of the Somalia conflict in early 1990s, the UN embarked on two unsuccessful operations called UNOSOM- I and- II between 1992 and 1995. The UN’s involvement has however been low-key with a focus on humanitarian issues with its various subsidiaries and agencies like the UNDP, UNICEF, WHO, the FAO, and the OCHA. In addition, on high politics level Somalia has always been

¹⁶¹Mollor, 2009

¹⁶²Ibid

¹⁶³Muthuma 2007b

on the priority agenda of the UNSC since its sanction was put into effect as of January 1992. The UN set up a Committee to oversee the sanctions. A Panel of Experts followed by a Monitoring Group was established to prepare comprehensive reports on the violations of the sanctions regime. In regard to the crises in Somalia, the Secretary-General has presented regular situation reports along with the UNSC resolutions mainly in concomitant with the various IGAD and AU initiatives for an international force. IGAD's deployment plan for instance clearly states that countries that border Somalia cannot deploy peace-keeping troops to Somalia.

3.3.5 The African Union, IGAD and the Arab League

The African Union and IGAD are the two major institutional arrangements that are directly engaged in the Somali conflict. Long before the AU, the OAU had already recognized the TNG which the AU chose to view the TFG as the former's successor. Its role was modest due to the lack of armed forces and other resources till a decision was taken by the PSC of the AU in January 2007 to send a peace-keeping mission to take over from Ethiopian forces. Albeit the AMISON was expected to constitute 8,000 troops, only Uganda and Burundi initially sent forces, later even Kenya sent its forces to Somalia. In late November 2011 Kenyan and Ethiopian forces was sent into Somalia, as these neighbouring countries felt the unease of the situation. AMISOM assumed official command over the Kenyan troops on 6 July 2012.¹⁶⁴

The AU has always been in collaboration with RECs particularly the IGAD in the course of sending a mission to Somalia. IGAD has been on the side of the so-called the Somali government partially because Ethiopia has a large say in the organization. IGAD has become the first start and inclined favourably towards the TFG's request of armed protection, as well

¹⁶⁴ AMISOM 2012b

as the relaxation of the arms embargo on Somalia so as to help it build-up of the armed forces. Besides IGAD, the Arab League has been playing a minor role as a mediator in the crisis in connivance with mainly the AU and occasionally the UN.

3.3.6 Non-Regional External Powers

The US's engagement in the forms of initiatives and various activities began since the early 1990s whose consequences though disastrous and counter-productive is a demonstration of its meddling in Somalia politics. It has however been argued that there is a difference between its motives in the 90s and the recent years. Its motives being its national interests, in the former period, the predominant motive was altruistic and humanitarian while in the latter it seems to be selfishness and the drive to ensure US's national security none of which offered the US a success.

In the 90s the outcome of US involvement in Somalia was the escalation of the humanitarian crisis and now it seems the expansion of Islamist militancy and in an extreme form what US calls 'terrorism'. Due to terrorism the US had to securitize Somalia as a stepping stone for the war against 'terrorism' especially with the Bush Administration. The fundamental assumption in this regard was the expectation that failed states would foster terrorism and so the US had to support the TFG.¹⁶⁵

Muthuma¹⁶⁶ argues that American interests matter because they happen to coincide with Ethiopian interests. One good reason Americans rejected initially the Islamic Courts was the fear that Somalia would provide a new theatre of operations for terrorist organizations. Therefore, other than its cover up of supporting the TFG in Somalia, the American

¹⁶⁵Mollor, 2009

¹⁶⁶Muthuma 2007

government worked in connivance with the Ethiopian government which used Ethiopia as a proxy state to fight back and crash extreme Islamist elements believed to have direct links with ‘terrorist’ organizations ¹⁶⁷ particularly al Qaeda.

The United States suffered the loss of 18 of its soldiers in the Battle of Mogadishu in 1993 in the incident which has become known as ‘Black Hawk *Down’. This has influenced the US approach towards Somalia ever since, and has resulted in statements like that made by the Obama administration’s top State Department official for Africa, Johnnie Carson, who said: “We do not want an American footprint or boot on the ground”.¹⁶⁸ However, the United States is active in the region through the military programme Combined Joint Task Force, Horn of Africa, which was established in 2002 and is based in Djibouti. In June 2012 the Obama administration acknowledged for the first time that the US military have conducted drone strikes in Somalia.¹⁶⁹ Not much is known about the extents and depth of the US counterterror involvement in Somalia. However, the United States is a large player in Somalia in other areas as well. USAID conducts projects in the spheres of governance, food security, education and economic growth (USAID 2013), and the United States also supports AMISOM and UNSOA. Since 2007, the United States has provided \$340 million in assistance to AMISOM Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs), and provided approximately \$150 million for its share of assessed costs for UNSOA.¹⁷⁰

The European Union’s engagement in Somalia has political, diplomatic, civilian, military, humanitarian and developmental dimensions. These constitute the EU Comprehensive

¹⁶⁷ Ibid

¹⁶⁸ *New York Times* 2011a

¹⁶⁹ *Wall Street Journal* 2012

¹⁷⁰ Swan 2012

Approach.¹⁷¹ The EU is one of the largest financial donors to AMISOM through the African Peace Facility. In March 2012 the EU allocated €67 million to support AMISOM,¹⁷² bringing the total contribution to AMISOM through the Peace Facility up to €325 million. This funding is used to cover allowances for soldiers, operational running costs, transportation, medical expenses, housing, and fuel and communication equipment.¹⁷³ The EU Training Mission also trains Somali Security Forces. In early 2013 the training mission's mandate was extended until March 2015 (*East African* 2013). The EU is present in Somali waters through the European Naval Force Somalia – Operation Atalanta (EU NAVFOR – Atalanta). The operation, launched in December 2008, is provided with a UN mandate to protect vessels of the World Food Programme (WFP), and shipping related to AMISOM's activities.¹⁷⁴

3.3.7 Non-State Actors

If only because of the absence in Somalia of any functioning state to serve as a 'gate-keeper' between the inside and the outside, there are plenty of opportunities for various non-state actors to interfere in domestic affairs in this stateless environment. When the civil war broke out since there was a dire need for humanitarian assistance a number of western as well as Islamic agencies became important actors. However much such agents strive for strict impartiality, this is often impossible to ensure. First of all, not everybody can be helped all the time, necessitating choices of whom to help and whom not—and the recipient of assistance will usually be able to transform humanitarian assistance somehow into politically or even militarily relevant assets, thereby strengthening themselves relative. The conditions under which such humanitarian agencies used to work became worse making their activities rather challenging. The security situation compelled almost all of these charity organizations

¹⁷¹European Commission 2012a

¹⁷² Ibid

¹⁷³ Ibid

¹⁷⁴EU NAVFOR

to evacuate Somalia. Amongst these to mention are CARE, OXFAM, the Red Cross and Save the Children. In contrast, some Islamic relief agencies were mostly religiously founded on Islam's tenets about alms and Zakat. As a result they might have been influenced to support the idea of 'jihadism' though with little success. In addition to these, Somalia has been an inter play of a number of other non-state actors.¹⁷⁵ Amongst are extreme Islamic religious elements who fight for a particular cause but have been shaping and affecting seriously the security situation in that country and in the region of the Horn as a whole.

Conclusion

Reading from the above script, the conflict in Somalia is informed both by the role of internal actor and external actors. It is evident that actors from the neighbouring states have not appeared on the stage with clean hands and intentions. The intricacies generated from the colonial discrepancies have tended to influence the relationships with the warring communities leading to the escalation of the conflict. If the mission has to succeed, it is prudent that an evaluation of external actors be carried to position players on the scene who are credible and determined to execute the mandate of the mission in transparent, accountable and unbiased manner. Some external actors have been accused of meddling in political and economic affairs of the state of Somalia despite its fragility and weaknesses in institutional framework. Some have been accused of advancing their economic interests, other political by way of determining the most advantageous militia group to partner with and worst of all, those determined to guarantee and reassure their pre and post colonial boundaries. It is a circus that will, if not nabbed in the bud, destroy the backbone of the nation that they purport to be rebuilding under the guise of peacekeeping.

¹⁷⁵Moller, 2009: 26-7

CHAPTER FOUR

PEACEKEEPING STRATEGIES IN AFRICA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF AMISOM AND ITS WORK IN SOMALIA

4.1 Introduction

This is the crux of the study, it analyses the issue of strategy employed by taking into account the case of multilateral institutional intervention using AMISOM. It begins by presenting some of the most fundamental factors explaining the present day security situation in Somalia through analysing the historical course of the process of state failure and the causes pertaining to the political development in that context leading to absence of political stability and security. The chapter also briefly pin points some of the main security challenges and the impact of the prevalence of insurgency politics in Somalia since the early 1990s. The chapter further outlines the humanitarian situation in order to understand the seriousness of the prevalence of insecurity at most affecting Somalia and its people and with spill over impacts on the neighbouring nations.

4.2 Emerging Issues

4.2.1 The Role of History in the Somali Conflict

Three European countries Great Britain, France, and Italy have each individually colonized Somalia. The two most influential colonial powers being Italy who occupied the South of Somalia from 1889, and Great Britain who controlled the North of Somalia from 1886. In 1950, Italy gained a trusteeship of South Somalia and agreed with the British who controlled the North (also known as British Somaliland) that the Somali people would gain their independence ten years later. Both countries kept their promise and in 1960 British

Somaliland and South Somalia were successfully transferred to the Somali Republic under a then well-developed Somali political elite.¹⁷⁶

Somalia is the number one failed state in the world, according to The Fund for Peace (2010), who in the past five years has created a failed state index based on 12 social, economic, political and military indicators (ibid). The degree of conflict is so severe in Somalia that it is not even ranked on the Human Development Index (2010), created by the UNDP, because of lack of data.¹⁷⁷

Somalia is universally pictured as a country synonymous with terrorism, clanism, conflict, civil war, violence, warlords, famine, jihad, piracy and underdevelopment. The country has been engulfed in violent conflict for more than two decades. The immediate cause of the Somali conflict relates to power competition in the post-colonial government.

Just before the independence of Somalia, Nasserite Egypt espoused the unification of all Somali peoples under a single flag, while Ethiopia fought successfully to retain its vast Somali territories. In 1960 British and Italian colonial territories were united to become independent Somalia. Even though by this move Somali were under one flag, it was seen as decolonization without due regard to the wishes of the Somali people who were against the union.¹⁷⁸ Such ‘irredentist’ political ideology created unfriendly relations with its immediate neighbouring states particularly Ethiopia. It then culminated into one of Africa’s catastrophic inter-state conflicts when Somalia aggressed against Ethiopia to regain its ‘lost’ territory of Ogaden from Ethiopia in 1977/78. Unfortunately, it was a military failure for Somalia while

¹⁷⁶Lewis, 2008

¹⁷⁷The Fund for Peace 2010

¹⁷⁸ ICG Policy Briefing: Africa Briefing Number 45 Nairobi/Brussels, 26 January 2007, ‘Somalia: The Tough Path Is Ahead’ pasted at www.crisisgroup.org

leaving the scar for potential future wars between the two states and a threat to security in the Horn of Africa.

In October 1969, the Somalia Army, led by a USSR trained General Mohammed Siad Barre, seized power in Somalia.¹⁷⁹ At the same time in pro-western Ethiopia, Emperor Haile Selassie was overthrown in a coup in 1975. Siad Barre's government received military aid from the USSR; at the same time Cuban troops arrived in Somalia for service in Ogaden in Ethiopia. Further, the US, which had lost its base in Ethiopia, then started providing Somalia with military aid.

In the post-independence period, Arab Governments supported successive Somali Governments, while Ethiopia backed the disparate Somali rebel groups which ultimately overthrew the Siad Barre Government.¹⁸⁰ In January 1991 President Siad Barre was overthrown creating a power vacuum in Somalia. This resulted in serious fighting for the control of Mogadishu the capital city of Somalia, in November 1991. There were 2 main factions involved in the fight, one of them supporting Interim President Mahdi Mohammed and the other supporting General Mohammed Farah Aidid, the chairman of the USC. The fighting later spread throughout Somalia as heavily armed groups controlled different parts of the country. The involvement of third parties in Somalia is justified by the need to resolve the humanitarian crisis that resulted from the outbreak of civil war in Somalia in 1991 and collapse of government structures, together with drought and famine in Somalia.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Hussein Ali Dualeh, *Somalia: The Agony of a Nation*, (Nairobi: Stella Graphics, 1994) p. 15.

¹⁸⁰ John Latin, *World in Conflict: War Annual 8* (London: Brassey's) p. 176.

¹⁸¹ FT Liu, *The History of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Following the Cold War: 1988 to 1997* (UNITARPOCI, 1998) p. 69.

The toppling of Said Barre in 1991 marked the collapse of the Somali state with cessation of government services and a long catalogue of chaos and human suffering. The ensuing intolerable humanitarian conditions included famine, disease, and endless civil wars.¹⁸² The collapse of the state also triggered a massive exodus of Somalis into the Diaspora. Humanitarian crises followed with the USA and UN intervening, albeit unsuccessfully between 1992 and 1995. This heralded the start of Somalia's diplomatic and economic isolation.¹⁸³

In 2000 the Transitional National Government (TNG) was formed, followed in 2004 by the establishment of the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) in Nairobi, Kenya. The TFG first met in Somalia in 2006, because of security concerns.¹⁸⁴ On 20 August 2012 the first federal Parliament since 1991 was instated leading to the adoption of a new constitution on 10 September. The Somalia parliament chose Hassan Sheikh Mohamud as the new president of the Federal Government of Somalia.¹⁸⁵ Somalia today is a state operating with at several separate administrative entities. The South Central Somalia has until recently had the TFG as its central government while the other is Puntland which declared autonomy as a federal state in 1998. Somaliland is a separate entity which has earlier sought independence from the Republic of Somalia,¹⁸⁶ but has not been recognized as an independent state. More recently, Galmudug declared autonomy within a federalized Somalia in 2006. The region of Jubaland which borders on both Kenya and Ethiopia declared its autonomy in 2010.

¹⁸² Centre for Research and Dialogue(CRD), *Somalia: Path to Recovery and Building a Sustainable Peace*, Mogadishu, July, 2004

¹⁸³ Ibid

¹⁸⁴ Sabala 2011:109

¹⁸⁵ Flyktningehjelpen 2012:42

¹⁸⁶ McKay 2011: 229

Somalia has been an unsolved puzzle for the international community for a long period of time. A number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) argue that external involvement has only achieved keeping the fighting alive and the war economy prospering. Even though it is dominated by anarchy, informal structures still exist and reports show that the Somali economy is actually not as shattered as presumed.

4.2.2 Realities and Challenges of AU Military Interventions

There is a realization on the part of the AU that the recommendations of the Brahimi Panel on UN Peace Operations in 2000 have far-reaching implications for AU and regional peace support efforts, especially in the areas of organization, equipment, training, doctrine and capacities. It is also acknowledged that the Panel's contention that "[t]here are many tasks which United Nations peacekeeping forces should not be asked to undertake and many places they should go" necessitates serious consideration of those issues relating to mission-capable forces on the African continent.¹⁸⁷ Furthermore, it is also duly acknowledged on the part of the AU that the Brahimi report has made collaboration with the UN system even more fundamental.¹⁸⁸ In this regard it should be noted that a number of events have taken place in Africa that clearly suggest a trend that regional and sub-regional organizations are the first to respond to emerging crisis situations. Such organizations undertake short robust stabilization or peace enforcement operations, and after some time, these operations are transformed into multidimensional UN peacekeeping missions.¹⁸⁹

This division of labor between the UN and regional organizations appears to play into the strengths and compensate for the weaknesses of both types of organizations. The UN is relatively slow to respond to crises on the African continent. The regional organizations are

¹⁸⁷ African Union, *Policy Framework for the Establishment of the African Standby Force and Military Staff Committee*, p. 9.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid

¹⁸⁹ Cedric de Coning, "Refining the African Standby Force Concept", *Conflict Trends* 2 (2004), p. 22.

not swift either, but they seem to be able to deploy somewhat sooner than the UN. Importantly, regional organizations are not required to meet the same criteria or minimum standards that the UN has adopted. Nor do they require units to meet the same level of readiness in terms of pre-deployment training or equipment tables.¹⁹⁰ Drawing on the Brahimi report, the first six to twelve weeks following a cease-fire or peace accord is often the most critical period for establishing both a stable peace and credibility of peacekeepers.

In short, credibility and political momentum lost during this period can often be difficult to regain. Using this as a point of reference for deployment time-lines, Kent and Malan argue that the AU will need the capacity to react quickly on three interdependent aspects of rapid deployment: personnel, materiel readiness, and funding.³⁴ In the opinion of Denning, "speed and teeth" should be regarded as the core competencies of "any credible ASF", i.e. the ability to organize and deploy rapidly and the ability to conduct Chapter VII operations.³⁵

This said, it should be noted that one of the realities of recent peacekeeping missions in Africa (AMISOM) relates to financial constraints. In the past years, the extent of African peacekeeping was not limited by political will or the availability of troops, but rather by insufficient funding. Peacekeeping endeavors are by their very nature costly affairs. The recent peacekeeping experience is that even the relatively small and less logistically demanding unarmed military observer missions undertaken were so costly that the AU and its predecessor, the OAU, were unable to finance them from their own budget. Moreover, it could be pointed out that the budget for the OAU Liaison Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (OLMEE) amounted to \$1.8 million per year in 2000. Its original planned strength was 43

¹⁹⁰ Ibid 23

civilian and military personnel, but it had an actual strength of 27 in 2000, comprising 11 military staff and 16 civilian support staff – directly as a result of financial constraints.

Moreover, as the AU already stands in arrears of \$40 million from previous budgets, the AU will have to depend on the strength and goodwill of 'lead nations' among its member states and the international community for financial support if it wishes to develop and utilize the ASF as a standby reinforcement system on the continent.¹⁹¹ In other words, the AU will have to address and meet the glaring financial realities of the high costs of peacekeeping missions if it would like the ASF to play any significant peacekeeping role in African conflict resolution and peacekeeping requirements. Some observers even contend that from a funding perspective, the only viable peacekeeping operations in Africa are UN (funded) peacekeeping operations.¹⁹²

Realizing that financial and technical assistance will be pivotal to the successful development of the ASF, a joint Africa/G8 Action Plan aims to enhance African capabilities to undertake peace support operations so that by 2010, African partners will be able to engage more effectively to prevent and resolve violent conflict on the continent. In this regard, it specifically provides for the establishment, equipment and training of coherent, multinational, multi-disciplinary standby capabilities at the AU and sub-regional level which would be available for UN-endorsed missions undertaken under the auspices of the UN, AU or an African sub-regional organization.¹⁹³

¹⁹¹ Vanessa Kent and Mark Malan, "The African Standby Force: Progress and Prospects", *African Security Review* 12/3 (2003), p. 73.

¹⁹² Cedric de Coning, "Peacekeeping Trends", *Conflict Trends* 4 (2003), p. 5.

¹⁹³ G8, "Implementation Report by Africa Personal Representatives to Leaders on the G8 Africa Action Plan", G8 Summit (Evian: France, June 1-3, 2003), www.au2002.gov.za/docs/releases/g8030604b.htm.

However, it should be noted that the initial G8 response to the ASF was anything but blank check acceptance. The G8 clearly indicated that the development of *five* regional brigades was considered to be overtly ambitious and expensive. In the words of Denning: "While the G8 did not offer the AU a blank check, neither did its members categorically dismiss the ASF initiative".¹⁹⁴ Substantial support – both funding and technical assistance – has already been contributed by G8 partners towards institutional capacity-building for peace and security, the development of capacity for peacekeeping operations and of an effective network in Africa of peace training centers for military and civilian personnel in peacekeeping operations.¹⁹⁵

Apart from financial and technical challenges, AU and ASF functionaries furthermore have to attend to logistical and administrative aspects pertaining to the establishment of rosters of mission leadership, military, police and civilian experts as a requirement for proper mission start-up, as well as the capacity to plan and develop missions quickly. In addition, the need to establish unity of command and staff capacities for new missions has been identified as a top priority with a view to organizing combined missions. Also, the quick disbursement of funds and procurement of essential goods will be an important component of any effective rapid deployment capacity.¹⁹⁶

4.3 Other Strategic Challenges

4.3.1 Security Challenges

Since its creation in 1960 when the territories of the former British protectorate and an Italian colony merged; Somalia has struggled to build state civility. The security situation in Somalia has deteriorated over time; since 1991 the country has been the archetypal failed state. There

¹⁹⁴Mike Denning, "A Prayer for Marie: Creating an Effective African Standby Force", *Parameters* xxxiv/4 (Winter 2004-05), p. 107.

¹⁹⁵ G8, "Implementation Report by Africa Personal Representatives to Leaders on the G8 Africa Action Plan".

¹⁹⁶ Ibid

have been several failed attempts to create a transitional set-up, and the current one may equally not succeed, it has been overtaken yet again by an Islamist insurgency in spite of the support of an Ethiopian military intervention since December 2006. It is claimed that the military defeat and the dispersal of the ICU forces of south central Somalia following Ethiopian occupation have occasioned the destruction of a tenuous civil peace in the area, the exacerbation of Darod-Hawiye competition and the emergence of a resistance movement with increasingly radical credentials.¹⁹⁷

While Ethiopian withdrawal from Somalia in 2009 was expected to open up a new period of uncertainty and risk, it was also believed that it would provide a window of opportunity to re-launch a credible political process. The reconciliation talks held in Djibouti provided room for additional parties to join the talks, it was apparent from local and international actors – including the U.S. and Ethiopia – that room must be found for much of the Islamist insurgency in that process and ultimately in a new government dispensation. Even though by 2007 Ethiopia had succeeded in destabilizing the powerful Islamic Courts Union (ICU)¹⁹⁸, the struggle for control of Somalia had only just begun. Immediately after the dissolution of the ICU, an eclectic mix of former ICU loyalists, al-Shabaab Islamists and various Somali militias launched an insurgency campaign against the ENDF-TFG. The ensuing violence would last for over two years, inflict significant losses on all parties to the conflict and result in a catastrophic deterioration of humanitarian conditions for the Somali populace.

Notwithstanding the defeat of the ICU, violence persisted largely unabated for the next two years as former ICU loyalists, Islamist militias such as al Shabaab and elements of the newly formed Alliance for the Re-Liberation of Somali (ARS) waged an insurgent campaign against

¹⁹⁷ Muthuma, 2007

¹⁹⁸ Chris Albin-Lackey, *So Much to Fear: War Crimes and the Devastation of Somalia* (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2008), 3.

the ENDF-TFG. The power vacuum left by the ICU's collapse turned Somalia into a proxy battlefield of sorts, as a host of combatants sought to achieve a diverse set of aims in the resulting chaos: (1) the US targeted suspected al Qaeda members;¹⁰ (2) Eritreans armed and trained Somali militias to inflict losses upon their chief rival, Ethiopia; (3) Islamist militias and foreign jihadists waged war to dislodge the US-supported ENDF and establish a foothold in the Horn of Africa; and (4) Somali warlords sought to aggrandize their power. Many of the belligerent parties committed flagrant violations of international humanitarian law, and the effects of the violence upon the civilian population were catastrophic.

Transitional Federal Government (TFG) in Somalia failed to create a broad-based government. In the beginning, President Abdillahi Yusuf marginalized large parts of the population, a move that exacerbated divisions. Earlier confrontation with parliament and the prime minister underlined that Yusuf was hampering progress on peace, and that he had become a liability for the country's survival and was encouraged to resign which in deed happened.

The political development in Somalia saw Ethiopia's attitude hardening creating a hostile mood in certain circles in Addis Ababa to the TFG leaders. The political motive for Ethiopia to withdraw from Somalia reflected frustration, as well as unwillingness to continue to accept considerable losses in a war against the insurgency that was going badly. Analysts argued that the opposition to the previous Ethiopian occupation had been the single issue on which the many elements of the fractious Islamist insurgency could agree. At the same time, when Ethiopian forces withdrew, it was feared that it would likely cause that infighting to increase,

making it difficult for the insurgency to sustain victory, and to creating opportunities for political progress.¹⁹⁹

After Ethiopia's withdrawal, in the course of time the Islamist fighters managed to gain some more ground. As all major towns in south-central Somalia were captured by one faction or another except for Mogadishu, where TFG control is ever more contested, and Baidoa The Islamists already dominate nearly as much territory as they did before the Ethiopian invasion, and a takeover of the entire south seemed almost inevitable.

A peace process was initiated in Djibouti but did not achieve much partly because it was not all inclusive; for instance parts of the Islamist insurgency that had the most guns and territory did not participate. In the dialogue it appeared that the TFG had signed this accord with the hope to preserve some semblance of credibility to add to the shaky international recognition it enjoyed, while on the other hand, the representatives of the Alliance for the Re-liberation of Somalia (ARS) had hoped to gain negotiated withdrawal of Ethiopian forces propping up the TFG in preparation for a new power-sharing agreement.

The key aim of the Djibouti peace process architects was to create a powerful political alliance, one that was capable of stabilizing the country, marginalizing the radicals and stemming the tide of Islamist militancy. Neither of the signatories to the Djibouti peace process enjoyed the support of their constituencies. Additionally, the TFG delegation was dominated by allies to the premier, not to the President while the ARS delegation was represented by one faction that had left Eritrea after having accused of its government of

¹⁹⁹ Cornwell, 2009: n. p

meddling in the Alliance's affairs. It was pilloried as traitorous by hard-line elements of the movement who remained based in Eritrea and militant and Jihadist fighters on the ground.²⁰⁰

The Djibouti peace accord failed notably because of the splits within the insurgent coalition- Alliance for the Re-liberation of Somalia (ARS) as well as the TFG, and the rapid advance by the parts of the opposition, in particular radical militias like Al-Shabaab that rejected the process entirely. The ARS faction located in Asmara (ARS-A) and its controversial leader, Hassan Dahir Aweys, also kept off Djibouti. Further, the failure could have been occasioned by the fact that those around the table – the ARS faction based in Djibouti (ARS-D) and the TFG – controlled very little territory. President Yusuf had also continuously undermined the process, citing that Djibouti was ultimately a strategy to oust him.

The Djibouti peace accord provided for the evacuation of Ethiopian forces and their replacement by a UN- sanctioned stabilization force. The replacement proved unlikely as the UN had already spelled out the high quality of the troops required- self-sustaining, experienced in the use of minimum force but capable of effective but controlled combat if necessary. Those that were in a position to contribute troops to such a cause are practically reluctant to do so in an environment in which losses are inevitably too many.

Following the political development in Somalia, the actual threat to security has come from Al-Shabaab, who had \ initially rejected the power sharing deal ensued between an Islamist splinter group led by Sheikh Sharif Sheikh Ahmed's Alliance for the Re-liberation of Somalia Djibouti faction (ARS-D) and TFG Prime Minister Nur Hassan held in Djibouti. Al-Shabaab had separated itself from the moderate Islamists of the insurgency, rejected the peace deal

²⁰⁰ ibid

and continued to take territories. Later, Al-Shabaab was joined by Hizbul Islam, which is an amalgamation of four Islamist group including the Alliance for the Re-liberation of Somalia-Asmara faction. Throughout 2007 and 2009, Al-Shabaab scored military victories, seizing control of key towns and ports in both central and southern Somalia. At the end of 2008, they had captured Baidoa but not Mogadishu. By January 2009, Al-Shabaab and other militias had managed to force the Ethiopian troops to withdraw from the country, leaving behind an underequipped AU's peacekeeping force. Amidst the happenings in Somalia, another Islamist group 'Ahlu Sunnah Waljama'ah', allied to the TFG and supported by Ethiopia, continues to attack al-Shabaab and take over towns as well although they have been effective only in the central region of Galguduud, where they ousted al-Shabaab from most of the region.²⁰¹

After the disintegration of the 'old' TFG, the ex-ARS-A wing headed by the moderate Islamist leader Sheikh Ahmed has managed to form the New TFG after the parliament took in 275 officials from the moderate Islamist opposition. In January 31, 2009ARS leader Sheikh Sharif Sheikh Ahmed was elected TFG President. Despite Sheikh Ahmed election, the al-Shabaab radical Islamists have accused him of accepting the secular transitional government and have continued the civil war since he arrived in Mogadishu at the presidential palace in early February 2009. Consequently, four Islamist groups, including Hassan Dahir Aweys' Eritrean branch of the ARS merged and created the group Hisbi Islam, to fight the new government of Sharif Ahmed while Al-Shabaab also vowed to fight the government. In consequence, since February 2009, they declared war on the new government of Sharif Ahmed and the AU peace-keepers.

²⁰¹ Anon, 2009: n. p

Heavy fighting still continues especially in southern Somalia and Mogadishu. Fighting in southern Somalia and Mogadishu began in early February 2009, with the conflict between the forces of the Federal Government of Somalia assisted by African Union peacekeeping troops and various militant Islamist groups and factions. The conflict has seen sectarian violence between the moderate Sufis ASWJ, and the Islamists Al-Shabaab. In 2011, a coordinated military operation between the Somali military and multinational forces began.²⁰² The mission was officially led by the Somali army,²⁰³ with analysts expecting the additional AU troop reinforcements to help the Somali authorities gradually expand their territorial control. On 6 August 2011, the Transitional Federal Government's troops and their AMISOM allies managed to capture all of Mogadishu from the Al-Shabaab militants. On 4 September 2012 the Kenyan Navy shelled Kismayo. This was part of an AU offensive to capture the city from al-Shabab fighters. The harbour was shelled two times and the airport three times. According to a UN report the export of charcoal through Kismayo is a major source of income for al-Shabab.²⁰⁴ On 28 September 2012, the Somali National Army assisted by AMISOM troops and Ras Kamboni militia launched an assault on Kismayo, Al-Shabaab's last major stronghold. The allied forces reportedly managed to re-capture much of the city from the insurgents.²⁰⁵

4.3.2 Internal Coordination

The first strategic challenge emerged from the multifaceted nature of the AMISOM mission. Indeed, in some senses the mission was so fragmented that it is more accurate to think of it as separate AMISOMs than one single, coherent operation. The challenge of internal coordination and coherence also had several dimensions. The first was the geographical

Heinlein, Peter (21 July 2014).²⁰²"E. African Nations Back Kenyan Offensive in Somalia".Voice of America.Retrieved 21 July 2014.

²⁰³ Joint Communique – Operation Linda Nchi

²⁰⁴ "Kenya's navy shells Kismayo in Somalia". BBC. 21 July 2014. Retrieved 21 July 2014.

²⁰⁵Chonghaile, Clar Ni (21 July 2014). "Kenyan troops launch beach assault on Somali city of Kismayo". The Guardian.Retrieved 21 July 2014.

separation of some of the key mission components. AMISOM's strategic planning and political work was based out of Addis Ababa, its head of mission and mission analysis unit was headquartered in Nairobi, while the military units and operational command were in Mogadishu. The fact that the various international training mechanisms for the TFG's security forces were also spread around Uganda, Ethiopia and Djibouti, among other places, did not ease this problem. Such a disparate mission set up was hardly conducive to internal coherence and effective coordination, especially for operational and tactical issues.

A second dimension of the problem was coordination between AMISOM's military, police and civilian components. This was not a major issue in the early years of the mission because the dire security situation on the ground in Mogadishu meant that it was inappropriate to deploy significant numbers of police officers and other civilian personnel. The latter were a scarce commodity within AU circles at any rate while the former carried out various training initiatives mostly outside Somalia and did not start deploying into Mogadishu in large numbers until mid-2012 when the first Formed Police Units arrived from Uganda and Nigeria. The majority of the civilian component of the mission also arrived only late in the day from 2012 but the exact nature of the tasks civilian peacekeepers would perform and how they would relate to the military efforts became the subject of considerable debate within AMISOM as it moved beyond Mogadishu and started to become embroiled in governance and stabilization issues (see below). (From late 2012, these also become a contentious issue with the new Federal Government in Somalia as well.)

A third aspect of the problem related to the relatively disengaged stance of AMISOM's political leadership. The fact that AMISOM's head of mission was based in Nairobi until the end of 2012 not only sent an unhelpful political signal to both locals in Somalia and the

outside world, but it left several AMISOM force commanders in the difficult position of having to act as the principal political representative of the mission in Mogadishu. While this task was handled more astutely by some AMISOM force commanders than others, this was not a position they should have been placed in and badly undermined international attempts to kick-start a peacemaking process and reconciliation. It was a task made even more difficult because of the lack of a dedicated and appropriately-sized force headquarters in Mogadishu until 2012. While this geographical problem could have been overcome by a major commitment to regularly travel to Mogadishu on the part of AMISOM's heads of mission, they did not all oblige.

Finally, especially after the new military and strategic concepts of operations were developed for AMISOM in late 2011 and early 2012, AMISOM had to contend with more problems of internal coordination with the arrival of new TCCs and the mission's deployment across the four land sectors which covered most of south-central Somalia. During 2012, Djibouti, Sierra Leone, and Kenya each signed a memorandum of understanding with the AU to join the mission. However, all of them experienced protracted debates over details of their deployment, either logistical or financial. From this point on, AMISOM faced the additional challenge of coordinating activities across the four sectors and the respective contingent commands. This proved easier in some cases than others: the Djiboutian battalion slated for deployment to sector four arrived approximately one year late, while the Kenyan forces in sector two were particularly concerned with operational security and hence not always forthcoming about their activities even with the AMISOM force headquarters. This was especially true in the run up to the assault on Kismayo in September 2012.

4.3.3 Initial International Pessimism

The second major challenge AMISOM faced was the widespread pessimism about embarking on the mission in the first place. This pessimism was evident across many member states of the African Union and beyond. It was partly rooted in the legacy of the UN peace operations in Somalia in the 1990s but was dramatically amplified by views that AMISOM simply would not work and was an ill thought out mission.

Several elements combined to generate this pessimism. First, there were arguments between the AU and UN over whether a military peace operation was an appropriate response to the conditions in Mogadishu in early 2007. Initially, the AU's Commissioner for Peace and Security had assumed the UN Security Council would take over the AU mission after six months but had failed to secure agreement for this course of action with the Security Council members in New York. This generated considerable resentment in New York where it was widely felt that the UN was not there simply to take over an AU operation hatched in Addis Ababa.

Second, the AU mission was widely seen as providing cover for the imminent withdrawal of Ethiopian forces from Mogadishu. Having installed the TFG in Mogadishu, the continued presence of Ethiopian troops stirred up a considerable local backlash and violence intensified dramatically throughout 2007 and the casualty levels and numbers of displaced people rose significantly. Ethiopian authorities were thus well aware that the presence of their troops in Mogadishu was undermining the legitimacy of the TFG they had installed but they were unwilling to withdraw without an alternative force to fill the subsequent security vacuum. AMISOM was conceived as the solution to that problem and Ethiopia pushed the mission

through the AU Peace and Security Council without respect for the internal procedures which are supposed to govern the deployment of AU peace operations.

The third issue was that this assessment of the mission and the fact that Mogadishu was an active warzone at the time meant that very few countries were willing to come forward and champion the mission despite its authorization by the AU and endorsement by the UN Security Council. Indeed, only Uganda stepped forward until December 2007 when Burundi also committed troops. But these two states were left as the only troop-contributing countries (TCCs) for nearly four years. Some African states, including Nigeria, conducted their own technical assessments of the situation in Mogadishu and concluded the circumstances were not right for them to deploy forces. This negative perception was further reinforced by the fact that AMISOM forces came under fire from the outset from some of the warlord factions which were vying for control of the airport. The combination of these factors created a widespread aura of pessimism around the mission and its prospects for success and contributed significantly to leaving Uganda and Burundi as the only TCCs for the first four years of the operation.

4.3.4 Strategic Coordination among External Partners

AMISOM also suffered from several challenges related to strategic coordination between its external partners, which came in a variety of forms. These problems were not unique to Somalia but are rather common features of the messy attempts to conduct what one recent analysis called ‘collective conflict management’ – where informal coalitions of networks of state, intergovernmental and non-state actors that display diffuse, improvised, ad hoc and pragmatic patterns of cooperation temporarily converge to address a particularly complex conflict.

Arguably AMISOM's most important external partners were the United States, which provided considerable amounts of equipment, training and logistical support to the contingents from Uganda and Burundi; the UK and France, which also provided various bilateral support packages to the TCCs; the United Nations, which from 2009 established an unprecedented mechanism (UNSOA) to provide AMISOM with logistical support via its base in Mombasa (see below); and the European Union (EU), which from 2011 began to pay the allowances for AMISOM's uniformed personnel and conducted a training programme based out of Uganda through its African Peace Facility. Diplomatically, the most prominent coordination mechanism was the International Contact Group. But since the Contact Group was so large and incoherent the practical decisions and supporting roles for AMISOM tended to be developed, from 2012, within the Joint Coordinating Mechanism, which worked at the ministerial level and the Military Operations Coordination Committee at the chief-of-staff level.

One challenge was that these external actors did not always speak with one voice on how to engage with Somalia. This was hardly surprising given that strategic coordination between different actors is always a deeply political process. In this case, differences quickly emerged over several issues. The most prominent early on was whether to deploy a UN peacekeeping operation to take over from AMISOM. While in 2007 the Security Council was broadly in agreement that the time was not right to re-hat AMISOM into a blue helmet force, by late 2008 the George W. Bush administration in the United States led a political campaign to deploy a multinational stabilization force to Mogadishu which would pave the way for transitioning AMISOM into a blue helmet mission. As it turned out, this course of action was rejected by most UN members who proved unwilling to supply the necessary troops for the

proposed stabilization force or the UN peacekeeping operation proposed by the Americans. Nevertheless, the subsequent Security Council resolution 1890 passed on 16 January 2009 left open the prospect of a UN takeover of the mission at a later date when the circumstances became appropriate. It also authorized the UN Department of Field Support to establish UNSOA in order to deliver a logistics capacity support package to keep AMISOM afloat. This was seen as critical for boosting the operational effectiveness for AMISOM but also as a necessary preparatory step in case a UN operation was required.

Other issues that divided AMISOM's external partners included the amount of resources which should be devoted to anti-piracy activities in the Gulf of Aden and whether to engage *al-Shabaab* in peace talks. In relation to the former, in December 2008, the EU, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and a variety of other countries embarked on a major set of maritime security operations off the coast of Somalia to stem the rise in piracy. In Somalia, this unprecedented commitment of resources generated considerable bewilderment as it did almost nothing to tackle the causes of piracy which stemmed from the conflict dynamics on the mainland. Even the UN Secretary-General publicly noted that his efforts to generate forces to tackle Somalia's problems on land stood 'in such sharp contrast to the exceptional political will and commitment of military assets which Member States have shown in respect of the fight against piracy.'²⁵ AMISOM also became increasingly frustrated with these maritime operations because although they helped protect the logistics and supply ships which arrived into Mogadishu, they did little to coordinate with AMISOM on how best to deploy these maritime assets to stem *al-Shabaab*'s war economy, particularly its continued export of various illicit commodities, most notably charcoal traded out of the southern port of Kismayo.

When it came to the issue of talking to *al-Shabaab*, the picture was also mixed. At one end of the spectrum, the United States was firmly against the idea, having designated *al-Shabaab* a Foreign Terrorist Organization in March 2008 and actively conducting air strikes and special-forces raids in Somalia to eliminate other *al-Shabaab* and *al-Qa'ida* targets. At the other end of the spectrum, actors including the League of Arab States, Finland, Kenya and even Ethiopia instructed their officials to talk to members of *al-Shabaab* in the hope of finding a political route beyond the impasse or marginalization of the movement's most extreme elements.

Another challenge was raised by Kenya's unilateral intervention into southern Somalia in October 2011, and the renewed Ethiopian military campaign which followed shortly thereafter. While these operations obviously helped AMISOM's struggle against *al-Shabaab* by opening up two new fronts, it also complicated things politically and logistically because it kick-started the process of AMISOM's expansion beyond Mogadishu and raised questions about coordination between the Kenyan, Ethiopian, AMISOM and TFG forces. Ethiopia quickly made it clear that its forces would not be integrated into AMISOM, although it did deploy a number of officers to the mission's new force headquarters in Mogadishu in 2012. Its troops also played the crucial stabilizing role in AMISOM's new sectors three and four throughout 2012 as the Djiboutian contingent slated to deploy to BeletWeyne failed to arrive until December, and the relatively small contingent of Ugandan and Burundian troops deployed to Baidoa operated largely in the Ethiopian's shadow.

Kenya's relationship with AMISOM was more sensitive because it was slated to run sector two in the south of the country. However, several issues arose. First, Kenya was initially reluctant to reveal the extent of its military forces in southern Somalia, including its air and

maritime assets. Second, an argument occurred between Kenya and the EU over the start date for the payment of allowances to Kenya's contingent in AMISOM given that Kenya did not sign the memorandum of understanding with the African Union until 2 June 2012 but wrote into the document that its forces would be paid allowances backdated to February 2012 (the date of UN Security Council resolution 2036). A third problem was suspicions about Kenya's motives in pushing its so-called Jubaland initiative. These became particularly acute after September 2012 when the new Federal Government voiced its suspicions about Kenya's agenda in Jubaland and its approach to administering Kismayo.

4.3.5 Problematic Local Partners

As well as its own internal communications, AMISOM's mandate made it crucial that the mission work closely and effectively with the authorities in Somalia. It is an established element of counterinsurgency doctrine that the efforts of external forces are highly unlikely to succeed without a legitimate and effective local partner. Between March 2007 and September 2012, AMISOM's local partner in its campaign against *al-Shabaab* was the TFG, which came in two versions. Both versions were far from being effective local partners for AMISOM to work with. The first TFG, led by President Abdullahi Yusuf from Puntland, was created in Kenya in 2004 but installed in Mogadishu by Ethiopian forces in December 2006. It remained in place until the end of 2008 when Yusuf resigned and the Ethiopian troops withdrew. It was perceived by many Somalis as both illegitimate – being foisted upon them by Ethiopia and other external powers – and ineffective inasmuch as it provided neither any form of public services to its citizens nor undertook any major attempts at reconciliation between the conflicting factions. The TFG's security forces also proved to be largely ineffective against *al-Shabaab* and regularly committed abuses against the local population.

The combination of local hostility towards Ethiopian troops and the TFG's weaknesses provided ample fodder for *al-Shabaab* to successfully recruit considerable numbers of fighters to its cause, both in Mogadishu and beyond. AMISOM was caught in the middle inasmuch as its mandate called for it to work with and support the TFG.

As Ethiopian forces drew down, AMISOM became more and more central to the TFG's continued survival and this, in turn, encouraged *al-Shabaab* to intensify its attacks on the AU force. The fact that the Ethiopian troops did not fully coordinate the details of their departure with AMISOM also meant that in early 2009, *al-Shabaab* forces were quickly able to occupy most of the former ENDF positions in the city, many of which were very close to AMISOM positions. In sum, despite AMISOM's best efforts, in the eyes of many locals, the mission's association with the TFG and Ethiopian forces meant that its first local partner was something of a liability rather than a help.

The situation did not fundamentally improve with the second iteration of the TFG, which formed in early 2009 after Yusuf's resignation. This was led by Sheikh Sharif Sheikh Ahmed, one of the former leaders of the Union of Islamic Courts which had taken control of Mogadishu in mid-2006 and leader of the Djibouti faction of the Alliance for the Re-Liberation of Somalia (ARS) which eventually decided to work within the TFG structure (unlike the Eritrean-based faction of ARS led by Hassan Dahir Aweys which refused). This configuration of the TFG was initially welcomed by some Somalis as an improvement on the previous authorities, but it still suffered from criticisms that it was too close to Ethiopia and too heavily influenced by diaspora elites and one particular clan, the Hawiye. It was also widely seen as corrupt, ineffective and largely uninterested in pursuing a strategy of conflict resolution and political reconciliation across Somalia. Instead, its politicians spent much of

their time engaged in a variety of acrimonious feuds. In addition, many of the TFG's members continued to reside outside Somalia and some of them were widely suspected to be *al-Shabaab* sympathizers if not outright supporters.

Within Mogadishu, the TFG still lacked an effective fighting force beyond a core group of militia that was little more than Sheikh Sharif's private army. Indeed, TFG troops and police quickly became associated with illegal roadblocks and looting. They were also accused by AMISOM of selling their weapons and ammunition on the black market and sometimes of selling information about AMISOM's activities to *al-Shabaab*. A particularly embarrassing incident along these lines involved Sheikh Sharif's elite personal guard, three of whom publically defected to *al-Shabaab* in July 2010. The TFG was therefore largely dependent upon AMISOM troops for its immediate physical survival and on external actors, primarily the UN and Western states, for its finances and the training and arming of its security forces. Once again, this fed local impressions that the TFG was 'more accountable to... the international community for its survival, than on the Somali people, a perception that continues to undermine trust in the TFG.'

At the operational level, AMISOM experienced its own lack of trust with the TFG's security forces, which were disorganized, poorly equipped, poorly motivated, and often unruly. Instead of being a reliable local partner in the fight against *al-Shabaab*, members of the TFG's security forces engaged in a variety of unhelpful activities including leading AMISOM troops into ambushes, selling their ammunition and weapons on the local market, and passing operational information to AMISOM's opponents. There were regular defections and an unwillingness to engage in risky operations, which was understandable given the lack of salaries, equipment, and medical support provided to them. All these things led to a major

deficit of trust between AMISOM and TFG forces, which took considerable time and effort to close. This was eventually achieved from late 2010 onwards as AMISOM and TFG forces started to participate in more successful joint operations; first repelling *al-Shabaab*'s Ramadan offensive and then working together to conduct joint offensive operations themselves. But trust took time to earn and build in the field and it had to endure several serious breaches by TFG forces along the way.

Even by 2012, however, the Somali security forces were in a dire state. Among the long list of challenges facing the Somali army, perhaps the most severe and urgent were problems of unresolved clan loyalties and more operational issues of command and control.¹⁸ These problems were particularly acute at the level of senior officers, between clan leaders, warlords, and the official military commanders; they also involved an absence of collaboration between the existing brigades of the Somali National Army. An additional problem was that different components of the army had received different types of training, mostly abroad, and there were poor levels of training for non-commissioned officers. Salaries were also unreliable: most having been provided in the form of US\$ 100 per month stipends paid by the United States and Italy to some but not all Somali soldiers. The forces also lacked modern weaponry – with many ostensibly Somali National Army weapons belonging to warlords, clans, and individuals – and effective logistical and medical support capacity. Finally, there remained major problems with recruitment, created by this long list of issues. In sum, AMISOM did not have the luxury of working alongside a popular and effective local partner in the pursuit of its mandate. Instead, its initial local partner was seen as a major part of the problem by large numbers of Somalis and AMISOM's central role in protecting the TFG brought more negative attention on the AU force.

4.3.6 *Al-Shabaab*: A Challenging Enemy

Another set of challenges flowed from the nature of AMISOM's principal opponent: *Harakat Al-Shabaab* ('The Youth'). Formally established in the early 2000s, the name *al-Shabaab* was not widely used until 2007 and came to refer to a populist and militaristic movement which gained popularity after the defeat of the Supreme Council of Islamic Courts in 2006. In the space of a couple of years, *al-Shabaab* went from obscurity to being the principal anti-TFG and hence anti-AMISOM force. During December 2006 and January 2007, Ethiopian troops nearly destroyed *al-Shabaab*'s relatively small forces and it was not until November 2007 that *al-Shabaab* was able to launch a serious counter-offensive.²⁰⁶ After that, however, growing linking Ethiopia's activities to Washington's nefarious counter-terrorism policies in the region presented *al-Shabaab* with a huge propaganda victory and its ranks swelled accordingly.

Al-Shabaab's military wing was organized in three main layers: the top leadership (*qiyadah*), the foreign fighters (*muhajirin*), and local Somali fighters (*ansar*). The *qiyadah* was thought to be comprised of a small group of Afghanistan veterans, former members of *al-Ittihad al-Islami*, and Somali diaspora ideologues. The dominant ideologue was probably Sheikh Fuad Muhammad Qalaf and by 2012 Ahmed Abdi Godane (aka Sheikh Abu Zubeyr) was in command of the organization. *Al-Shabaab* also employed a range of media outlets and websites such as Hegaan, Kata'ib, Al Hesba and Al Qimmah. The movement proved particularly adept at producing anti- Ethiopian and anti-AMISOM propaganda using videos, websites, and later a Twitter account.

²⁰⁶Roland Marchal, 'A tentative assessment of the Somali *Harakat Al-Shabaab*', *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2009, pp. 393-4.

Part of the challenge in combating *al-Shabaab* was that its fighters came from several different feeder routes, making it difficult to identify and target a single centre of gravity. In brief, it comprised of a core of locally-focused fighters, particularly from the sub-clans associated with its leading figures; a larger number of what David Kilcullen called ‘accidental guerrillas’ – those fighting because they felt aggrieved at Ethiopia’s presence in Mogadishu not because they wanted to invade Ethiopia or had strong ideological commitments to the messages disseminated by *al-Shabaab*’s leadership²⁰⁷ – and an unknown number of foreign, often *takfiri*, fighters associated with *al-Qa’ida* who had arrived in Somalia to fight the Ethiopians and other non-believers. Estimates for the number of foreign fighters (*muhajirin*) in *al-Shabaab*’s ranks varied widely from 200 to over 1,500, with most said to hail from Kenya’s Swahili coast, Pakistan, India, Afghanistan, Yemen, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, and Saudi Arabia.²⁰⁸ Similarly, estimates of *al-Shabaab*’s local strength varied considerably, in part because of the shifting allegiances of many rank and file fighters. While *al-Qa’ida*’s ideas about the global struggle between Islam and the West were thought to influence some of *al-Shabaab*’s leaders, most of its foot soldiers were initially motivated primarily by the desire to expel the Ethiopians and facilitate the operation of sharia courts in Somalia.²⁰⁹ Later, *al-Shabaab* entered into the longstanding issue of clan conflicts where it often sided with smaller sub-clans in local disputes. It was also widely believed that a significant part of *al-Shabaab*’s attraction was that its leaders would pay new recruits and also compensation to the families of militiamen who died in action. In early 2009, for example, AMISOM’s Force Commander told the UN that *al-Shabaab* was offering TFG troops \$50 a month to swap sides. Community dynamics were also important with the

²⁰⁷David Kilcullen, *The Accidental Guerilla* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

²⁰⁸David H. Shinn, ‘Al Shabaab’s Foreign Threat to Somalia’, *Orbis*, vol. 55, no. 2, 2011, pp. 209-11; *Report of the 2nd AMISOM-TFG Information Sharing Meeting, 22nd to 24th November 2011, Bujumbura Burundi*

²⁰⁹Ken Menkhaus, ‘Violent Islamic Extremism: Al-Shabaab Recruitment in America’, at http://hsgac.senate.gov/public/_files/031109Menkhaus031109.pdf.

organization offering youth a means of empowerment and financial security for them and their families which was either too attractive to ignore or group pressures were too intense to resist.²¹⁰ This meant that AMISOM often had a very difficult task of deciding who exactly was an *al-Shabaab* fighter as well as designing strategies to combat them.

Yet while in one sense *al-Shabaab*'s multiple sources of support was a strength, it also suffered from a prolonged power struggle between its so-called 'nationalist' and 'transnational' factions, particularly after the Ethiopian forces withdrew from Mogadishu in early 2009.²¹¹ As part of this internal struggle, some elements of *al-Shabaab* gradually increased their extremist rhetoric and trumpeted ties to *al-Qa'ida*. In mid-March 2009, for example, Osama bin Laden had described TFG President Sheikh Sharif as a 'surrogate of our enemies', declared his authority 'null and void', and said 'he must be dethroned and fought'.²¹² In June 2009 the *al-Shabaab* group in Kismayo apparently responded to this call by releasing a video pledging allegiance to Osama Bin Laden.²¹³ *Al-Shabaab* made a formal declaration of allegiance to *al-Qa'ida* on 2 February 2010. Although it seemed clear that *al-Shabaab* was not under the operational control of *al-Qa'ida*, the exact nature of the practical relationship between the two organizations remained hazy.

Since mid-2009, *al-Shabaab* tended to adopt a hit-and-run strategy and avoid set piece battles after it suffered a major defeat in Mogadishu on 12 July.²¹⁴ (The major exception was the ultimately disastrous Ramadan offensive in September 2010.²¹⁵) Given that many *al-Shabaab*

²¹⁰Marchal, 'A tentative assessment', p. 395.

²¹¹International Crisis Group, *Somalia's Divided Islamists* (ICG Africa Briefing No. 74, 18 May 2010).

²¹²Cited in Haggai Erlich, *Islam and Christianity in the Horn of Africa* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner 2010), p. 182.

²¹³Fred Ngoga Gateretse, Adviser to the AU Special Representative for Somalia, Amb. Nicholas Bwakira, Statement before the House Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, Washington, DC, 25 June 2009, p. 3.

²¹⁴*Somalia Security Sector Assessment* (AU, US, EU, TFG, World Bank and UN: 1 January 2010), para. 15c.

²¹⁵Stig Jarle Hansen, *Al-Shabaab in Somalia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013), pp. 100-102.

positions in Mogadishu had been occupied immediately following the Ethiopian withdrawal, a major question mark remains over how strong a conventional fighting force *al-Shabaab* actually was. It certainly does not appear to have mastered what one eminent scholar has described as the ‘the modern system’ of tactics, i.e. the ability to use ‘cover, concealment, dispersion, small-unit independent maneuver, suppression and combined arms integration’ on offence and the integrated use of ground, deep positions, reserves and counterattack in defence.²¹⁶ Nevertheless, it utilized tactics from insurgents in Iraq and Afghanistan to good effect and regularly caused casualties among the TFG and AMISOM troops through the use of IEDs, suicide bombings, snipers, and the occasional ambush. It also effectively utilized a system of tunnels in central Mogadishu and had the odd success with tank-traps designed to immobilize AMISOM’s large armoured vehicles and tanks. In this sense, *al-Shabaab* was able to benefit from the difficult urban terrain in which AMISOM was forced to fight and in which its troops were not initially well-versed.

However, after AMISOM’s deployed strength was increased following the suicide bombings in Kampala in July 2010 and the Ugandan and Burundian contingents received additional training in various techniques of urban warfare, *al-Shabaab* forces suffered a series of sustained assaults from AMISOM (in Mogadishu) and later Kenyan forces (in southern Somalia) and Ethiopian troops (across central Somalia) during 2011. These assaults were so significant that in December 2011 *al-Shabaab* reportedly established a 500-strong *Amniat* (internal security) force to stem an increasing number of defections from its approximately 9,500 fighters.²¹⁷ By February 2012 the Somali National Security Agency was receiving on average 3-4 defectors per day.²¹⁸

²¹⁶Stephen Biddle, *Military Power* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

²¹⁷*Report of the 2nd AMISOM-TFG Information Sharing Meeting*, p. 9.

²¹⁸*Concept Note: Draft AMISOM Stabilization Plan for the Liberated Areas* (AU doc., February 2012).

In economic terms, *al-Shabaab* was estimated to have generated about \$70-100 million per year in revenue from taxation and extortion in areas under its control, especially the export of charcoal and contraband into Kenya.²¹⁹ After its withdrawal from Mogadishu in August 2011, Kismayo was identified as the movement's 'single largest revenue-generator and a strategic military fortress.'²²⁰ This was estimated to generate around \$35-50 million per year from the port revenues.²²¹ This revenue stream was only halted in October 2012 when AMISOM and Somali government forces occupied Kismayo, driving *al-Shabaab* forces further north. By mid-2012, the estimated number of *al-Shabaab* fighters in northern Golis mountains was 300-400.²²² This posed another major headache for AMISOM inasmuch as *al-Shabaab*'s displaced forces gravitated north towards sector four; however this sector had only one battalion of AMISOM troops because at the time the force configuration was developed in late 2011 *al-Shabaab* forces were not concentrated in this area.

4.3.7 Lack of Exit Strategy

AMISOM biggest challenge is figuring out how to leave the scene. There are not clear demarcations or beacons to guide the exit strategy. Conventionally, a major component in any operation is the timelines and activities of the operation guiding it to eventual withdrawal and closure by way of scaling down of the military forces and entire mission in general. Operations cannot be undertaken indefinitely especially in an international environment. AMISOM does not have a timeline nor does it define the stage at which the mandate will be handed over to the local actors or any other agency. In effect, this may be a cause of discontent on the part of local players as the mission may turn into an occupation force and elicit counteraction and counterforce from the local agents. It, therefore, appears that finding

²¹⁹*Report of the Monitoring Group on Somalia and Eritrea pursuant to Security Council resolution 1916(2010)* (UN doc. S/2011/433, 18 July 2011), p. 12.

²²⁰*Report of the 2nd AMISOM-TFG Information Sharing Meeting*, p. 13.

²²¹*Report of the Monitoring Group* (18 July 2011), para. 64.

²²²*Report of the Chairperson of the African Union Commission on the implementation of the mandate of the African Union Mission in Somalia pursuant to paragraph 21 of the Security Council resolution 2036 (2012)* (UN doc. S/2012/468, 1 June 2012), para. 14.

the exit strategy remains a bridge too far. On one hand it was envisaged that the mission will transit into a full-fledged UN mission. The UNSC passed resolution 1863 which only expressed the intent to establish a UN peacekeeping operation as a follow on force to AMISOM. It does not have any timeline or material backing.

In his April 16, 2009, report on the modalities of such a transition, Ban Ki-Moon set out four options intended to help achieve the UN's strategic objective in Somalia. The "high-risk" Option A, envisaged replacing AMISOM with a 22,500 strong UN peacekeeping operation with a Chapter VII mandate. The "pragmatic" Option B was for the UN to devise a support package for AMISOM until the Somali National Security Force could secure Mogadishu on its own. The "prudent" Option C was Option B plus a UN Political Office for Somalia and a UN Support Office for AMISOM within Mogadishu. Option D, "Engagement with no international security presence," was intended to serve as a contingency plan in case of an AMISOM withdrawal (either intentional or forced). The Secretary-General has advocated an "incremental" approach, divided into three phases: Phase 1 would entail adopting Option B; during Phase 2, Option C would be practiced; and during Phase 3, it would be appropriate to enact Option A. Option D would remain the contingency plan in case of AMISOM withdrawal. It remains to be seen whether this plan will be adopted and, if so, whether it will work. The UN mission in Somalia still remains a tall order in terms of exit strategy.

4.4 Opportunities and a Challenges for AMISOM in Enhancing Security

Though AMISOM has thus far made considerable progress towards the achievement of its mandate and by extension contributed to the enhanced security and restoration of peace in Somalia, there are still outstanding challenges that require to be addressed.

4.4.1 Challenges

The political power in Somalia can be characterized as fragmented, local, violent, heterogenic and based on hybrid structures of formal and informal institutions controlled by clans or militias, in which different socio-political orders interact.²²³ The fluidity of structure, with access to resources and power being an important source of clan conflicts, has been an enduring challenge for peace negotiations and will continue doing so. Beyond clanism, there are disagreements about the nature, or even desirability of the state. Much of Somali society has traditionally been nomadic and suspicious of the interference of a central authority in their affairs, a sentiment reinforced by experience with military dictatorship. The major clans favour a federal system of governance where distinct units of the country are largely autonomous but federated into a loose nation state, thus giving them control over their own territories.²²⁴ The success of AMISOM is therefore partially reliant on whether centralized structures of government can demonstrate legitimacy among the Somali citizenry. This can be demonstrated through for example, through ensuring the timely and efficient delivery of the much-needed public goods and services and providing stability and peace throughout the liberated areas. The challenge with the recognition of legitimacy is already manifest in the country with accusations that the local leaders who have replaced former al-Shabaab leaders do not, often, come from the majority clans in their areas but are puppets of the central authority. To date, the central government continues to struggle to gain the needed legitimacy.

The mandate of AMISOM poses another challenge as it is renewed annually and is subject to political dynamics, financial and other factors out of control of the AU and the Somali government. There are a lot of negotiations that take place between African decision-makers,

²²³Hjalte T, *The Spaces of Civil War : From a Global Typology of Civil War to a Topography of Violence in South Africa*,

1976, 1986, 1996, University of Tromsø, 2013

²²⁴Owen F, *Somalia: Little Hope for Peace*, Zurich, September 2012

Somali government and their non-African partners. The outcome of these negotiations has complex motives and interests that have consequences on the autonomy of the mission. Also, when contingents are yearly rotated, there are implications for performance as personnel leave just after they have been trained and have gathered sufficient knowledge on the terrain and on al-Shabaab operations and tactics.

The strength of AMISOM troops is a source of another challenge especially in regards to the Military component, the insufficient numbers of troops necessary to guarantee the stabilization of areas liberated from al-Shabaab and to continue with military offensive to root out all insurgency in the country. Indeed, the increase of troop levels from 12,000 to 17,731 through Security Council Resolution 2036 (2012) had significant impact on the military operations.

However, there is need to increase the number, currently the number is still too low to stabilize whole of Somalia given its size and the asymmetric nature of threats posed by al-Shabaab. In a letter to the president of the UN Security Council sent in October 2013, it is noted that there was need to increase the capability of AMISOM to enable it, operating alongside the Somali forces, to liberate and secure territory in Somalia and to effectively deny al-Shabaab the opportunity to mobilize resources and/or forcefully recruit and train insurgents to prosecute its asymmetric warfare.²²⁵

Another challenge is the shortage of skilled and specialized police Trainers in AMISOM. A challenge that is further compounded by the fact that the few skilled and specialized police trainers like all other police officers, are deployed on a rotational basis and so, have to leave at the end of their mission cycle. This negatively affects both the internal and external training cells in AMISOM. The training of AU Peace Support Operations remains a significant challenge because of low level of experience and language problems. Particularly

²²⁵ Letter dated 14 October 2013 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

since its latest expansion, AMISOM is hampered by a lack of Somali speakers, who could play a crucial role in the understanding of the local population and the National Security Force.²²⁶

Similar to the Military and Police challenge, the Civilian component of AMISOM is understaffed and therefore faces difficulties in achieving its stated objectives. This makes it difficult to organize in-mission training as each unit needs specific training in addition to the generic peace support operations knowledge that is applicable to all the units in the component. The most significant purpose of training in a peace support operation is to enhance the capabilities of mission staff to efficiently perform the mandated tasks needed for the effective execution of the mission mandate. Training must therefore be based on a function need and performance assessment basis. However, due to the absence of a structure for function and performance analysis, the training has been individual-needs led rather than mission led. Initially, the mission, the international community prioritized strengthening the Federal Government and mitigating the threat posed by the al-Shabaab. This in effect resulted in the neglect of recruitment and training of a capable civil component.²²⁷

Increasingly, AMISOM is being called upon to deal with emerging security challenges for example, those pertaining to maritime security including piracy, dumping of toxic wastes, over-fishing among others along the coast of Somalia. The slow pace in liberating areas occupied by al-Shabaab and the sporadic attacks in the liberated areas can lead to anxiety among the Somali population. Indeed, the Somali government, which is receiving support from AMISOM, could face credibility deficit whereby legitimacy of government is questioned and the resulting vacuum could easily be retaken by al-Shabaab.²²⁸

AMISOM in collaboration with other partners has been developing strategies, policies and plans for the management of both the Captured and Voluntary Disengaged Fighters (CVDF).

²²⁶ Report on Training Needs Analysis (TNA) for the African Standby Force, Nairobi/Accra, July 30, 2013

²²⁷ Peace and Security Council Report, January 2013

²²⁸ Peace and Security Council Report, 2013

These instruments have been presented to the FGS for adoption but, without corresponding provision of adequate financial resources, efforts to offer alternative livelihoods to former fighters pose another challenge. In the end their disengagement from the fighting might only be temporary with disgruntled individuals reverting back to fighting and/or engaging in banditry and other forms of criminality.²²⁹

Large Numbers of IDPs and Refugees pose a challenge to AMISOM operations, UN agencies estimated that more than 1.2 million persons had fled their homes in Mogadishu and its surroundings as a result of targeted attacks by al-Shabaab and continued conflicts between National Forces and antigovernment groups. The Somalia office of the UNHCR, estimated that there were 1.46 million IDPs in the country as a result of internal conflict. Most IDPs continue to live in dire conditions in protracted displacement, and prospects for durable solutions remain distant for many of them. Refugees were estimated to be 684 475 in 2011.⁴³

Since its establishment in August 2012, the new National Federal Government of Somalia has sought to promote peace, good governance and improve relations with parts of the country which have been seeking degrees of autonomy. However, the federal structure remains weak and potential for further instability remains. The Islamic militia Al-Shabaab, despite being ousted from some areas it controlled for years, remains a major threat to peace and security.

Clan Rivalry among the Somali people homogenous group in Africa, both ethnically and religiously. Despite their homogeneity, they are deeply divided by an ancient family or clan system which stands at the foundation of political and social life. Somalia has five main clans and numerous sub-clans in the population structure of Somalia. The Hawiye clan is most closely associated with the Islamic extremists and represents some 25% of the population. Traditionally, it is located in the areas north of Mogadishu and stops below Punt land.

²²⁹ Williams P. D., *Dealing with Disengaged Fighters: The Case of al-Shabaab*, International Peace Institute, 2013

Northwest Somaliland and eastern Ethiopia is the territory of the Isaaq clan, a tribe representing 22% of Somalia's people. The Darod clan is the most widely distributed tribal network and accounts for some 20% of the Somali population. It covers Puntland and a little further south, as well as the area bordering Kenya.²³⁰

The lack of sustainable funding equally poses a serious challenge for AMISOM in terms of continuity of its operations, the provision of the required capabilities and logistical support. While there are several co-existing support models including the UN Trust Fund, the EU African Peace Facility, direct donor support and United Nations Support Office for AMISOM (UNSOA), AMISOM is a heavy burden for the AU. To its credit, UNSOA and the support from the EU has made a big difference, but is still far from meeting most of the needs of the mission. For example, the necessary additional deployment of troops to area where they are most needed has been hampered by the lack of resources to airlift and sustain the troops in the mission.

AU in its calendar for AMISOM nor the Somali regime do not seem to envisage an exit strategy of AMISOM which is becoming a thorny issue both to the local players and the international community. It will remain as such so long as the interests of the donor community remain unfulfilled then AU and AMISOM will be dealt the same blow that Eritrea and Ethiopia suffered under UNMEE and the ensuing debacle.

4.4.2 Opportunities

The current Federal Government and Parliament are no longer transitional like before. This means that the government has a degree of authority and legitimacy domestically and has been recognized by the international community, including the United Nations (UN), the African Union (AU) and many other organizations and countries. The President has set out a vision and priorities for the country including security and justice, economic recovery,

²³⁰ Ulf Dahre J : Post-Conflict Peace-Building in the Horn of Africa, A Report of the 6 Annual Conference on the Horn of Africa, Lund University, August 24-26, 2007

governance and combating corruption.²³¹ Where government institutions are in place, the work of AMISOM can be enhanced.

For there to be significant impact from external support, it must be leveraged on viable institutions that advance the quest of the state in nation building. In Somalia, local governance is intended to be a key instrument for reconciliation and peace building, as well as serving as the basic political structural framework that enable the Somali population, through decentralized service delivery, to benefit from better social services and livelihood opportunities.²³²

The Capture of Kismayo presents another opportunity, since the KDF was incorporated into AMISOM and the eventual capture and control of the port of Kismayo; AMISOM has gained critical leverage because this has denied al-Shabaab access to the main seaport that had been a major source of income. The intervention by the Kenyan military was both successful and important to the AMISOM and the Somali Government not only because they were able to gain ground and extend their area of control but also to demonstrate to the Somali community that al-Shabaab could be outdone. Indeed, without the control of the port of Kismayo and the surrounding areas, al-Shabaab could have gained the necessary financial resources and continue to command the needed moral authority to mount and sustain a military campaign against Mogadishu.

In recognition of the risks of fighting among an urban population, AMISOM reviewed its engagement strategy and re-prioritized its interventions paying more attention to Somali cultural ties to attract the support of the population. Regular meetings with community leaders, outpatient clinics for treating civilians, and the provision of clean drinking water have been purposefully used by AMISOM to build and maintain the support of the population and political leaders during the most intensive periods of the military campaign.

²³¹ African Development Bank Group Somalia Country Brief, 2013-2015

²³²Ramsbotham , A and Zartman W, Paix sans frontières, Building Peace Across Borders, 2011

The success of this strategy was demonstrated by the fact that despite its sophisticated propaganda capacity and sustained efforts to discredit AMISOM, al-Shabaab has failed to create substantial opposition to the mission among the majority of the Somali population. AMISOM has been able to fully exploit the withdrawal of al-Shabaab from Mogadishu and the waning support for the militants particularly following their unpopular response to the famine and aid efforts of 2010–11.²³³

Since deployment AMISOM, it has been supported by various partners who have provided the necessary resources to sustain the mission. To date, AMISOM, in concert with the Somali government, has provided and is seen as the central pillar of stability in Somalia. The Somali government forces have greatly complemented AMISOM operations through the provision of vital human intelligence and facilitating the mobilization of the populace to support the mission. In addition, Militia forces, including the Ahlu Sunna WalJama'a and Ras Kamboni, have been vital allies to AMISOM and have assisted in operations outside Mogadishu, particularly in the capture of the port of Kismayo and its environs.²³⁴

The continued support by the EU in the training of the forces that began in 2010, complemented by additional training by US forces and other partners; has been instrumental, for example, in the fight against al-Shabaab. This commitment to train both the African Union led force and the Somali forces are expected to continue and even gain more momentum in the wake of international commitments made at the 2013 Somalia Conference in London.²³⁵ This engagement offers a perfect opportunity to develop the necessary capacity and required security infrastructure in Somalia.

²³³ Matt Freear and Cedric de Coning, *Lessons from the African Union Mission for Somalia (AMISOM) for Peace*

Operations in Mali, 2013

²³⁴ Nur M. Abdi, *International Community and Stability of Somalia: Case of AMISOM*, 2012

²³⁵ Matt Freear and Cedric de Coning, *Lessons from the African Union Mission for Somalia (AMISOM) for Peace*

Operations in Mali, 2013

The end of the Cold War brought a rapid growth in quantity of UN activities in Africa. Soon after unsuccessful withdrawal from Somalia and failure to stop the genocide in Rwanda led to the retrenchment and reassessment of UN operations in Africa.²³⁶ Major Powers in the UNSC retreated from their initial post-Cold War enthusiasm for engagement in African conflicts. Simultaneously, a debate about possible increased cooperation with regional organizations emerged.²³⁷ Interventions by African countries in conflicts outside the UN or AU frameworks have been observed. More importantly, such interventions by individual states have occurred side by side with internationally mandated missions in two central theatres of armed conflict: Somalia and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Both are the centerpiece of a regional conflict formation with non-state armed groups, but also state forces operating across borders on a regular basis.²³⁸

In Somalia, the establishment of AMISOM was meant to replace Ethiopian military involvement, but the neighbor's forces have repeatedly intervened after an official withdrawal in 2009. Furthermore, Kenya directly intervened in Somalia after October 2011 and got approval from the AU later, followed by the plan to incorporate Kenyan forces into AMISOM. Similarly, the Eastern DRC has time and again seen military interventions by neighboring Rwanda based on an agreement between the Congolese and the Rwandan Presidents after November 2008. The international community finds it convenient to argue for the regionalization of peacemaking and peacekeeping efforts in Africa and the principle of "African solutions for African problems."²³⁹ This was also the consequence of the death of American soldiers which not only influenced American public opinion towards UN

²³⁶ ONUC - <http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/Missions/onuc.htm>

²³⁷ Vladimír Kvača : UN Peacekeeping Operations in Africa, *Jan Masaryk Centre of International Studies, University of Economics, Prague*

²³⁸ The Center for Security Studies (CSS) at ETH Zurich: International Peace Keeping in Africa: Actors and Missions; 23/24 November 2012

²³⁹ Vorrath, J: When the Neighbors Keep a Foot in the Door: Regional Interventions and Peacekeeping in the DR Congo and Somalia, Center for Security Studies, Zurich, 2010

peacekeeping but also acted as a major warning against putting Western boots on the ground in African war zones.

Prospects for infrastructure rehabilitation and development during the re-construction period will greatly depend on maintaining a peaceful political environment, law and order, sound economic and social policies, and the proper functioning of the facilities and services later. Rehabilitation of infrastructure also provides opportunities for enhancing the dialogue and cooperation between communities, around improving common infrastructure assets, as part of peace building efforts. The actual state of infrastructure in Somalia presents many challenges, including logistical means and insecurity especially in large parts of South Central Somalia. All kind of infrastructure has suffered from lack of maintenance and rehabilitation, war damage and vandalism, and years of neglect.²⁴⁰

In conflict situations, it is important to identify local peace actors/factors that can reduce tensions and draw the people together. In Somalia, clan leaders have for the past fourteen years largely taken over the roles of the state in security and law. They have consolidated their traditional role as dispute mediators and enforcers of customary laws, including the *xeer*, that regulate most aspects of social life within and between clans. As such, traditional leaders in Somalia have not only been the prime force for stability and continuity in terms of regulating access to pasture, water and in conflict resolution between clans, but have also been instrumental in establishing relatively stable structures of governance especially in the Northern parts of Somalia. Apart from maintaining a primary role in local conflict resolution and upholding of customary laws, the traditional leaders have generally been perceived as the most legitimate leaders by their clan members. Given the central and legitimate position of the traditional structures in Somali society especially after the collapse of the state in 1991, it

²⁴⁰Bassiouni D, S & McKay, L: Somali Joint Needs Assessment, Infrastructure Cluster Report, September, 2006

is extremely important that they be involved in the actual peace processes in the re-emerging Somalia state.

Given the vibrancy and innovativeness of the Somali business community, they must be involved in post conflict reconstruction in the country. The business sector not only thrived in spite of chaos but has also been innovative as seen in the creation of a local entrepreneurial cadre in telecommunication industry, banking and money transfer services unrivalled even in stable countries. The business sector, if empowered, can absorb the youth and engage the population in gainful employment which will reduce the militancy of al-Shabaab.

The close relationship between traditional elders, business community and the new political leaders can lead to identify an inclusive recovery strategy to accelerate the rate of economic recovery of the country. The private sector has contributed to peace building in Somalia by paying for the disarmament, rehabilitation and employment of thousands of former gunmen. In Mogadishu, many telephone repairmen, petty traders, drivers and company or business guards are former gunmen.²⁴¹

Somalia is rich in natural wealth and if properly and sustainably harnessed can play a critical role in alleviating poverty and rebuilding the required infrastructure. Therefore the FGS has to promote sustainable development and management of natural resources by developing legal and regulatory frameworks and building capacity in Natural Resources Management. Somalia natural resource is the backbone of the economy but also could be a driver of conflict and increase vulnerability both economically and politically, at local and regional levels. To ensure sustainable environmental and natural resource management the FGS should develop technical options for natural resources revenue-sharing and build the capacity of key natural resource management institutions.²⁴²

²⁴¹ Mohamed A J, Business as usual: Bakaaro market in war, International Contact Group,2010

²⁴² The Federal Republic of Somalia : A new beginning for a sovereign, se cure, democratic, united and federal Somalia at peace with itself and the world, and for the benefit of its people

4.5 Conclusion

The findings of this study have clearly established that since its debut in Somalia in 2007, AMISOM has made important and substantial contributions towards the improvement of security in Somalia. Key to this success was the defeat and subsequent ejection of the militant al-Shabaab group from the capital city in Mogadishu in 2011 followed by that of the port of Kismayo in October 2012. The liberation of these key areas have been instrumental and today after over 20-years of civil strife, Somalia has a functioning central government and its populace are slowly re-building their shattered lives. AMISOM, working together with the Government of Somalia, continue to liberate and hold more ground previously held by the al-Shabaab.

The chapter has pointed out that the achievements of AMISOM was made possible by several factors ranging from the implementation of more robust mandates, conducive political climate and goodwill within and outside Somalia, and provision of most needed resources by the international community, among other factors. Further, it has been revealed that there has been a genuine desire by the Somali population to see the end of the strife and commitment to see the re-birth of their country. The aforementioned have contributed to shift in public opinion that has increasingly seen al-Shabaab losing ground at all levels.

This chapter has also identified various challenges that face AMISOM, and its partners, in their quest to enhance security and enhance peace in Somalia. The analysis show that the challenges are diverse and range from the latent threat of the al-Shabaab manifested in sporadic acts of violence within and out Somalia, the question of legitimacy of the central authority/government, large number of internally displace persons and refugees, emerging

new security threat and frontiers of conflict, lack of and uncertainty of guaranteed provision of resources among many other challenges.

The analysis at the same time has revealed that there has also been a myriad of potential opportunities available to AMISOM, and its partners, in its endeavour to realize its mandate. This includes, revamped and more realistic mandates, political goodwill, an educated and enlightened populace especially those in the Diaspora, untapped wealth from the country's natural resources, and entrepreneurial society, existing strong local structures of governance amongst other factors. AMISOM initiative has demonstrated that as a continent Africa has come of age and the adage of 'Africans finding the solutions to African problems' is not a myth but a reality and opportunity for the continent to grab and embrace.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

Dealing with the issue of Somali security possesses a complex situation surrounded with a number of dynamics. Somalia being an outcome of colonial artificial state formation, a state that came into existence with the merger of ex-British and ex-Italian 'Somaliland's' in the 60s. Its conflict resolution should be treated with the casual relationship of its colonizers in mind. The casual relationship between ex-British and ex-Italian created a fertile ground to the weakening of the nation. Soon after its independence, the young nation found itself in full-scale border conflict with Ethiopia which assumes to 'take' the lion's share of its region by Somali speaking population. A situation that resulted in the emergence of a dominant factional politics thereby to the escalation of clan-based power rivalries

Another internal dynamic is that Somalia even though unlike other African states, is relatively constitutes a more or less homogeneous population liable enough to be called a 'nation-state citizens', the dynamic and fragile nature of association to clan cleavages than to the nation as a whole was and still is the core reason for the weakening of the Somali societal fabrics a condition that has significantly given rise to the intense clan division among the major clans and the numerous sub-clans and further to the dissection of the country's political forces along those loose clan lines.

The divisions along the clan lines manifestly express the fragility of statehood experiences in Africa. As in Somalia the merger of two 'Somalilands' due to the interests of colonial powers failed to take into consideration the deep-rooted Somali culture of strong tendencies towards clan affiliations than the nation. The Siad Barre rule was considered repressive for forcefully bringing Somali nationalism thereby creating a strong 'Greater Somalia' seems to fail to

thoroughly understand the nature of the societal fabrics of the Somali society at large which is highly complex to understand. To that extent it failed to more or less reflect the fragile nature of the absence of strong statehood culture in that country (as in many newly independent African states).

When the Siad Barre's rule fell in 1991, Somalia collapsed. Peace initiative attempts to bring together all the political forces into peaceful negotiation so as to enable the war-torn nation stand on its feet have failed. The last of these international peace conferences was held in Nairobi, Kenya with expectations to hopefully bring a lasting solution to the problem of Somalia. It in fact created a federal government representing the interests of the main vying factions and hence a precondition to restore the institutions of a state and guarantee peace, security and order in the country. Unfortunately, the transitional federal government of Somalia became non-functional and incapacitated to ensure domain over other political forces. For a greater part of its existence TFG was neither able to outshine the Islamic Courts Union which in reality ruled over Somalia and ensured a more or less stable and predictable political environment since the last government was deposed in early 1990s nor could it secure 'legitimacy' to rule over the majority of the Somalis. But Ethiopia's military intervention to crash elements of the ICU in a manner to ensure that the TFG become the legitimate government of Somalia had some impacts.

The Ethiopian peace initiative was supported by the African Union in support of the TFG sent a peace keeping mission to the country. Since 2007, AMISOM has been operational but with a much more difficulties a head of it. Strong political forces like the Al-Shabaab and other militant Islamic elements have been the headache for its peace-keeping operations. In the present day Somali, AMISOM is faced with a number of challenges including Suicide bombings, hit-and-run street shootings and unprecedented attacks on AMISOM's bases. Due to these challenges the mission has been facing numerous casualties since its arrival in that

country whose operations seem to be confined to securing its main base, the capital airport and the presidential palace. AMISOM's situation is further worsened by the fact that members of the AU who promised to send more troops to the mission have failed to keep their words. It was estimated that the AMISOM should at least need to have about 8000 troops for peace-keeping troops for peace-keeping.

Nonetheless, this study has revealed that the mission in general lacks the relevant human and logistic resources to facilitate its peace-keeping operation in one of the world's unsafe and dangerous place. AMISON's situation can be described as precarious to say the least and it has left the mission nothing but the most likely decision to evacuate the country if things continue in the same manner. Support from the international community including the US seems to be lacking in Somalia, rather, they are talking about the problem of piracy than focusing on the root causes of piracy and other security challenges which are entirely linked to the internal dynamics of Somalia caused by absence of a government.

On a general perspective on peacekeeping strategies in Africa, it has been revealed by the study that the AU's conflict management initiatives critically need adequate facilities, systems, and infrastructure to sustain peacekeeping missions and mediation efforts in the field. For peacekeeping operations, for example, safe and secure accommodation facilities are crucial, similarly, no mission can operate effectively without logistics chains to facilitate the deployment (and sustainment) of military and civilian capabilities into the theater of operations. Yet the AU has conducted its peace operations without an equivalent of the UN's Department of Field Support. This leaves the AU's Peace Support Operations Division without the capability to effectively manage planning processes in relation to movement control, logistics, human resources, finance, provisions, fuel, maintenance, troop rotations, stores management, and other elements crucial to mission support. To the extent that any of these gaps were ever plugged, it was by Western donor states and various UN agencies. Not

only has the UN given the AU practical tools such as pre-deployment checklists and planning tools, it has also brought AU officials to its logistics bases in Brindisi, Italy, and Entebbe, Uganda, to help the AU establish a logistics base in Africa.

As most analysts contend the coloniality nature of the African statehood plays a pivotal role in explaining the security situation in Africa. Most of the factors are both directly or implicitly related to colonial statehood and its post-colonial impacts in igniting and fuelling a number of inter-state conflicts between or among newly independent countries. In the immediate aftermath of independence, we have experienced a number of border wars between Ethiopia-Somalia, Nigeria-Cameroon, Chad-Libya, Morocco-Algeria, etc. In fact, due to the nature of state formation in Africa, inter-state conflicts later subsided (but with a potential to 'time-bomb') and were superseded by intra-state conflicts. Africa again has begun to face an ever increasing internal conflicts caused by the deliberate and distorted statehood formation. This in fact has been caused by the displacement of two or more ethno-linguistic /cultural identities between two or more independent states. Since independence the above coupled with other factors have become the main reasons to instigate many more inter- and intra-state conflicts in Africa than in any other continent.

The issue of Somali security should be treated from these two angles/causal relationships. First, likewise many of the newly independent countries in Africa, Somalia was an outcome of colonial artificial state formation. It came into existence with the merger of ex-British and ex-Italian 'Somalilands' in 1960. The young nation-state sooner found itself in full-scale border conflict with Ethiopia which assumes to 'take' the lion's share of its region by Somali speaking population. Two of such occasions were military disasters for Somalia. These later created a fertile condition to the weakening of the young state and to the emergence of a dominant factional politics and thereby to the escalation of clan-based power rivalries in the

next few decades.

Second, from the perspective of the internal dynamics, even though unlike other African states, Somalia relatively constitutes a more or less homogeneous population liable enough to be called a ‘nation-state citizens’, the dynamic and fragile nature of association to clan cleavages than to the nation as a whole was and still is the core reason for the weakening of the Somali societal fabrics. This has significantly given rise to the intense clan division among the five major clans and the numerous sub-clans and to the dissection of the country’s political forces along those loose clan lines.

5.2 Key Findings

While military assets are critical, multidimensional peace operations also require civilian capabilities. Here the AU suffers from a shortage of experts in the rule of law and security institutions such as police, justice, and corrections officers—as well as expert trainers to build local capacity in Somalia.

However, the AU’s biggest civilian deficit in conflict management is its lack of mediation capacity. Rather than developing a systematic approach to mediation, the AU has proceeded on an ad hoc basis, largely dictated by the personalities of the senior figures involved. It has often deployed high-level candidates who lack the relevant expertise and experience, while investing meager effort in evaluating what went right or wrong in its previous mediation initiatives.

The AU consistently struggles to marshal the requisite military personnel and range of military assets needed for complex peace operations. Perhaps the most blatant example of

military unpreparedness came in the early phases of AMISOM when the initial Burundian contingents lacked the most basic military equipment (which was ultimately provided by the U.S. government). Among the assets in highest demand in difficult African theaters such as Sudan and Somalia are helicopters (utility and attack), armored personnel carriers, communications and intelligence equipment, unmanned aerial vehicles, night vision goggles, and, in the case of AMISOM in Mogadishu, battle tanks. AMISOM also lacks a sophisticated mortar radar system, which could have helped it reduce levels of civilian casualties. As for military personnel, the AU's greatest deficits are specialists with niche skills including medicine, engineering, and intelligence gathering. To fill these gaps, AU missions rely on external donors to provide funding, training, and equipment directly to troop contributing countries—hence bypassing AU systems.

5.3 Recommendations

Effective peacekeeping and peacemaking initiatives require efficient management and bureaucratic structures both in Addis Ababa and in the field to provide strategic vision and support senior mission leadership teams. At present, however, AMISOM lacks the institutional capacity and human resources to conduct effective peacemaking initiatives and complex peace operations. According to its own internal assessment, the AU Commission suffers from weak bureaucratic processes and management systems; poor information technologies; inadequate physical infrastructure; a lack of professional and motivated personnel; weak reputation, presence, and reach; and inadequate sources of funds.

Arguably the most important dimension of conflict management is the political piece. As the UN secretary-general correctly concluded, “The African Union’s effectiveness results from the sum of its members.”²⁴³ Important political enablers that affect the AU’s conflict

²⁴³Report of the UN Secretary-General, *Support to African Union peacekeeping operations*, paragraph 59.

management capabilities include: widespread agreement on what AU peacekeeping operations can (and cannot) be expected to achieve; unity within the PSC in support of those objectives; sustained high-level political engagement to support AU special envoys, committees, and panels as well as peacekeepers in the field; and genuine cooperation from host-state authorities. Unfortunately, the AU has not performed well in these areas.

When confronting armed conflict, it is particularly important that there be strong and united PSC support for a viable peace process, the force generation phase of the peacekeeping operation, the conduct of the operation, as well as an exit strategy. During the crucial start up/planning phase, powerful African leaders, and not merely commission officials, must champion the mission and play a proactive role in generating the required forces. Early and sustained high-level political engagement makes it more likely that the required technical capabilities will be allocated and maintained during the mission's life cycle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Society of International Law 2007 accessed from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4149826> .
- ‘United Nations Peacekeeping an Indispensable Weapon in International Community’s Arsenal Secretary-General Says in Anniversary Message of First Mission’ pasted at www.un.org
- “Prodi Report,” i.e., *Report of the African Union-United Nations panel on modalities for support to African Union peacekeeping operations*, African Union, *Draft Framework for a Common African Defense and Security Policy*, p. 3.
- African Union, Policy Framework for the Establishment of the African Standby Force and Military Staff Committee, p. 9.
- Aidan Hehir, *Humanitarian Intervention After Kosovo: Iraq, Darfur and the Record of Global Civil Society* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
- AMISOM (2008). "AMISOM: Background and Political Developments." [Africa for Peace, Stability and Development](#). Retrieved Aug. 12, 2014.
- AU Commission, *Strategic Plan 2009-2012*, AU document EX.CL/501 (XV) Rev.2, May 19, 2009, p. 11.
- AU doc. PSC/PR/Comm(LXIX), 19 January 2007 and UN Security Council Resolution 1744, 20 February 2007.
- Bassiouni D, S & McKay, L: Somali Joint Needs Assessment, Infrastructure Cluster Report, September, 2006
- Bellamy, A.J., Williams, P. & Griffin. 2004. *Understanding Peacekeeping*. Cambridge: Polity Press. pp. 15-23.
- Bellamy, A.J., Williams, P. & Griffin. 2004. *Understanding Peacekeeping*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Boulden, Peace Enforcement: The United Nations Experience in Congo, Somalia, and Bosnia, p. 6
- Carolyn Haggis, *The African Union and Intervention: The Origins and Implications of Article 4(h) of the 2001 Constitutive Act*, Unpublished D. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 2009.
- Carsten Stahn, Responsibility to Protect: Political Rhetoric or Emerging Legal Norm?
- Cedric de Coning, "Towards a Common Southern Africa Peacekeeping System", *CIPS Electronic Briefing Paper* 16 (2004), p. 3
- Centre for Research and Dialogue(CRD), Somalia: Path to Recovery and Building a Sustainable Peace, Mogadishu, July, 2004
- Chonghaile, Clar Ni (21 July 2014). "Kenyan troops launch beach assault on Somali city of Kismayo". *The Guardian*. Retrieved 21 July 2014.
- Chris Albin-Lackey, *So Much to Fear: War Crimes and the Devastation of Somalia* (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2008), 3.

David H. Shinn, 'Al Shabaab's Foreign Threat to Somalia', *Orbis*, vol. 55, no. 2, 2011, pp. 209-11; Report of the 2nd AMISOM-TFG Information Sharing Meeting, 22nd to 24th November 2011, Bujumbura Burundi

David Kilcullen, *The Accidental Guerilla* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Festus B. Aboagye, "Global and Regional Approaches to Peacekeeping and Security in Africa," presentation to the Potsdam Spring Dialogue, April 4–5, 2008, www.sef-bonn.org/download/veranstaltungen/2008/2008_pfg_presentation_aboagye_en.pdf.

Francis, D.J., Faal, M., Kabia, J. & Ramsbotham, A. 2005. *Dangers of Co- Deployment: UN Co-Operative Peacekeeping in Africa*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Francis, D.J., Faal, M., Kabia, J. & Ramsbotham, A. 2005. *Dangers of Co- Deployment: UN Co-Operative Peacekeeping in Africa*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Fred Ngoga Gateretse, Adviser to the AU Special Representative for Somalia, Amb. Nicholas Bwakira, Statement before the House Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, Washington, DC, 25 June 2009, p. 3.

FT Liu, *The History of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Following the Cold War: 1988 to 1997* (UNITARPOCI, 1998) p. 69.

G8, "Implementation Report by Africa Personal Representatives to Leaders on the G8 Africa Action Plan", G8 Summit (Evian: France, June 1-3, 2003), www.au2002.gov.za/docs/releases/g8030604b.htm.

Gareth Evans, *The Responsibility to Protect: Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and for All* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2008), 41–43.

Heinlein, Peter (21 July 2014). "E. African Nations Back Kenyan Offensive in Somalia". *Voice of America*. Retrieved 21 July 2014.

Hjalte T, *The Spaces of Civil War : From a Global Typology of Civil War to a Topography of Violence in South Africa, 1976, 1986, 1996*, University of Tromso, 2013

Hussein Ali Dualeh, *Somalia: The Agony of a Nation*, (Nairobi: Stella Graphics, 1994) p. 15.

ICG Policy Briefing: Africa Briefing Number 45 Nairobi/Brussels, 26 January 2007, 'Somalia: The Tough Path Is Ahead' pasted at www.crisisgroup.org

In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All, Report of the Secretary-General, UN Doc. A/59/2005, available at <http://www.un.org/largerfreedom/contents.htm>

Institute for Security Studies (ISS), "Peace and Security Council Report," Issue 5, December 2009, p. 17.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), *The Responsibility to Protect* (Ottawa: IDRC, 2001).

International Commission on Intervention and States Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect*, at VIII (2001), available at <http://www.iciss.ca/report-en.asp>

International Commission on Intervention and States Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect*, at VIII (2001), available at <http://www.iciss.ca/report-en.asp>

International Crisis Group, *Somalia's Divided Islamists* (ICG Africa Briefing No. 74, 18 May 2010).

- Jackie Cilliers, *The African Standby Force: An Update on Progress*, ISS Paper No. 160, Institute for Security Studies, March 2008, p.17.
- Jeremy Sarkin, "The Role of the United Nations, the African Union and Africa's Sub-Regional Organizations in Dealing with Africa's Human Rights Problems: Connecting Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect," *Journal of African Law* 53, no. 1 (2009)
- John Latin, *World in Conflict: War Annual 8* (London: Brassey's) p. 176.
- Ken Menkhaus, 'Violent Islamic Extremism: Al-Shabaab Recruitment in America', at http://hsgac.senate.gov/public/_files/031109Menkhaus031109.pdf.
- Kindiki, K. (2003). "The normative and institutional framework of the African Union relating to the protection of human rights and the maintenance of international peace and security: A Critical Appraisal." AFRICAN HUMAN RIGHTS LAW JOURNAL 3: 20.
- Kioko, B. (2003). "The right of intervention under the African Union's Constitutive Act: From non-interference to non-intervention." *IRRC* 85(852): 18.
- Kofi Annan, 'Peace Operations and the UN', paper delivered at Conflict Resolution Monitor 1, Centre for Conflict Resolution, Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford, (1997) pp. 25-32.
- Laurie Nathan, "Mediation and the African Union's Panel of the Wise," submission to the Commission for Africa, July 15, 2004, www.commissionforafrica.org/english/consultation/submissions/before/sb-jul-aug04-007.pdf.
- Lawrence A Onoja Maj Gen, *Peacekeeping and International Security in a Changing World*, (Jos: Mono Expressions Ltd, 1996) p.91.
- Liu FT, *The History of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Following the Cold War: 1988 to 1997* (New York: UNITARPOCI, 1998) p. 13.
- Lyons, Terrence and Ahmed Ismail Samatar. 1995. *Somalia: State Collapse, Multilateral Intervention and Strategies*. Washington, DC: Brookings.
- MacQueen, N. 2002. *United Nations Peacekeeping in Africa since 1960*. Great Britain: Pearson Education.
- Marten, K.Z. 2004. *Enforcing the Peace: Learning From the Imperial Past*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Melber, H. (2001). "The New African Initiative and the African Union: A Preliminary Assessment and Documentation." **25**(Current African Issues): 36.
- Mike Denning, "A Prayer for Marie: Creating an Effective African Standby Force", *Parameters* xxxiv/4 (Winter 2004-05), p. 107.
- Mohamed A J, *Business as usual: Bakaaro market in war*, International Contact Group, 2010.
- Murithi, T. (2007). "Institutionalizing Pan-Africanism: Transforming the values and principles into policy and practice." *Institute For Security Studies*(143): 13.

- Murithi, T. (2007). "Institutionalizing Pan-Africanism: Transforming the values and principles into policy and practice." *Institute For Security Studies*(143): 13.
- O’Niell, J.T. & Rees, N. 2005. *United Nations Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Paul D. Williams, “From Non-Intervention to Non-Indifference: The Origins and Development of the African Union’s Security Culture,” *African Affairs* 106, no. 423 (2007).
- Power, □ a Problem from Hell □ *America and the Age of Genocide.*, 14.
- Report of the Monitoring Group on Somalia and Eritrea pursuant to Security Council resolution 1916(2010) (UN doc. S/2011/433, 18 July 2011), p. 12.
- Richard J.F. Day (2005), *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements* (London: Pluto), 54.
- Richmond, O.P. 2001. *The Limits of UN Multidimensional Peace Operations*. In *The United Nations and Human Security*, Newman, E. & Richmond, O.P. (eds.). New York: Palgrave.
- Rikhye, I.J. 1984. *The Theory and Practice of Peacekeeping*. London: C. Hurst & Co.
- Roland Marchal, ‘A tentative assessment of the Somali Harakat Al-Shabaab’, *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2009, pp. 393-4.
- Samuel M. Makinda and F. Wafula Okumu, *The African Union* (London: Routledge, 2008), pp. 51, 50. See also p. 120.
- Somalia Security Sector Assessment (AU, US, EU, TFG, World Bank and UN: 1 January 2010), para. 15c.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty *A Critique of Post-Colonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999.
- Stuart Croft, □ *International Relations and Africa*, □ *African affairs* 96, no. 385 (1997).
- UN document A/3943, Summary study of the experience derived from the establishment and operation of the Force: report of the Secretary-General
- UN document A/47/277 – S/24111, *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping*, p. 11
- UN document A/63/666-S/2008/813, December 31, 2008, paragraphs 11, 15, 16.
- United Nations. 1945. Charter of the United Nations. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/>.
- United Nations. 1996. *The Blue Helmets: a Review of United Nations Peace-keeping*. 3rd Edition. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information.
- United Nations. 1996. *The Blue Helmets: a Review of United Nations Peace-keeping*. 3rd Edition. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information.
- United Nations. 2003. *Handbook on United Nations Multidimensional Peacekeeping Operations*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.peacekeepingbestpractices.unlb.org>.

United Nations. 2008. United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Principles and Guidelines. [Online]. Available at:
http://pbpu.unlb.org/PBPS/Library/Capstone_Doctrine_ENG.pdf.

United Nations. 2008. United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Principles and Guidelines. [Online]. Available at:
http://pbpu.unlb.org/PBPS/Library/Capstone_Doctrine_ENG.pdf.

Vanessa Kent and Mark Malan, "The African Standby Force: Progress and Prospects", *African Security Review* 12/3 (2003), p. 73.

Weiss, Thomas G., and Don Hubert. *The Responsibility to Protect: Research, Bibliography, Background*. International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001. Available from <http://www.icissciise.gc.ca/menu-e.asp>.

Williams P. D., *Dealing with Disengaged Fighters: The Case of al-Shabaab*, International Peace Institute, 2013

Wiseman, H. 1984. The OAU: Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution. In *The OAU After Twenty Years*, El-Ayouty, Y. & Zartman, I.W. (eds.). New York: Praeger.