



How EU Support of the African Peace and Security Architecture Impacts Democracy Building and Human Security Enhancement in Africa

Kenneth Mpyisi, Institute for Security Studies, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia



How EU Support of the African Peace and Security Architecture Impacts Democracy Building and Human Security Enhancement in Africa

© International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance 2009

International IDEA publications are independent of specific national or political interests. Views expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent the views of International IDEA, its Board or its Council members.

Applications for permission to reproduce or translate all or any part of this publication should be made to:

International IDEA
SE -103 34 Stockholm
Sweden

Layout by: Bulls Graphics

How EU Support of the African Peace and Security Architecture Impacts Democracy Building and Human Security Enhancement in Africa

Abstract

Over the years there has been an emphasis on strengthening African regional security mechanisms to stem conflicts and sustain the democratic culture that is taking shape on the continent. The Joint Africa-European Union Strategy, a comprehensive policy framework, has peace, security, democratic governance and human rights as one of its principal objectives. With regards to security, the Joint Strategy has three principal pillars: enhancing dialogue on challenges to peace and security, directing the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) and funding African Union-led peace support operations. At the request of African leaders, the European Union (EU) in 2004 implemented the African Peace Facility (APF), a EUR 250 million, three-year instrument designed to support peace, security and development. Although the programme was intended to be a short-term measure, when it ended in 2007 it was renewed until 2010 with a further infusion of EUR 300 million.

Yet, by paying excessive attention to the institutions that constitute the African Peace and Security Architecture, the Joint EU-Africa Strategy seems to have forgotten that the present crisis on the continent is the weakness of African states. State weakness remains the principal source of insecurity in Africa. Additionally, some powerful EU members seem to pursue their own African foreign policies despite the EU-wide character of the APF. As a result, the competing agendas of EU member states disrupt the common EU democracy agenda. Taking the African Peace Facility and the EU Forces in Chad and the Central Africa Republic (EUFOR) as case studies, this paper examines the effect on democratization by EU support to the APSA and Africa in general.

By paying excessive attention to the institutions that constitute the African Peace and Security Architecture, the Joint EU-Africa Strategy seems to have forgotten that the present crisis on the continent is the weakness of African states.

Summary of Recommendations

To address the root causes of conflict and deprivation in Africa, the EU should:

- Strengthen democratic institutions in order to emphasize development and sustainable democratic culture.
- Establish an effective early warning mechanism with particular reference to electoral processes.
- Use a multi-pronged approach with the instruments currently available to the African Union such as the Democracy, Governance and Elections Charter.
- Implement action through the regional economic communities and at the national level.
- Support domestic democratic institutions like electoral processes.
- Reward democracies through economic cooperation and development.
- Build greater uniformity in European foreign policy.

The African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) refers to a well-ordered blueprint and neatly assembled structures, norms, capacities and procedures to prevent and manage conflicts and mediate for peace.

1. The EU's Support of Africa and its Effect on Democracy

An overview of the African Peace and Security Architecture

The African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) refers to a well-ordered blueprint and neatly assembled structures, norms, capacities and procedures to prevent and manage conflicts and mediate for peace. The APSA marks an evolution of Africa's attempts at solving its own crises by taking account of changing global politics and realities. The APSA is the result of a consensus by African leaders that the Organization of African Unity (the precursor of the African Union) was not properly suited to confront Africa's contemporary security challenges. The APSA represents an interventionist approach and a conflict mechanism that prioritizes prevention (Article 4 (h), Constitutive Act of the African Union). The following institutions comprise the APSA:

- A) Peace and Security Council (PSC): a standing decision-making organ for the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts. It is a collective security and early warning group that facilitates timely and efficient responses to conflict and crisis situations in Africa (Article 2, Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union). The PSC legitimizes and coordinates all the activities of the other institutions of the architecture. The PSC also builds relations with the United Nations Security Council and the EU Political and Security Committee.
- B) Panel of the Wise: an advisory mechanism aimed at stemming conflict before it breaks out. The Panel is composed of five highly respected African personalities selected by the chairperson of the African Union Commission after consultation with member states concerned (Article 11, Protocol Relating to the Establishment

of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union). Candidates are appointed by the Assembly of the African Union.

- C) Continental Early Warning System: a system to collect and analyze country data on the basis of an appropriate 'early warning indicators module' to enable early response to a crisis.
- D) African Standby Force (ASF): a mechanism to deploy humanitarian assistance as a preventive means to avert conflict. The ASF is a multi-disciplinary contingent with civilian and military components in the country of origin. It deploys on missions decided by the PSC and authorized by the Assembly of the African Union.
- E) Military Staff Committee: composed of the chiefs of defence of the countries serving on the PSC. The Military Staff Committee advises and assists the Peace and Security Council on questions relating to military and security requirements.
- F) Peace Fund: comprises financial appropriations taken from the regular budget of the African Union, as well as voluntary contributions from member states and from other sources within Africa, including the private sector (civil society and individuals) and appropriate activities (Article 21 (2), Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union).
- G) Regional Mechanisms of the Regional Economic Communities: part of the overall security architecture of the African Union, which has the primary responsibility for promoting peace, security and stability in Africa. The Peace and Security Council and the chairperson of the African Union Commission are charged with harmonizing and coordinating activities of Regional Mechanisms in compliance with the objectives and principles of the AU. The AU and Regional Mechanisms of Conflict Prevention and Resolution signed a memorandum of understanding on peace and security in 2007.
- H) Civil Society: non-governmental organizations, community-based and other civil society organizations (particularly women's organizations) are encouraged to participate in the efforts to promote peace, security and stability in Africa. Such organizations may be invited to address the Peace and Security Council (Article 20, Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union).

2. Analysis of EU Support to the African Peace and Security Architecture

What are some of the variables that inform the EU's renewed effort to engage on issues of peace and security in Africa? Although humanitarianism has emerged as the driving force, the degree of EU engagement can be explained to a large extent by geo-strategic reasons. As regional integration in Europe deepens, Europe has tended to develop a coherent approach to Africa, at least at the regional level. Of course, the simple answer would be that Europe is struggling to have a common foreign policy and that a common security approach is a natural outcome of such a process. Whether this interest represents a coherent foreign policy agenda of member states is still a huge debate. However, the reconceptualization of security has provided an opportunity for renewed EU engagement on peace and security in Africa.

Conceptual Vehicle for EU Engagement on Peace and Security in Africa

The AU has adopted a conceptual approach to security that encompasses both the traditional, state-centric notion of the survival of the state as well as the survival of the individual. Human security is the bedrock of the African peace and security agenda. The AU defines human security as:

The security of the individual in terms of satisfaction of his/her basic needs. It also includes the creation of social, economic, political, environmental and cultural conditions necessary for the survival and dignity of the individual, the protection of and respect for human rights, good governance and the guarantee for each individual of opportunities and choices for his/her full development.¹

This definition underlines the principle that Africa's security is indivisible. The security of each African country is inseparably linked to that of other African countries, sub-regions and the continent as a whole (Paragraph 6, African Union Solemn Declaration on a Common African Defence and Security Policy). Thus, Africa's security could be

understood in terms of transnationality or what is popularly known as a 'security complex' (Aning, 2007). However, Africa's political economy reveals that the reality is in stark contrast to the human security agenda. Though the AU has not entirely lived up to the ethos of the human security agenda, the AU policy approach at least on paper is in line with the liberal tradition that conceptualizes security through human development, which is couched in the discourse on democracy.

The security of each African country is inseparably linked to that of other African countries, regions and the continent as a whole. Unfortunately, Africa's political economy demonstrates that the reality is in stark contrast to the human security agenda.

From the EU side, security is seen through the prism of development. As a result, security can not be excluded from development. It is within this context that the African Peace Facility is conceptualized as part of development aid in Africa. The African Peace Facility is not the only tool for the EU to support peace and security in Africa, but it is by far the strongest mechanism available to the EU for assisting peace support operations by African institutions.

Probable Incentives for EU Engagement on Peace and Security in Africa

Disengagement: European countries seem not to be eager to engage in African conflict zones, considering the political costs. This trend was epitomized by France, which instituted the Reinforcement of African Peace-keeping Capabilities (RECAMP), a programme that helps African states acquire military skills to conduct peacekeeping missions. It has become a policy imperative for the EU and EU member states to fund African-led peacekeeping missions; after all, it goes along with the catchy phrase 'African Solutions to African Problems'. Thus, while EU forces are decreasing in Africa, EU funding for peace and security in Africa is on the increase (Vines and Middleton, 2008).

¹ Article 1 (k), African Union Non-Aggression and Common Defence Pact, Abuja, 2005

Moreover, while the EU is prepared to disengage from African conflict theaters, there is a perception that the security vacuum created by a failing state can be a haven for terrorists. The West considers terrorism to be a consequence of state failure. As a result, there is a need to bolster the security apparatus of African states.

Energy Security: as the Middle East and Russia become unreliable for energy security, Africa seems the next logical location. Unlike the United States of America (USA), which has stated that Africa is important to its energy needs, the EU has not explicitly made such a pronouncement. However, it would be naive to pretend that the EU or at least its members have no interest in Africa's natural resources. The Gulf of Guinea is considered to be the next frontier in the oil industry, and has become critically important to Western countries, France and the USA in particular (Ayangafac, 2008). Five of the six countries of the Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa (CEMAC) are oil-producing countries with their total reserve making up 12 per cent of Africa's oil reserve (Tamba, Tchatchouang and Dou'a, 2007). The Gulf of Guinea accounts for about 45 per cent of Africa's total reserve and oil accounts for about 79 per cent of CEMAC's export (Tamba, Tchatchouang and Dou'a, 2007). The Central African Republic's uranium deposits also provide an alternative source of energy for countries like France with which to enhance their nuclear capabilities (Ayangafac, 2008).

Migration: migration has become a huge security threat in Europe not only because it threatens the European way of life and job security but also because of terrorism. As millions of Africans attempt to enter Europe every day to escape socio-economic problems and in some instances political harassment, helping Africa to resolve this situation is perceived within the EU as a strategy to stem the tide of migration.

3. The Africa Peace Facility

The Africa Peace Facility was established in April 2004 as an instrument to strengthen peace and security through support for African peacekeeping operations. The APF is based on the principles of partnership; African ownership; solidarity between AU member states to enable cooperation with regional sub-organizations in Africa; and creating conditions for development. The APF consists of two main components: African peace support operations (PSOs), conducted under the authority of the African Union, and capacity building to strengthen the AU and regional economic communities to implement and conduct the peacekeeping operations.

Critique

It is apparent that the APF is mostly a conflict-management tool. The APF was established with EUR 250 million of which EUR 200 million was earmarked for PSOs, EUR 35 million for capacity building and the remaining EUR 15 million to cover audits, evaluations and contingencies. Grants have so far been allocated to two different PSOs in the Central African Republic and Darfur, Sudan (FOMUC and AMIS), respectively), and a limited amount to capacity building.²

² See Mid Term Evaluation of the African Peace Facility Framework-Contract available at <http://www.dgroups.org/groups/CoOL/docs/APF-Evaluation-Final_Report-ECDDPM_version_for_ECORYS_190106.pdf>, last accessed on 20 April 2009

The APF's overemphasis on conflict management has been replicated by what at times appears too much attention from Africa's major donors, especially the EU, to fund the African Standby Force. Though not a bad thing, it is important to stress that such euphoria should also be matched by efforts to strengthen domestic political institutions. An examination of the crisis in Darfur and the Central African Republic (CAR) reveals that though the violence in these conflicts might have abated, the structural causes found in democratic deficits have not been addressed. The case of EUFOR in Chad shows that any sustainable PSO must be accompanied by an inclusive and constructive internal dialogue. It is a fact that PSOs have an effect (intended or unintended) on the balance of power and trajectory in conflict. The absence of internal dialogue aimed at a political solution to the crisis might paint the PSO as an impartial intervention masked to support a party. Moreover, the existence of an internal dialogue facilitates the development of an exit strategy.

The direct consequence of strengthening the APSA would liberate the EU from the pressure of intervening in African conflicts. However, it will not solve Africa's problem of governance deficit, which is at the heart of African conflicts. Weak states produce weak regional security mechanisms. The central pillar of the APSA is the domestic security apparatus of AU member states. Albeit its interventionist posture, the weak nature of the APSA is a function of African domestic politics. Thus, the APSA is first and foremost an initiative, an embodiment of a political ideology. The structure, design and function of the APSA is nothing but a reflection of a political compromise to realize and accommodate political interest.

The direct consequence of strengthening the African Peace and Security Architecture would liberate the EU from the pressure of intervening in African conflicts. However, it will not solve Africa's problem of governance deficit, which is at the heart of African conflicts.

4. EU Peacekeeping Mission and its Effect on Democratization

EU forces in Chad (EUFOR)

On 16 October 2007, the Council of the European Union gave its final approval to conduct its largest military operation in Africa – in Chad and the Central African Republic – based on United Nations (UN) Security Council Resolution 1778 (2007) within the institutional framework of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP).³ The mandate of the mission was to protect civilians in danger, particularly refugees and internally displaced persons, protect UN personnel and equipment, and facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid in eastern Chad and northeastern CAR. The mission was conceived as a bridging operation, to be replaced by a UN follow-on-force within one year. The UN Security Council voted unanimously to replace the mission with a UN mission by 15 March 2009. How has the EU mission affected democracy, rule of law and respect for human rights in Chad and the CAR?

³ The largest EU mission in Africa to date was the EU military operation in the Democratic Republic of Congo (Operation Artemis) launched in 2003. It included approximately 2,000 troops.

Overview of the Political Situation in Chad

Since independence, Chad has not known constitutional transfer of power. Its political history is a story of elite fragmentation, ethnic animosity and external intervention, which has produced a chain of protracted conflict that has left ordinary Chadians destitute and frustrated. Oil production in 2003 seems to have compounded the situation by increasing the stake for the control of the state with the result being entrenched corruption and economic chaos – thus qualifying Chad as another example of the Resource Curse of Paradox of Plenty. Worst of all, the conflicts in Darfur and the CAR have interwoven with that in Chad to threaten the regional stability of central Africa as a whole. In April 2006 and in January 2007 thanks to external support of the Chadian Army, President Idriss Déby managed to retain power. Compounding that precarious security situation, the conflict in Darfur spilled over into Chadian territory. As a consequence, Khartoum and N’djama have accused each other of trying to engineer regime change.

Since independence, Chad has not known constitutional transfer of power. Its political history is a story of elite fragmentation, ethnic animosity and external intervention, which has produced a chain of protracted conflict that has left ordinary Chadians destitute and frustrated.

Structural Causes of the Chadian Conflict

The Chadian conflict has been described as a spillover of the Darfur conflict. It has also been depicted as a contest for Chad’s oil wealth. The former argument states that ethnic Zaghawas who make up the political leadership in Chad came to the help of Zaghawas in Darfur. As a result, Khartoum had no option but to support dissident forces in Chad. This line of argument does not address the origin of the rebellion in Chad in the first place. Khartoum and N’Djamena have supported rebellion in each other’s territory merely as a means of political survival.

The latter argument posits that the conflict is the result of greedy Chadian politicians who want to get their hands on the country’s oil wealth. While there is some credence to this analysis, it is nevertheless a simplistic conclusion that does not take into account the context of Chad’s socio-economic and political configuration. Beyond the greed for oil and the violent contingent from Darfur, the insurgency against President Déby’s government has roots in the country’s socio-political history. The present crisis today can be traced to a sequence of violence that has truncated the country’s history. In 1963, just three years after independence from France, civil strife gripped Chad, and since then, the country has never recovered. Rounds of factional fighting, ranging from chronic low- intensity conflict to all-out civil war, have been interspersed with cyclical external intervention, both regional and international. Factions form, fight, ally and dissolve seemingly in accordance with tacit conventions.

Against this backdrop, while oil abundance influences the preference and objectives of Chad’s political actors, institutional configuration is the real factor for the structural causes of the conflict in Chad. Thus, no matter how tempting oil profits might be and how they may exacerbate political stability and conflict in Chad, they are unlikely to have stimulated the civil war on their own. The absence of democratic institutions to govern the country has left the military as the only viable option to further the economic and political objective of Chadian elites.

EUFOR epitomizes how the international community responds to most crises: stability first and peace later. After all there can be no peace without stability.

Critique of EUFOR

EUFOR epitomizes how the international community responds to most crises: stability first and peace later. After all there can be no peace without stability. President Déby seemed to present the best chance for stability; consequently, he needed all the support that could be rendered by the international community. A neutral force in the east of Chad

would not only relieve him from the burden to engage the rebels in the east, it would also constrain the rebels' maneuvers and their use of humanitarian aid. To the rebels, EUFOR was nothing but a thinly veiled attempt by external forces to bolster President Déby's faltering regime.

It could be argued that the EUFOR was a response to the failure to deploy a credible and robust peacekeeping mission in Darfur. However, there is a perception that EUFOR is nothing short of military protection for President Déby. France shoulders both the financial and logistic burden of EUFOR (Seibert, 2008). Within policy circles in certain European capitals, it has consistently been argued that chaos in Chad would produce a domino effect that might affect other externally supported regimes such as the Central African Republic. As a consequence, the militaries of certain European countries have become critical players in Chad's domestic politics.⁴

In pursuing their interest in Africa, some EU members seem to prefer working within multilateral channels against the backdrop of attempts at an EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). But the European Commission is not a pawn to execute these states' national interests in Chad. The European Union is the country's largest donor. Its past and present contributions have been focused – under the 9th European Development Fund – on transport and infrastructure, as well as providing budgetary aid and support for institution building.⁵ The EU has budgeted EUR 5 million for the 13th August Political Accord to Re-enforce the Democratization Process in Chad.⁶ Nevertheless, commonality or convergence of interest does not necessarily amount to coherence in policy. There are strong incentives for some EU members interested in Chad to Europeanize their foreign policy engagements. Europeanization is simply a change of tactics, not a change in strategic objectives, at least in the short run. Europeanization gives more legitimacy and legality to some EU members' engagement in African adventures.

For example, EUFOR was conceived and implemented as a bridge mission to MINURCAT II (the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad that took over from EUFOR). In the process, it was a good strategy for France to have others involved in an attempt to stabilize Chad, since France would not find many willing partners among EU member states to share the burden of its policies/

⁴ France entered a military cooperation treaty with Chad entitled 'Agreement on technical military co-operation. Signed at N'Djamena on 6 March 1976' available at <http://untreaty.un.org/unts/1_60000/30/16/00058764.pdf>

⁵ See EU 'Document de stratégie pays et programme indicatif national pour la période 2008-2013' available at <<http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/CSPChad2008-13.pdf>>

⁶ 'Comite de Suivi et d'Appui de l'Accord en vue du Renforcement du Processus Democratique au Tchad: Rapport d'Activites, Juillet a Decembre 2008', available at <http://www.issafrica.org/dynamic/administration/file_manager/file_links/CHADRAPPORJTAN09.PDF?link_id=14&slink_id=7618&link_type=12&slink_type=13&tmpl_id=3>

engagement in Chad. The geo-strategic importance over humanitarianism is evidenced by the fact that EUFOR is estimated to have cost EUR 119.6 million based on the Athena mechanism, a financial and administrative instrument to which only the participating member states contribute. France is estimated to have contributed € 260 million (Gros-Verheyde, 2008). This is in contrast to the EUR 30 million that the EU apportioned for humanitarian aid in 2008–2009.⁷ EUFOR was a commendable effort and represented a commonality of interest of some EU member states that did pay attention to the roots causes of the crisis.

The AU and the UN tacitly gave President Déby diplomatic support and in the process the political cover required for intervention by his allies.⁸ While international law lends credence to the AU and UN positions, the policy implication of these positions suggests that regional stability and the regional character of the Chadian conflict demand urgent solutions rather than skewed domestic political institutions that are the structural cause of the conflict. International law and humanitarian reasons aside, one should not be blinded by the political incentives that drive the AU and UN positions. Stability will go a long way to protect Chad's oil and foreign businesses in the country. Stability is synonymous with 'business as usual'. More than a year since President Déby was almost toppled, some democratic gains achieved in Chad before January 2008 have been reversed: the political opposition has been suppressed, press freedom has been curtailed and religious rights have been restricted. Some opposition leaders who disappeared after the February 2008 attack on N'Djamena are still missing and feared dead. Chad is among the world's most vulnerable countries and its citizens are among the world's most destitute and disenfranchised (Thomas-Jensen, 2008). There is little doubt that since President Déby's ability to survive depends on repression and domination, he will continue to disregard some democratic gains he instituted when he took power in 1991. Consequently, while President Déby is still in power thanks to his allies in the West, which have tended to overlook his repression as part of 'some kind of a pseudo-humanitarian face-saving dispensation' (Prunier, 2008), Chad will continue to face a governance and human security crisis.

Against the backdrop of pursuing national interest through multilateralism, can the Lisbon Treaty provide an answer on how to manage inconsistency in EU external relations? First, it seems that individual member state action has some legal recognition in the Lisbon Treaty. The Treaty institutionalizes the 'implementation of a mission' by a group of member states that are 'willing and have the necessary capability for such a task' on behalf of the European Union and 'entrusted' by the Council (Article 28A, paragraph 5, and Article 28 C).

Against the backdrop of pursuing national interest through multilateralism, can the Lisbon Treaty provide an answer on how to manage inconsistency in EU external relations?

⁷ Interview with a humanitarian officer in Chad, March 2009

⁸ The AU declared 18 February 2008 that it would not recognize any government in Chad that came to power through unconstitutional means (Assembly/AU/Dec.188 (X), PSC/PR/Comm(CX)). On 4 February 2008, the UN in a press statement called on governments to help the Chadian Government (UN Security Council Presidential statement S/PRST/2008/3). France has played a critical role in regime change in Chad. It has practically determined who rules the country since independence. Former Chadian President Goukouni Weddeye sums it all up by saying Déby came to power with the support of Paris for economic and geo-strategic reasons, and remains, for the same reasons, 'France's man'. See May, R. and Massey, S., 'Chad: Politics and Security', Writenet independent, March 2007, available at <<http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/pdfid/46384ed12.pdf>>

Second, in an attempt to overcome the problem of lack of coherence and effectiveness in foreign policy, the Lisbon Treaty seeks to rationalize institutions and actors involved in foreign policy and facilitate decision-making procedures. The Treaty establishes a permanent president within the European Council. This new position aims to give better visibility and stability in 'the preparation and the continuity of the work of the European Council' and 'the external representation of the union on the CFSP [Common Foreign and Security Policy] issues' (Article 9B paragraph 6). The Lisbon Treaty also sets up a 'High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy', called the 'EU Minister of Foreign Affairs'.

Third, to facilitate decision-making procedures, the Lisbon Treaty introduces qualified voting majority (QVM). The significance of QVM is that it overcomes the national veto and enables a majority of states to push through a decision against the opposition of a minority. Certainly this might have an effect on enhancing coherence and the decision-making process in an EU of 27 member states. However, there is little doubt the CFSP and Common Security and Defence Policy remain fundamentally intergovernmental in nature, with their overriding objectives being that of coordination while preserving national security interests (Dagand, 2008).

There is little doubt the CFSP and Common Security and Defence Policy remain fundamentally intergovernmental in nature, with their overriding objectives being that of coordination while preserving national security interests.

5. Conclusion

While it is difficult to ascertain the impact of the Joint EU-Africa strategy on democracy in Africa for the time being, the current format of the African Peace Facility focuses more on enhancing the peacekeeping capacity of the AU and has paid less attention to democratic governance within the context of conflict prevention. The African Peace Facility has been reacting to the symptoms of conflicts (conflict management and stabilization) rather than to the structural causes of crisis on the continent, which is a function of democratic crisis or deficit (conflict prevention). Civil wars in Africa are invariably the outcome of the failure of development and of governance to regulate, reconcile and harmonize differences (Ayangafac and Cilliers, unpublished). By paying excessive attention to the institutions that constitute the African Peace and Security Architecture (especially the African Standby Force) in an attempt to enhance their capacity, the Joint EU-Africa Strategy seems to have forgotten that the present crisis on the continent is the weakness of African states. Although Africa's security threats have and will evolve over time and space, state weakness will remain the principal source of insecurity in Africa. Thus, the Joint EU-Africa Strategy should move beyond functional cooperation to deeper commitment to democratic governance and human security.

The Joint EU-Africa Strategy should move beyond functional cooperation to deeper commitment to democratic governance and human security.

Moreover, although there are attempts at coherent and consistent EU policy, some powerful EU members seem to pursue their own African foreign policies despite the EU-wide character of the APF. Thus, EU military ventures in some parts of Africa have been straddled in real politik that is counter-productive to democracy and democratization. As a result, the competing agendas of EU member states might to an extent undercut the good intentions of the EU. In some instances, EU assistance helps strengthen a repressive regime rather than enhance democratization. The EU must

develop a comprehensive policy approach that enhances the capacity of African states and the APSA to deal with structural causes of conflict rather than reacting to the symptoms and consequences.

6. Policy Options and Recommendations

The EU has both a democracy and security promotion agenda in Africa. However, excessive focus on conflict management and competing agendas of EU member states at times is counter-productive to democracy and democratization. Africa may suffer unintended long-term damage if the current focus on conflict intervention and the potential diversion of development assistance to emergency response and peacekeeping programmes replace approaches that address the root causes of conflict and deprivation.

To truly aid Africa, the European Union should implement the following recommendations:

- Excessive focus on conflict management might create a false impression that the African Peace and Security Architecture is going to become more effective to resolve conflicts. It is imperative that EU engagement with the APSA emphasize development and sustainable democratic culture by strengthening democratic institutions.
- Also needed is an effective early warning mechanism with particular reference to electoral processes.
- To achieve the impact required, a multi-pronged approach needs to be used with the instruments currently available to the African Union such as the Democracy, Governance and Elections Charter, while at the same time implementing action through the regional economic communities and at the national level.
- The APSA may not be able to usher in peace and security as long as it operates in an environment replete with deep socio-economic and political systemic inadequacies. Although the APSA integrates human security, it does little to address the democratic and governance deficits that are at the heart of the human security crisis in Africa. The EU must support domestic democratic institutions like electoral process.
- The EU should also 'reward' democracies through economic cooperation and development.
- While the Lisbon Treaty will enhance coherence and effectiveness between EU member states, the EU's engagement in Africa is driven by both national and EU-wide sentiments and interests. Thus, the EU needs to build greater uniformity in European foreign policy.

In some instances, EU assistance helps strengthen a repressive regime rather than enhance democratization. The EU must develop a comprehensive policy approach that enhances the capacity of African states and the APSA to deal with structural causes of conflict rather than reacting to the symptoms and consequences.

The EU has both a democracy and security promotion agenda in Africa. However, excessive focus on conflict management and competing agendas of EU member states at times is counter-productive to Africa's democracy and democratization.

References

- African Union, 'African Union Non-Aggression and Common Defence Pact', Abuja, Nigeria, 31 January 2005, <http://www.africa-union.org/Official_documents/Treaties_%20Conventions_%20Protocols/Non%20Aggression%20Common%20Defence%20Pact.pdf>
- African Union, 'The Constitutive Act', Lomé, Togo, 11 July 2000, <http://www.africa-union.org/root/au/AboutAu/Constitutive_Act_en.htm>
- African Union, 'Meeting the Challenge of Conflict Prevention in Africa: Towards the Operationalization of the Continental Early Warning System', 2008, <<http://www.africa-union.org/root/AU/AUC/Departments/PSC/PSC/CD/Meeting%20the%20Challenge%20of%20Conflict%20prevention%20in%20Africa.pdf>>
- African Union, 'Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union', Durban, South Africa, 9 July 2002, <http://www.africa-union.org/root/au/organs/psc/Protocol_peace%20and%20security.pdf>
- African Union, 'Solemn Declaration on a Common African Defence and Security Policy', Sirte, Libya, 28 February 2004, <http://www.africa-union.org/News_Events/2ND%20EX%20ASSEMBLY/Declaration%20on%20a%20Comm.Af%20Def%20Sec.pdf>
- Aning, Kwesi, 'Africa: Coping with Complex Security Threats', *Coping with Crisis Working Paper Series*, International Peace Academy, February 2007
- Ayangafac, Chrysantus (ed.), 'The political economy of regionalisation in Central Africa', *Monograph*, No. 155 (Tshwane (Pretoria), South Africa: Institute for Security Studies), November 2008
- Ayangafac, Chrysantus and Cilliers, Jakkie, African Solutions to African Problems: Assessing the Capacity of the African Peace and Security Architecture (unpublished)
- Dagand, Sophie, 'The impact of the Lisbon Treaty on CFSP and ESDP', *European Security Review*, No. 37 (International Security Information Service, Europe), March 2008, available at <http://www.isis-europe.org/pdf/2008_artrel_150_esr37tol-mar08.pdf>
- Gros-Verheyde, Nicolas, 'La mission la plus importante jamais déployée par l'UE', *Europolitique*, April 2008, p. 3, available at <<http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/DossTchad3517.pdf>>
- Prunier, Gérard, 'Chad: Between Sudan's Blitzkrieg and Darfur's War', Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Africa Policy Forum, 14 March 2008, available at <http://www.opendemocracy.net/article/democracy_power/africa/chad_sudan_darfur>, accessed 24 April 2009
- Seibert, Bjoern H., 'EUFOR Tchad/RCA – A Cautionary Note', *European Security Review*, Number 37 (International Security Information Service, Europe), March 2008
- Tamba, I., Tchatchouang J. C., and Dou'a, R., 'L'Afrique Centrale, Le Paradoxe De La Richesse: Industries Extractives, Gouvernance Et Développement Social Dans Les Pays De La CEMAC', Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2007, available at <<http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/kamerun/05079.pdf>>

Thomas-Jensen, Colin, 'Is Anyone Serious about Ending the Political Crisis in Chad?' The Enough Project, 19 February 2008, available at <<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/02/pdf/chad.pdf>>, accessed 24 April 2009

Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, 13 December 2007, available at <<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:SOM:EN:HTML>>

United Nations Security Council, Resolution 1778 (2007), S/RES/1778, 25 September 2007, available at <<http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/516/15/PDF/N0751615.pdf?OpenElement>>

Vines, Alex and Middleton, Roger, 'Options for the EU to Support the African Peace and Security Architecture', EP/EXPO/B/AFET/FWC/2006-10/Lot 4/13, PE 385.541, (Brussels: European Parliament, February 2008), available at <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/committees/studies/download.do?language=en&file=23448 - search= African Peace and Security Architecture>>

About the Author

Kenneth Mpyisi is the director of the Institute for Security Studies in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. He is a former Ugandan foreign service officer who served in various departments in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in the diplomatic department of the Office of the President. He later held senior positions at the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance and SaferAfrica, a non-governmental organization based in South Africa.

Mr Mpyisi holds master's degrees in international relations from the University of Kent at Canterbury, International Policy Studies (Security and Development), and Monterey Institute for International Studies. He has pursued specialized courses in peace studies and conflict management at the US Naval Post Graduate School and the European Peace University in Austria.