

Peace and Security Council Report

Issue 50,
September 2013



Current members of the Peace and Security Council: Algeria, Angola, Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, the Gambia, Guinea, Lesotho, Mozambique, Nigeria, Tanzania and Uganda

Peace and Security Council Protocol

'The PSC shall encourage non-governmental organizations to participate actively in the efforts aimed at promoting peace, security and stability in Africa. When required such organizations may be invited to address the Peace and Security Council' – Article 20 of the Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the PSC of the African Union.

Early warning issues for September 2013

During September, when the International Day of Peace is celebrated, the ominous spectre of unrest, violence and human suffering still lies in wait to visit its ills upon the inhabitants of the African continent. Uncertainty and insecurity are ever present in Mali, where enormous challenges in the coming peace negotiation process will follow a successful and peaceful election; in the Central African Republic, which remains in a state of instability and chaos; and in the eastern region of the Democratic Republic of Congo, made virtually ungovernable by marauding rebel militias.

In some countries, such as Nigeria, Somalia and Kenya, where terrorist groups like Boko Haram and Al-Shabaab periodically wage war against the institutions of the state or against soft civilian and religious targets, the threat is ongoing. Despite a marked decline in acts of piracy off Africa's east

coast, such activities continue sporadically in West Africa, as exemplified by recent incidents in the Gulf of Guinea. In the meantime, the effects of long-delayed elections in Madagascar may give further cause for concern, even beyond September.

The unresolved consequences of the uprisings in Tunisia, Libya and Egypt continue to provide reasons for a high level of vigilance and concern. Finally, the potential impact on Africa of events in Syria and, at a less dramatic but nonetheless significant level, Israel's deportation of large numbers of illegal African immigrants back to their countries of origin (including Tel Aviv's decision to put an end to the Ethiopian Jews' *Alya*, or return to the promised land), could have serious economic and political repercussions for a number of African countries.

IN THIS ISSUE

Early warning issues for
September 2013 1

Country analysis: Mali 2

Open page: An overview
of prospects for power-
sharing in Africa 6

PSC retrospective:
Protection of civilians in
the DRC and CAR 10

Important dates to diarise 12

► Current PSC Chair

Bio data: H.E. Mr George Aboua

Current posts: Côte d'Ivoire's Ambassador to Ethiopia
Permanent Representative to the AU and UNECA
and Chair of the PSC

Livingstone formula

'Civil Society Organizations may provide technical support to the African Union by undertaking early warning reporting, and situation analysis which feeds information into the decision-making process of the PSC' – PSC/PR/(CLX), 5 December 2008, Conclusions of a Retreat of the PSC on a mechanism of interaction between the Council and CSOs.

Country analysis

MALI

Introduction

The previous country analysis on Mali was published in the Peace and Security Council Report of June 2013. The analysis below covers the events that have taken place since then. Readers who are interested in the earlier developments are encouraged to consult the June report.

Previous PSC and AU communiqués

In its press release of 13 August 2013, the President of the Commission of the African Union (AU) congratulated all those involved in the electoral process. Dr Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma especially praised the recognition of Ibrahim Boubacar Keïta's defeat to his challenger, Soumaïla Cissé, describing it as an indication of 'great political and democratic maturity and a deep commitment to the best interests of Mali'. The AU reiterated its commitment to completing the process of democratisation in Mali.

After holding the first round of elections, the AU Commission, in a press release dated 2 August 2013, welcomed 'the fulfillment of this important step in the process to complete the full restoration of constitutional order and in consolidating the remarkable progress made in recent months'. The President of the Commission urged 'all stakeholders to persevere in the same way to ensure the success of the second round', before confirming the commitment of the AU to continue to support Mali in its quest for peace and democracy.

In a statement issued on 18 June 2013, the Chairperson of the AU Commission welcomed 'the signing in Ouagadougou of the Preliminary Agreement to the Presidential Election and Inclusive Peace Talks in Mali between, on the one hand, the Transitional Government of National Unity of the Republic of Mali, and on the other, the Coordination of the National Movement for the Liberation

of Azawad (MNLA) and the High Council for the Unity of Azawad (HCUA)'. After noting that 'the crucial phase of any agreement is its implementation', she 'urged the Malian parties to honour the commitments they have undertaken' and also called for the co-operation of all armed groups in northern Mali that do not have any connection with terrorist and criminal groups.

The AU Peace and Security Council (PSC) held its sixth annual joint consultative meeting with the EU Political and Security Committee (PSC) on 11 June 2013 in Addis Ababa. In a joint statement, they expressed their views on the issues in Mali and, more generally, the Sahel. Concerning the transformation of the African-led International Support Mission (AFISMA) into the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilisation Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), they expressed the view that 'the new UN mission should build on the achievements of AFISMA and contribute to the long-term stability of the country by helping Malian forces prepare to resume their responsibilities throughout the territory of Mali'.

The AU PSC and the EU PSC welcomed the efforts made by the EU and regional actors to strengthen the capacity of the Malian army and the evolution of the political process. They also asked donors to honour their commitments, and to continue to support Mali while highlighting 'the importance of organising free, transparent, inclusive and fair elections'.

Crisis escalation potential

The Ouagadougou Agreement for presidential elections and inclusive peace talks, signed on 18 June, has allowed the presidential election to be held throughout the country, reduced the risk of renewed conflict between the Malian army and Tuareg rebels, and given new impetus to the process of reconciliation, at a time when many had begun to doubt the usefulness of the Dialogue and Reconciliation Commission.

The agreement between the Government of Mali, on the one hand,

and the National Movement for the Liberation of Azawad (MNLA) and the High Council for the Unity of Azawad (HCUA), on the other, laid the groundwork for a post-election negotiation process that will ideally lead to a 'final and comprehensive peace agreement'. Also, on 18 June, a declaration to join the Agreement was signed by two other armed northern groups, the Arab Movement of Azawad (MAA) and the Coordination of Movements and Patriotic Resistance Forces (CMFR).

The crucial test of the presidential election was passed on 28 July and 11 August for the first and second rounds, respectively. Indeed, given the political, logistical and security challenges, the presidential elections were considered successful in terms of both national and international opinion. Firstly, the entire country was able to participate, although the voting in Kidal turned out to be largely symbolic. Secondly, no major security incidents were recorded during the polls. Thirdly, participation rates announced in the first and second rounds exceeded all predictions, amounting to 48,98 per cent and 44,41 per cent respectively.

In addition, while analysts initially feared that the president-elect would lack legitimacy, the winner, Ibrahim Boubacar Keïta, leader of the Rally for Mali (RPM), was elected with an overwhelming majority of 77,62 per cent in the second round. Finally, while there was concern about post-election protests calling the results into question, Keïta's rival, Soumaïla Cissé, representing the Union for the Republic and Democracy (URD), conceded defeat even before the announcement of the provisional results.

It is now important to implement the Agreement successfully. Both the security and the reconciliation components have to be implemented, and a final comprehensive peace agreement must be negotiated. Numerous challenges have to be overcome in this regard, including the disarmament of non-state actors in northern Mali, the restoration of government authority in the region,

effectively curbing the escalation of conflicting relationships between certain communities in northern Mali, the risks associated with parliamentary elections and the involvement of religious leaders in politics.

The presence of several armed groups in the north continues to pose a risk. The implementation of the provisions of the Ouagadougou Agreement, which involves the entry of the Malian Armed Forces into Kidal and the cantonment of militant Tuareg groups, faces a number of obstacles. In early July, the Malian army entered the town of Kidal under the supervision of MINUSMA. The following day, tensions between those opposed to the presence of the Malian army and those supporting its arrival resulted in a deadly confrontation. The current situation is exacerbated by the presence of several other non-state armed groups in the region, such as the MAA and CMFR. The presence of these armed groups, which were signatories to the declaration to join the Ouagadougou Agreement in June 2013, is a major concern in the process of stabilising Mali.

In terms of community relations, hostilities between the Arabs and Tuaregs seem to have resumed. Since 13 August, some of the Barbiche Arabs and the Idnan Tuaregs have clashed in Borj, Algeria, where a large number of Malian refugees are located. The clashes left several people dead on both sides. A dividing line has since been established between the two communities by Algerian security forces.

In northern Mali, several inter-communal incidents have been reported. On 17 August 2013, the bodies of five Fulani herdsmen were found in the town of Niya, a few kilometres from Timbuktu. A week earlier, on Sunday 11 August, the murder of a Tuareg, Yehia Mohamed Ali Ag, resulted in angry demonstrations in the region and subsequent attacks were carried out against several dark-skinned people in the area between the town of Lere in Mali and N'Berra Fassala in

Mauritania. Conflicts between communities are nothing new in northern Mali, but the current clashes between Arabs and Tuaregs appear to reflect conflicts of interest and an attempt to position themselves before the start of future negotiations. The MNLA accuses the MAA of being an extension of the Movement for Unity and Jihad in West Africa (Mujao), which occupied the city of Gao for several months before the commencement of Operation Serval.

On 17 August 2013, MNLA and MAA representatives issued a joint statement announcing a potential alliance between the two groups prior to negotiations with the Malian authorities. However, the Tuareg continue to advocate autonomy while the MAA remains focused on economic interests. Moreover, the fundamental divisions between the two groups are weakening their union, which already suffers from the conflictual historical relationship between Arab and Tuareg. Without the total disarmament of the Tuareg, Arab and Songhai combatants, there can be no stability in the area.

The risks pertaining to the legislative elections are mainly related to the perceived consequences of a breakdown in the political consensus that was achieved prior to the first elections. In some areas of Mali, especially the Kidal region, these elections could provoke violent intra- or inter-community power struggles. The current configuration of the National Assembly is not in favour of Keita and among Malian politicians opinions are divided on the timing of the elections. The opinion of the political class, especially the parties supporting the Front for Democracy and the Republic (FDR), is that the parliamentary elections should be held as soon as possible. For the leaders of this group, it is important to hold elections before the new president has time to set up a partisan bureaucracy, which would allow him to obtain an absolute majority in the National Assembly.

The coalition close to Keita believes it is important to take the time to

better address certain issues, including the question of enabling refugees and displaced persons to vote. Voters have moved out of several northern regions to other locations in the south or have become refugees in neighbouring countries. As coalition members have noted, the election of deputies or legislators, unlike that of the president, takes place on a constituency basis. Consequently, for the sake of effective representation, the necessary measures should be taken to ensure the vote of internally displaced people and refugees and their participation in elections in their respective constituencies.

For the members of the coalition supporting Keita it is imperative to win the parliamentary elections in order to be able to implement the desired post-conflict reconstruction programme. The FDR parties have the same objective and believe that having a parliamentary majority would force the new president to collaborate and cooperate with the opposition in the exercise of power. On 19 August 2013, following a meeting aimed at analysing the results of the presidential election, officials declared that the FDR had made every effort to maintain the legislative electoral timetable announced for 27 October (first round) and 17 November (second round).

Given that Mali is a secular state, the possibility of religious leaders interfering in the political life of the country could have a very serious social impact. Islam already has considerable influence in Mali when it comes to politics, as illustrated by the establishment, during the second transitional government, of a governmental ministry dedicated to worship and religious affairs, which was headed by a member of the High Islamic Council. During the election campaign, some prominent members of the Muslim community gave voting instructions to their fellow Muslims and even campaigned in mosques on behalf of certain candidates. The strong involvement of religious leaders in Malian political life can lead to a

deep social crisis and tensions among religious communities.

Key issues and internal dynamics

With the signing of the Ouagadougou Agreement, the absorption of AFISMA into MINUSMA and the holding of the presidential elections, efforts to resolve the complex crisis in Mali are entering a new phase. An analysis of the post-election situation in Mali reveals three important aspects: the reconfiguration of the national political scene; the challenges of post-conflict reconstruction; and, finally, the growing influence of some key military actors in the exercise of political power.

Regarding the Malian political landscape, it has reverted to the conditions that prevailed in the aftermath of the coup of 22 March 2012. Throughout the more recent campaign, Keita, elected by close to 78 per cent of eligible voters, was supported by most socio-political groupings perceived as favourable to the coup or a clear break with previous regimes. Cissé, the candidate who received just over 22 per cent of the vote, drew most of his support from the main 'anti-coup' socio-political groups united in the FDR.

Between the first and second rounds of the elections, 20 of the 27 unsuccessful candidates competing in the first round rallied round Keita, creating a broad coalition of support for him. Immediately after the final round of the elections, on 11 August 2013, Cissé acknowledged the victory of his opponent, declaring that he would focus on leading a constructive opposition. The opposition consists mainly of parties that joined to support the platform of the FDR, including the Union for the Republic and Democracy (URD), the Party of Economic and Social Development (PDES), the Alliance for Democracy in Mali – African Party for Solidarity and Justice (ADEMA-PASJ), the Party for Solidarity and Progress (PSP) and the Party for National Renaissance (PARENA).

Keita now faces many complex challenges, including the key challenge of security sector reform. Also, under the Ouagadougou Agreement, national reconciliation and

inclusive dialogue remain priority objectives in the context of national reconstruction. The Malian people have highlighted the importance of economic recovery and development, especially in the north of the country. The fight against corruption and nepotism and the restoration of state authority throughout the whole of Mali should also be priorities for the new regime.

The tasks of the Dialogue and Reconciliation Commission, set up by the interim President in March 2013, gained more ground after the signing of the Ouagadougou Agreement on 18 June 2013. Keita plans to organise a national conference in northern Mali that will be a prelude to negotiations for the final comprehensive peace agreement, as prescribed in the Ouagadougou Agreement.

The influence of the military in politics is becoming increasingly apparent, as exemplified by the promotion of the coup leader, Amadou Haya Sanogo, from the rank of Captain to that of General on 14 August 2013. According to some observers, the promotion aims to facilitate Sanogo's role in reconstructing the Malian army. Others have taken the view that his promotion may be sending the wrong message to future coup plotters. In addition, the director of Human Rights Watch, Jean-Marie Fardeau, has warned: 'Despite the protection of the authorities, we will ensure that one day his acts are judged before the courts.'

Ultimately, the promotions of Sanogo and other military figures who have played important electoral or military roles, such as the Minister of Territorial Administration Moussa Sinko Coulibaly and the Commander of Military Operations in the North Didier Dacko, indicate that the leaders of the coup d'état of March 2012 have succeeded in positioning themselves favourably during the country's transition. It will therefore be very difficult for Keita to keep them away from Mali's political arena.

Geopolitical dynamics

Africa and the RECs

On 17 and 18 July 2013 the Economic Community of West African States

(ECOWAS) held its 43rd Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government. The latter, in a statement, welcomed 'the adoption of Resolution 2100 (2013) on 25 April 2013 by the United Nations Security Council and the transition between the African-led International Support Mission to Mali (AFISMA) and the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) on 1 July 2013'.

The ECOWAS Heads of State and Government also welcomed the signing of the preliminary agreement for the presidential elections and inclusive peace talks in Ouagadougou on 18 June 2013. They reiterated their call for 'the donor community ... to diligently provide additional financial and material support in response to the humanitarian emergency in Mali and neighbouring countries'. The conference also 'instructed the Commission to conduct a review of the ECOWAS peace and security architecture on preventive diplomacy and rapid deployment capability, taking into account lessons from Mali'. On 21 June 2013, the Council of Ministers of ECOWAS commented on the Ouagadougou Preliminary Agreement, describing it as a 'major step towards peace'.

United Nations

MINUSMA, in collaboration with France's Operation Serval, provided logistical support for securing the elections in Mali. This was the first challenge for the UN mission, which officially took over from AFISMA on 1 July 2013. The transition from AFISMA to MINUSMA has not been without tensions between the UN and African organisations. Indeed, the AU PSC stated in a communiqué on 25 April 2013 that the concerns of Africa were not taken into account in the transformation process.

In this regard, two elements need to be noted. The first relates to the political roles of the AU and ECOWAS, which seemed to be relegated to the background by the provisions of the resolution entrusting the UN Secretary General, through his Special Representative, with the task of facilitating political dialogue between

the Malian people. The second element has to do with the UN's failure to acknowledge Africa's on-going efforts regarding regional security cooperation, which is essential to strengthen the effectiveness of the fight against terrorism. Africa's discontent was worsened by the appointment of a non-African to lead the mission, whereas the AU had proposed the head of AFISMA, Pierre Buyoya, for this position. Greater collaboration between the UN and African organisations will be required in order to effectively support efforts to end the crisis in Mali.

Given the context of the deployment of MINUSMA, the mission will have to prove its worth on the ground rather quickly. Among other mandated tasks, in accordance with Resolution 2100 the authorities need to stabilise Mali's main cities, especially in the north, and in this context prevent the return of armed factions to these areas. In addition, MINUSMA is mandated to assist Malian authorities to expand and restore state administration throughout the country and contribute to the organisation of free, fair and transparent legislative elections. Other dimensions of the mandate include providing technical and logistical assistance and implementing effective security measures.

International community

The presidential poll in Mali was, in the eyes of the international community, an important step toward resolving the crisis. The elections were recognised as free and fair by all observer missions and praised because the final result was accepted without dispute.

After the proclamation of the final results, US President Barack Obama congratulated Mali's new president while calling on the Malian people to respect the result of the polls. Moreover, the US Ambassador announced the upcoming resumption of cooperation with Mali. Francois Hollande, President of France, a prominent partner in resolving the crisis in Mali, also

congratulated Keïta on his election after the announcement of the provisional results.

Shortly before the elections in July, the Support and Follow-up Group for Mali held its fifth meeting in Bamako. The group expressed its satisfaction with the restoration of state authority in northern Mali, made possible by the signing of the Ouagadougou Agreement. The group also expressed its gratitude to the UN, AU and ECOWAS for deploying human rights observers in northern Mali. It further commended the efforts being made to train and restructure the Malian Defence and Security Forces, while stressing the need to strengthen security cooperation between the countries of the region as well as coordination between regional organisations. The group stated that economic recovery and development were essential components of the stabilisation efforts in Mali. It encouraged the UN Special Envoy for the Sahel, Romano Prodi, to continue his efforts and welcomed the report of the UN Secretary-General on the UN Integrated Strategy for the Sahel region.

Civil society

The main role of civil society has been its involvement in ensuring successful elections, and supporting the process of dialogue and reconciliation in Mali. The role of civil society in promoting participation in the elections was a key contribution to ensuring their successful outcome. Even so, Malian civil society remains divided.

It is important to involve civil society in the process of dialogue and reconciliation. In some parts of Mali, especially the south, many people believe the Tuareg are responsible for disrupting national unity. Several civil society organisations have conducted outreach programmes to challenge these perceptions, such as the Tuareg Managers and Intellectuals Platform established in May 2013 and headed by the former Prime Minister, Mohamed Ag Hamani. This platform recently completed a tour to facilitated exchanges with the residents of Kayes and Sikasso. The aim was to inform these communities

that the majority of Tuaregs were not involved in the armed rebellion launched by the MNLA in 2012.

Scenarios

Scenario 1

The President of the Republic of Mali, supported by the international community, creates conditions conducive to the development of constructive relations with the political opposition. This allows for the holding of peaceful and transparent parliamentary elections. External partners, encouraged by these positive developments, invest heavily in projects that support economic recovery. Similarly, national consultations promoted by Keita initiate a process of dialogue and open the way for reconciliation. The efforts of the Dialogue and Reconciliation Commission, in collaboration with the government and the international community, accelerate the negotiation process, which leads to the signing of a final and comprehensive peace agreement. This agreement is supported by the vast majority of socio-political, religious and military groups and ultimately results in the disarmament of armed groups in northern Mali.

Scenario 2

The President of the Republic fails to create the conditions required to facilitate constructive collaboration with the opposition. In this context, disagreements arise regarding the organisation of parliamentary elections. The international community struggles to influence the evolution of the process and loses credibility amid persistent differences between its main actors. Meanwhile, the political crisis makes it impossible to hold national consultations and severely limits the work of the Dialogue and Reconciliation Commission. With the negotiation of the final and comprehensive peace agreement effectively deadlocked, community relations at the local level, especially in the northern regions, are imperilled by the approaching elections. Without the disarmament of armed groups in the north,

inter-communal violence intensifies and increases the level of insecurity in the north despite the security measures taken by MINUSMA and the forces of Operation Serval. This state of increased insecurity makes it impossible to pursue effective economic activities in the north. These developments raise fears of interference by socio-political agitators, religious or military elements in the political life of Mali.

Scenario 3

The President of the Republic, supported by the international community, creates the conditions required for the development of constructive relations with the opposition, which makes it possible to organise parliamentary elections that are peaceful, transparent and fair. At the same time, however, neither the national consultations promoted by Keïta nor the efforts of the Dialogue and Reconciliation Commission are able to diffuse tensions between communities, particularly those who harbour resentment against armed Tuareg groups. The process leading to the signing of a final and comprehensive peace agreement becomes bogged down along with the process of disarmament, demobilisation and socio-economic reintegration. This situation raises fears of interference by socio-political agitators, religious or military elements in the political life of Mali.

Options

Option 1

The full implementation of the Ouagadougou Agreement should remain a central concern for the AU, which should, in the context of existing monitoring mechanisms, pay as much attention to the 'inclusive post-electoral talks' component as to the preliminary measures agreed upon for holding the presidential election. This effort should be undertaken with international partners, especially within the framework of the Support and Follow-up Group that the AU co-chairs with ECOWAS and the UN.

Option 2

The AU should draw lessons from its collaboration with ECOWAS in managing the Malian crisis and AFISMA. In this regard, the workshop envisaged by the PSC in its communiqué of 25 April should be held as soon as possible, and could provide the two commissions with the opportunity to consider the establishment of a joint office, as called for by the PSC. In doing so, they would enhance their efficiency and be able to make better use of their limited resources.

Option 3

The absorption of AFISMA by MINUSMA does not mean that the AU and ECOWAS, which contributed to the launching of the first military operation in Mali, should lose interest

in the 'peacekeeping' dimension of the international effort. As regards MINUSMA's mandate, the AU, in collaboration with ECOWAS, should continue to advocate the most robust interpretation and implementation possible.

Documents

AU, EU and RECs

Press release of the Commission, Addis Ababa, 13 August 2013

Press release of the Commission, Addis Ababa, 12 August 2013

Press release of the Commission, Addis Ababa, 18 June 2013

Joint Communiqué AU and EU, Addis Ababa, 11 June 2013

PSC Communiqué, 371st meeting, Addis Ababa, 25 April 2013

ECOWAS Press Release, No. 208/2013, Abuja, 17 July 2013

Conclusions of the meeting of the Support and Monitoring of Mali from 1 July 2013

UN

Resolution 2100 of the Security Council of the United Nations

Open page

OVERVIEW OF PROSPECTS FOR POWER-SHARING IN AFRICA

The 2013 elections in Kenya and Zimbabwe marked an important transition away from the power-

sharing arrangements that had governed the two countries for the past five years. Associated with recalcitrant incumbents not willing to give up power in 2008, the Kenyan and Zimbabwean examples animated a lot of debate about their implications for democracy in Africa. Apart from the two examples, Africa has had its fair share of power-sharing arrangements, the majority of which occurred in countries that had experienced civil wars and

formed part of the relevant ceasefire agreements. With the African Union (AU) generally supportive of the use of power-sharing agreements as a tool for conflict resolution, the question is: what are the prospects for these arrangements and the African continent? Do they lead to democratic governments and even sustainable peace? For Kenya and Zimbabwe, to what extent have these arrangements contributed to their initial objectives of repairing

past fractures and strengthening democratic processes? At a basic level, is it judicious for the AU to promote power-sharing arrangements in contexts of conflict and post-election disputes?

This open page takes a cursory look at power-sharing arrangements in Africa broadly and in Kenya and Zimbabwe in particular, and gives a tentative assessment of power-sharing as a model for governance in Africa.

Power-sharing in context

Some renowned scholars of democratic theory such as Arend Lijphart advocate power-sharing as a tool to socialise opponents into compromises and moderation, and as a viable option for democratic governance in divided societies. Lijphart and others who hold a similar viewpoint argue that the breakdown of democracy in various post-Cold War African states is because of the adoption of the majoritarian Westminster-style democracy. Majoritarian democracy, they argue, is unsuitable for ethnically divided societies since the winner-takes-all character and concentration of power allows dominant groups or coalition groups to capture state power and relegate minorities to peripheral roles in the sharing of state power and resources. The point here is that democracy is only possible when power is shared instead of monopolised, and devolved rather than centralised.

However, there are those on the other side of this argument who see power-sharing arrangements largely as being inimical to democracy. These opponents regard the concept of power-sharing as being elitist and undermining the democratic quality of the right and will of the people to elect their leaders.

Broadly speaking, there are different forms of power-sharing in Africa. Indeed, the essence can differ from context to context in terms of aims, structures and effects, although the underlying theme in power-sharing

arrangements is that the principal elements in society are guaranteed a place, and influence, in matters of governance.

Examples of power-sharing in Africa

As observed earlier, Africa has, over the last two decades, witnessed a rise in power-sharing agreements initially aimed at resolving protracted civil wars, but which have more recently been designed to arbitrate violently contested elections. Cases where power-sharing arrangements have been used as a means to resolve protracted conflicts in Africa include Angola (1991), Eritrea (1993), South Africa (1993), Rwanda (1993), Sierra Leone (1996), Burundi (1994, 2001 and 2003), Congo (2002), the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC, 2002 and 2003), Côte d'Ivoire (2003) and Sudan (2004). This list is not exhaustive and it is also important to underscore the subtle differences between each of these cases. In all the above cases, however, the aim of the relevant power-sharing arrangement was to promote stability and peace. To understand the mechanics of power-sharing arrangements in each case, it is important to understand the contextual factors, which this article does not address in detail. Indeed, a combination of forces prevailing at any given time can determine the difference between the successes and failures of power-sharing arrangements. A power-sharing solution to the Burundi crisis proved utterly unworkable in 1994, but reasonably promising in 2005. On the flipside for Rwanda, what seemed like a feasible experiment during the Arusha talks (1992–93) was obliterated by the genocide of 1994. When considering power-sharing as a tool to resolve conflicts, it is important to note that the nature and intensity of conflict can have an important bearing on the implementation of a power-sharing arrangement. The prospects for peace through power-sharing become all the more problematic, for instance, in cases where the state has

collapsed or no longer has the capacity to protect the lives of its citizens, where the security forces operate under the weight of factional rivalries, where the judicial system has collapsed, and/or where the civil service is dysfunctional due to corruption.

Problematising power-sharing

There are concerns whether or not power-sharing can promote democracy and peace in the short and long term. The value and effectiveness of power-sharing in Africa is still unclear. Several countries that have had power-sharing experiences seem to be doing better than others currently. Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone have done fairly well in comparative terms, but it is unclear to what extent this is due to power-sharing.

At a practical level, power-sharing arrangements offer several potentially positive benefits. They can assist conflicting parties to end armed violence or, as in Burundi, the DRC and Kenya, to significantly reduce such violence. Other than ending violence, albeit temporarily in some contexts, power-sharing arrangements in Kenya and Zimbabwe have also contributed to a number of reforms, including those of a constitutional nature. Donald Rothchild has observed that power-sharing can be a logical response to the configurations of power in contexts where parties view the costs of compromising on peace as lower than the continuation of war. In cases where military stalemates occur, power-sharing can act as a face-saving measure that enables adversaries to avoid a worse outcome. By bringing the leaders of the various warring groups into the ruling coalition, power-sharing can promote confidence among the parties and lead to the rebuilding of institutions of governance. As observed earlier, people like Lijphart have argued compellingly that democracy in deeply divided societies can be enhanced when

power is shared rather than monopolised. It is nonetheless apparent that there need to be favourable conditions for power-sharing to succeed. One of these conditions seems to be the question of leadership. There has always been a type of leadership, more often than not willing to cooperate and to negotiate in the spirit of compromise, as exemplified by South Africa, where power-sharing has achieved positive outcomes. Under power-sharing arrangements, especially following violent conflict, it is important that leaders preserve the support and loyalty of their constituents and have the ability to maintain their confidence and support. Rothschild and Roeder agree that under the right conditions power-sharing can have positive outcomes. However, they also argue that few if any of the necessary conditions are likely to be found in ethnically divided societies. This is especially true of countries emerging from conflict where conditions such as elite dominance, the accommodation of disparate views and strong governmental institutions are mostly likely lacking. They argue that while power-sharing may be needed in the short term to end conflict, it is harmful to the long-term prospects of democracy and social peace in post-conflict societies; and that it may solve the commitment problem in a context of severe distrust and vulnerability by guaranteeing positions in the future government, but such governments are elitist and invariably suffer from a deficit of popular democratic quality.

Overall, looking at the various African countries where power-sharing has been adopted, governments have generally remained unstable, and power-sharing arrangements have often only provided a short-term reprieve from violent conflict. Where conflicting groups live in close geographical proximity, it can become difficult to enter into seamless political alliances, especially where the trauma of atrocities

committed previously against each other are still fresh. In a number of cases like Rwanda (1993), Burundi (1994) and Sierra Leone (1996), severe escalations happened in the aftermath of power-sharing agreements. Often, the polarised and hostile perceptions that contributed to the initial conflict are not immediately transformed by power-sharing arrangements. Consequently, the coalition government is often characterised by a lack of shared norms and aspirations. Without shared norms and aspirations, it becomes difficult to maintain a balance of forces, especially when uncompromising leaders, including warlords, enter the cabinet. If power-sharing is conceived in a zero-sum game perspective where one party or group considers itself to have won not with the others but at the expense of the others, and political leaders carry conflicting political agendas into the grand coalition, the arrangement can experience difficulties in the course of implementation. Indeed, difficult personal relations with people representing the opposite side of the political divide have been among the key challenges in making power-sharing work. In Zimbabwe, the lack of trust between the leaders of ZANU-PF and MDC-T has hampered the implementation of various provisions of the power-sharing arrangement.

Power-sharing in Africa is also constrained by the difficult economic situations that follow conflicts. The immediate costs of reconstruction represent a very expensive undertaking. As a consequence, the constrained economic circumstances that follow conflict situations may give the members of the power-sharing coalition little incentive to act with civility toward members of other groups. The power pie remains small. All too often this can result in both a wasteful collusion among members of the power-sharing cartel over the distribution of resources and intense competition

between them and others over control of the meagre resources available to the state.

While there are arguments that portray power-sharing as synonymous with democracy and as an alternative to competitive elections, there are also concerns that power-sharing can actually present potential dilemmas for long-term democratisation and peace. By fixing the ratio of government positions for each contending group, the arrangement may regulate the direct form of conflict by changing the dynamics of political contestation, while concealing the underlying sources of conflict. In Kenya and Zimbabwe, some critics have argued that the power-sharing arrangements have largely papered over deep-seated social and economic structural problems exposed by the respective December 2007 and 2008 presidential elections. It is therefore possible that power-sharing can be used to level power relations in the short term while undermining the long-term process of democratisation and peace.

Power-sharing can also be risky especially where it calls for the balancing of ethnic elite interests. It may build upon and maintain separate rigid identity loyalties, which, as was the case in Rwanda, can become a source of instability, ineffective governance and violent conflict. A concern for the majority of the countries that have had power-sharing arrangements is that often there is no stability in the power-sharing arrangement and that political parties may simply continue to operate on the basis of positions and power, which, as happened in the DRC, prolonged the struggle for power. Under such circumstances, parties find it difficult to reach consensus and the resultant impasse might lead to a continuous struggle and paralysis of governmental functions.

Those who view power-sharing as being inimical to democracy also

argue that by granting warring parties a stake in government, violence is rewarded. Under such conditions the only access to political power is through violence. Actors are therefore likely to continue using violent tactics to effect similar outcomes. This can have negative consequences, especially in electoral disputes where incumbents refuse to give up power. With many African leaders nursing their greed for power and seeking the spoils of office, no wonder it was feared that the Kenyan and Zimbabwean examples could encourage other incumbents in Africa to bastardise the electoral process and then get to share power with the real winners.

Ian Spears says that power-sharing is an attractive option because it offers a logical approach to managing socio-economic and political power that is especially attractive to the international community, which sees it as a way to reduce the need for its continued involvement in dealing with armed conflicts. In this regard, there are questions about the legitimacy of power-sharing arrangements imposed by third parties. The argument goes that power-sharing is more likely to last when it is arrived at indigenously. In most African countries, however, third parties have played an important role in mediating power-sharing arrangements. Critically, third parties need to act as security guarantors to ensure adherence to the relevant power-sharing arrangement. Allocating a role for civil society in this process can also improve the chances of a positive outcome.

Conclusion

An important question to be asked is whether the power-sharing arrangements in Africa have provided an incremental approach to dealing with long-term divisions within society. Have they provided opportunities for the countries to pursue reforms and establish viable

institutions that promote democracy and long-term stability?

Africa's power-sharing experiences have largely provided a basis for ending violent conflict, at least in the short term. The mixed package of incentives offered by these arrangements (the possibility of bringing an end to the conflict and inclusion in government), can convince the elite during negotiations to share power. This outcome, however, does not guarantee that the coalition government will remain stable. With the passing of time, power-sharing all too often ends up being a source of suspicion and political rivalry, as dominant parties seek to maximise their interests and become less and less inhibited by the need to allay the uncertainties of weaker partners. Moreover, with time, new groups who may not be bound by the power-sharing agreements may emerge and seek to assume positions within the relevant power-sharing arrangement. All these factors may threaten the precarious balance necessary to maintain a coalition government.

Power-sharing arrangements have been introduced in various African countries to reduce the level of violent political competition by compelling competitors to cooperate. As a response, this has proven effective in lowering the level of conflict in some countries. Yet, this type of outcome should not lead to the conclusion that political competition is a source of violence and bad governance in itself. In fact, it the opposite may be true: the lack of political competition and the existence of power monopolies have contributed to conflicts across Africa. In societies experiencing conflict, power-sharing arrangements should rather be seen as transitional measures that are intended to conclude with competitive electoral processes. While tailor-made power-sharing arrangements may have beneficial transitional benefits, such as reducing the level of violence, it should not be assumed that such

effects will be automatic once a power-sharing arrangement has been agreed upon.

In order to use power-sharing principles and practices to achieve peaceful transitions or prevent further violence, actors involved need to understand the need to coexist; that some incentives will be required in order to avoid further violence; and that the failure to accommodate each other will almost certainly lead to a resumption of conflict.

Broadly, while there are sometimes understandable pressures to assume power-sharing arrangements, the value and effectiveness of these measures are not always clear cut. While power-sharing can offer a way out of conflict, it does not guarantee a long-term solution to problems of conflict and governance in Africa. In fact, if the power-sharing system is not well planned or properly effected, it may contain the seeds of self-destruction. One key challenge in Africa has been the constitutional issue of overbearing, often unchecked, presidential powers. In such cases, the party in power invariably controls the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. This power phenomenon has been at the root of many of the governance problems on the continent. It calls for institutional re-engineering in order to assuage the problems of a skewed distribution of national resources, which is at the heart of most intra-state conflicts. Many African countries could also benefit from a better post-election protection of political competition through politically neutral institutions such as independent courts and electoral commissions.

PSC retrospective

PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS IN THE DRC AND THE CAR

The concept of protecting civilians is an evolving one. At the primary level, protection is imperative to prevent specific imminent threats to potential victims in order to reduce or eliminate the risk of violence and provide access to humanitarian aid and human rights support. However, beyond targeting specific moments of abuse, the protection of civilians constitutes transforming structures, building capacities and changing attitudes that make conflict and abuse less likely to occur in the future. In the cases of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and the Central African Republic (CAR), strategies aimed at the protection of civilians should also address historical divisions and cycles of brutal conflict. The UN and AU documents on the protection of civilians stress the need for access to services; the protection of vulnerable groups, such as women, children, refugees, returnees and internally displaced populations, from violence and abuse; and the need to continue fighting impunity.

As noted in the Report of the Chairperson on the Protection of Civilians in African Union Peace Support Operations (18 May 2011), 'peace support operations in Africa have increasingly been tasked with the protection of civilians, and the ability of these operations to implement their mandates in this respect has become increasingly linked with their legitimacy and credibility'. In February 2011, in a vital move to harmonise the AU's agenda on the protection of civilians, the AU Commission established a Working Group on the Protection of Civilians, chaired by the Humanitarian Affairs Division in the institution's Political Affairs

Department. The Working Group includes representatives from the Political Affairs Department, the Peace and Security Department, the Department of Social Affairs, the Women Gender and Development Directorate, and the Office of the Legal Counsel. The deployment of the UN Intervention Brigade (IB) under the UN Mission for the Stabilization of the Congo (MONUSCO) in the DRC, as authorised by UN Security Council Resolution 2098 (2013), is regarded as a milestone redefinition of the protection of civilians in Africa and elsewhere. The IB, which has the mandate to neutralise 'negative forces' and armed groups, and help to reduce the threat such groups pose to the authority of the state and the safety and security of civilians, began an offensive against some of the armed groups in the latter weeks of August 2013. The Brigade's troops have been contributed by Tanzania, South Africa and Malawi. The IB has the strongest mandate yet given to such a peacekeeping force and is tasked with the active protection of civilians and the eradication of the rebel groups that have troubled the eastern DRC since 1994.

In its 391st meeting on 19 August 2013 the PSC held an open session about the protection of civilians and the humanitarian situation in the CAR and DRC. The meeting, which took place on World Humanitarian Day, included briefings by the AU Commission, UN, partners, members of civil society and the Institute for Security Studies (ISS) on developments in the DRC and CAR, as well as policy recommendations for resolving the crises. The PSC also heard reports by the AU Department of Political Affairs on the humanitarian assessment mission to the CAR from 12–16 August 2013 and welcomed the briefing to the UN Security Council on 14 August 2013 by the UN Under-Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs about the humanitarian situation in the CAR.

In a subsequent communiqué PSC/PR/BR.(CCCXCI), the PSC expressed

its concern about the continuing presence of 'negative forces' in the eastern DRC as 'a major source of violence, instability, insecurity, denial of access to humanitarian assistance to those in need of urgent help, violations of human rights and an alarming increase in internal displacement'. The PSC also discussed political and security developments in the CAR and stated that the control of power by the Seleka armed forces in the CAR had resulted in the weakening of state institutions and widespread insecurity, arbitrary detentions, summary executions and the denial of access to humanitarian assistance for people in dire need. A recent report by Save the Children noted that more than 100 000 children in the CAR were facing threats of sexual abuse and recruitment into armed groups, and that many of them were suffering from malnutrition and malaria. The health system in the CAR was severely damaged and ineffective.

The PSC considers the enhancement and transformation of the peace support mission in the CAR to be the most viable way to support stability and political transition in the country. Consequently, the PSC requested the UN Security Council to accelerate the provision of financial and logistical support to the African-led International Support Mission in the Central African Republic (AFISM-CAR) to ensure, among other duties and responsibilities, the safety of humanitarian personnel and the protection of the civilian population. The PSC further endorsed the outcome of the 6th Extraordinary Summit of the International Conference for the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR) on the situation in the DRC, held in Nairobi, Kenya on 31 July 2013, within the context of the implementation of the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the DRC and the Great Lakes Region.

In its meeting held on 19 July 2013, the PSC discussed the situation in the CAR. It listened to the report of

the Chairperson of the Commission on the situation in the CAR [PSC/PR/2(CCCLXXXV)], as well as the statement made by the Commissioner for Peace and Security. Statements made by the representatives of Rwanda, the Secretariat of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), the UN, the European Union, France, the United Kingdom and the United States were also presented at the meeting. In a subsequent communiqué, PSC/PR/COMM.2 (CCCLXXXV), the PSC reaffirmed its support for the establishment of the AFISM-CAR for the period of the transition as articulated in the Roadmap and endorsed the conclusions of the technical meeting held in Addis Ababa from 2–5 July 2013, which resulted in an agreement on the draft Concept of Operations for the AFISM-CAR. The PSC also commended efforts by the International Contact Group on the CAR (ICG-CAR) to resolve the crisis in the CAR.

The PSC thus decided to authorise the six-month deployment of the AFISM-CAR. According to the AU, 'the Mission is mandated to contribute to: (i) the protection of civilians and the restoration of security and public order, through the implementation of appropriate measures; (ii) the stabilisation of the country and the restoration of the authority of the central government; (iii) the reform and restructuring of the defence and security sector; and (iv) the creation of conditions conducive for the provision of humanitarian assistance to populations in need. It will have a total strength of 3 652, including 3 500 uniformed personnel (2 475 for the military component and 1 025 for the police component) and 152 civilians.'

In a press release dated 1 August 2013, the AU announced that the process of transition from the Mission of the Economic Community of Central African States for the Consolidation of Peace in the Central African Republic (MICOPAX) to the

AFISM-CAR had begun in accordance with the communiqué of the 385th meeting of the PSC, held in Addis Ababa on 19 July 2013.

Earlier, at its 381st meeting held on 20 June 2013, the PSC considered the report of the field mission to the DRC, particularly Kinshasa and Goma, on 11–14 May 2013. In a subsequent communiqué PSC/PR/COMM (CCCLXXXI), the PSC commended the steps taken by the DRC government to facilitate the conduct of the mission and expressed its concern at the persistence of insecurity and the humanitarian crisis in North Kivu due to the activities of armed groups, in particular M23, the Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR) and the Allied Democratic Forces/National Army for the Liberation of Uganda (ADF/NALU). The PSC also strongly condemned all forms of violence committed by these groups against civilians and vulnerable groups, particularly women and children. It emphasised the importance of dialogue and the political process as a means to bring about durable peace in the DRC and the region and requested Kinshasa to intensify its fight against the scourge of impunity and the illegal exploitation of the DRC's natural resources.

Many of the problems in the eastern DRC emanate from historical disputes over resources and land. Developing a land management code for traditional leaders and implementing governance reforms could help address the structural problem in the area. In addition, a stronger stance on the flow of illegally obtained resources and targeted economic sanctions is needed, as well as a commitment to vigorously address the issue of resource exploitation in any conflict negotiation process. The proper implementation of a disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration programme (DDR) with regard to rebel groups in the DRC could also be helpful. The IB has already started to make its presence and impact felt on the ground. However, its efforts

should be accompanied by improved MONUSCO communication with the civilian population in the eastern DRC. Recognising and encouraging grassroots conflict resolution initiatives by local and international civil society could also help resolve the crisis from the bottom up.

The transition process in the CAR requires coordinated and continual supervision from the AU and ECCAS. The timely transition from the MICOPAX to the AFISM-CAR and its capacity and working relations with the interim government in Bangui will determine its ultimate effectiveness. The new force should work closely with civil society and NGOs to scale up the monitoring of emerging protection threats, vulnerabilities and risks.

The threat emanating from the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) against civilians in the DRC and the CAR could also be reduced by enhancing the defection programme that supports the reintegration of ex-combatants; working with Khartoum to isolate and eliminate LRA elements in the Kafia Kingi enclave; and by achieving stability and effective transition in the CAR in order to strengthen the state and ensure access for the AU Regional Task Force (AU RTF).

Important dates to diarise

12	September	United Nations Day for South-South Cooperation
15	September	International Day of Democracy
21	September	International Day of Peace
2	October	International Day of Non-Violence
11	October	International Day of the Girl Child
15	October	International Day of Rural Women

Country	Election	Date *
Rwanda	Chamber of Deputies	16 September 2013
Swaziland (Secondary)	House of Assembly	20 September 2013
Guinea	National Assembly	24 September 2013
Mauritius	Presidential (indirect)	September 2013
Madagascar	Presidential 2nd Round	25 October 2013
Mauritania	Senate, National Assembly, local	23 November 2013
Guinea-Bissau	Presidential	24 November 2013
Madagascar	National Assembly	20 December 2013

**could change, dependent on circumstances*

Contributors to this Volume

Conflict Prevention and Risk Analysis Division, ISS Addis Ababa

Dr Duke Kent-Brown

Mr Hallelujah Lulie

Conflict Prevention and Risk Analysis Division, ISS Dakar

Dr Lori-Anne Thérroux-Bénoni

Mr Paulin Maurice Toupane

Mr Kilo Lidawo

Ms Marie Emmanuela Kabran

Mr Baba Dakono

Ms Naomi Kok

Mahamadou Kane

Conflict Prevention and Risk Analysis Division, ISS Nairobi

Dr Emmanuel Kisiangani

Acknowledgements

Ms Antoinette Louw

Ms Iolandi Pool

Mr Jean-Guilhem Barques

Contact

Amb. Olusegun Akinsanya

Regional Director

Institute for Security Studies

P.O. Box 2329

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Tel: +251-11-515 6320/24/67/98

Fax: +251-11-515 6449

Emails: addisababa@issafrica.org

oakinsanya@issafrica.org

website: www.issafrica.org

Subscribe electronically to the PSC Report at
www.issafrica.org/subscribe.php

Donors

The publication of this report is made possible through the support of the Humanity United Foundation. The ISS is also grateful for the support of the following key partners: the Governments of Norway, Sweden, Australia and Denmark.

The ISS is a leading African policy research and training organisation. The vision of the ISS is a peaceful and prosperous Africa for all its people. The mission and overall goal of the ISS is to advance human security in Africa through evidence-based policy advice, technical support and capacity building.



About this report

This report is an independent publication of the ISS. It is also available on the ISS website in English and in French and can be viewed together with thematic reports on the work of the PSC at www.issafrica.org/publications/peace-and-security-council-report. The PSC Report can also be accessed in English and French at the ROP website at www.operationspaix.net.

© 2013, Institute for Security Studies

Copyright in the volume as a whole is vested in the Institute for Security Studies, and no part may be reproduced in whole or in part without the express permission, in writing, of the Institute. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the ISS, its trustees, members of the Advisory Council or donors.