Medhane Tadesse

TURNING CONFLICTS TO COOPERATION

ERITREA

SUDAN

SOMALIA

TOWARDS AN ENERGY - LED INTEGRATION IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

KENYA

FRIEDRICH
EBERT
STIFTUNG

TURNING CONFELICTS TO COOPERATION
IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

MEDHANE TADESSE

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF HISTORIY; COMFLICT AND DEFENCE
ANALYST IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

TURNING CONFLICTS TO COOPERATION

TOWARDS AN ENERGY – LED INTEGRATION IN
THE HORN OF AFRICA

MEDHANE TADESE

January , 2004

Addis Ababa

Executive Summary

The Horn of Africa is one of the most fragile crisis regions in the world, and close observers have not hesitated to proliferate ideas of what the major sources of conflict-identity fault-lines, resource, poverty, super power rivalry, porous borders, among others. Others also subscribe to hard security issues like sovereignty and self-determination and dissatisfaction with patterns of governance. All these factors are closely inter-related and are relevant to a contemporary issue of regionalized civil wars and inter-state rivalry in the Horn. They all catch aspects of the wider conflict system in the region. Yet they all miss one crucial, indeed a central, source of all the problems of instability in the region. Almost in all instances the conflicts in the Horn are system-induced conflicts.

An abiding theme in this study is that the nature of the state is at the heart of the conflicts in the region. The state does not reflect both the interest and the character of the society as a whole. Almost all regimes in the region are the products-and not solutions-of the historical contradictions in their respective countries. At the root of the entire crisis lay a political crisis. The non-participatory character of political systems as well as the lack of democratization have further contributed to both instability and socioeconomic decline

The strategy of building a nation through controlled reform from above not only complicated the problems of the nation state, but in the end it has also produced

authoritarian and interventionist states. The relationship between nationalism and democracy has never been properly defined. This partly explains the politicization of ethnicity, religion and regionalism in the Horn of Africa. Evidently, the present governments have failed to develop either a viable political formula or a viable economic formula for governing their respective countries.

They are unable to create either a strong constituency for themselves, or a political structure for their respective countries as a whole that could offer any plausible prospect of managing their countries political problems. The net result of this failure is reflected in the behavior of increasingly nervous and isolated governments, and a declining human rights situation.

The delegitmation of the state and the parochial policies it adopts has also opened up considerable room for both internal civil strife and regional instability. State interest prevails in the Horn of Africa. In much of the region the dominant threat to citizens is their own government.

Governments dominated by small groups that run their countries in a secretive and authoritarian manner are incapable of identifying and defining their countries national interests. Such governments have narrow definitions of security, based on considerations of military defense and regime stability. They resort to force to try to resolve issues that are better addressed through longer-term diplomatic processes. They easily slide into foreign adventures and unwanted wars.

While democracy does not ensure that governments do not pursue policies that lead to unwanted wars, it is still the best insurance against such catastrophes. For instance it is clear that the aggressive Islamist foreign policy of the early years of the National Islamic Front/NIF/ and for that matter Eritrean belligerence did not reflect the will of the Sudanese

and Eritrea peoples. Because decision making in these countries is very secretive, neither party is seriously constrained by organized public opinion, civil society groups or the media. Thus, returning these countries to democratic rule is perhaps the best insurance against narrow based groups pursuing destabilizing regional relations. Central to this discussion is that most of the states in the Horn are not democratic and truly representative in nature, and many of them contain within themselves the seeds of potential conflict.

So the problem (as in most African states) is not whether the state should exist or not; but on whose behalf should it exist? And conflicts emerge not due to the state as such rather due to the nature of some states. ***Thus the nature of the states, the way they came to power (not as solutions) but only as products of historical contradictions and the internal and external policies that they have adopted engulfed the region in intensive intra and inter-state conflicts.*** This largely explains the stateless situation in Somalia and the civil war in the Sudan as well as the inter-state rivalry and the politics of destabilization in the Horn of Africa.

Since the end of the cold war the two states, which has been exporting conflicts in the region, were Eritrea and the Sudan.Sudanese regional policy during the 1990's could be characterized by regional aggression (of exporting Islam) that ended up antagonizing all its major neighbors by 1995. Eritrea's war was also conditioned among others by the EPLF's hegemonic project, although economic reasons could not be discounted. So Asmara's stance must be seen in the context of EPLF (now PFDJ) leadership's bid for a regional role.

Both the Sudan and Eritrea pursued partly *realist* but mainly ***idealist*** foreign policies, which served as a main catalyst of conflicts in the region. While Sudanese foreign

policy of exporting political Islam triggered an opposing military camp in the form of Asmara -Addis- Kampala axis, Eritrea's hegemonic project led to Ethio-Eritrean war and the creation of Addis-Khartoum-Sa'na axis. Beggaring one's neighbor is a finely developed political art in the Horn of Africa and in the case of the Sudan under the NIF it was exacerbated by an aggressive foreign policy designed to spread political Islam to the far corners of the region.

It is not accidental that, in the years between mid-1995 and 1998, Sudan's regional adversaries were engaged in covert action intermittently aimed at containing or removing the government in Khartoum. The above reality fragmented the regional diplomatic landscape, weakened the regional organization IGAD and complicated the civil wars both in Somalia and the Sudan and delayed the search for peace. Some of the regimes are also unable to identify where their true national interest lies vis-à-vis their neighbors and regional conflicts. To this could be added the diverse complexity and incompatibility of political systems in the region. Thus the Horn of Africa continued to be a venue for a typically intricate story of a regional conflict, with a mix of idealism, real politic, ideology, partisan interest, vision and stupidity.

Another underlying theme is the growing economic dimensions of peace and security. Strong economic interest among countries contributes to stable relations.The recent production and export of oil that has proceeded in spite of the civil war suggests that Sudan is capable of becoming an economic giant in the region and this has significant implications for regional relations. There are already some indications that oil agreements will in turn be used to advance the interests of Sudan in the region.

To the extent that oil continues to be an instrument of economic bondage among the countries of the region, tensions between Khartoum and its neighbors are likely to be settled by diplomatic means. In this regard recent Ethio-Sudanese relations deserves careful consideration.

Economic Cooperation: The Path To Peace And Regional Integration

African leaders have always accorded high priority to regional cooperation and integration as a means to achieve peace and economic development. Apart from ensuring regional security, sub-regional cooperation and integration was considered as a vehicle for economic growth. The quite often rational is that, the future development of African countries depends on their ability to pool their natural endowment including their human resources. Accordingly, many institutions for regional integration and cooperation were created, often without much planning and preparation, soon after countries gained their independence.

To this effect, mainly in the past three decades a great deal of effort has been made by most sub-Saharan African countries to establish sub-regional blocks. The same is true with the Inter- governmental Authority for Draught and Desertification/IGADD/ which was established in 1986. After the end of the cold war, however, the economy-led approach to integration in many parts of Africa has been slightly displaced by a political rational i.e the issue of regional security. Similarly IGADD was revitalized in 1996 so as to broaden its mandate to conflict management, prevention and resolution.

But in the few years after the revitalization of IGAD, the member states were more serious in mapping out common projects on infrastructural development than common approaches to regional security. Optimal pace, extent and sequencing of the peace initiatives, fractured by narrow

security interests and ideological differences, and divided by disputes about the purpose, autonomy and use of certain structures of the regional grouping, IGAD at the beginning of the new century is seen by many as little more than a hollow shell.

The reasons for the fracturing of IGAD unity are too complex to analyze in detail in this section. Suffice it to remember that regional grouping can only be as strong as its constituent parts, or as strong as its constituent parts allow it to be. The failure is not merely from the particular circumstances of IGAD, but from the characteristic features of the member states and the regional integration scheme as a whole.

The attempts within IGAD to forge a common approach to the sub-regional resolution of conflict have focused on structural reorganization than common policies and strategies. Central to this failure is the absence of political consensus and strong economic bondage. The absence of common political values, such as democratic political cultures founded on tolerance and cultural diversity within an overarching national framework is another factor. Worse, the region is characterized by ideological polarization. It is also characterized by a multiplicity of regional organizations with overlapping membership. Except for Ethiopia most of the countries have double or triple loyalty. Outer rim states like Egypt also share the blame for the fracturing of regionalism in the Horn of Africa.

Egyptian politics have been structured around its desire to control the headwaters of the Nile, and therefore sought to isolate Ethiopia and prevent an alliance of the states in the Horn from emerging to challenge its sub-regional hegemony. Egyptian attempts to torpedo the Ethiopian peace initiatives on Somalia is best explained by this Egyptian interest. Recall that the continuing identification with narrow security interests of the state and a steady pursuit of limited set of aims fused to

beggaring ones neighbor is at the root of the chronically unstable and volatile security regime that characterizes the Horn. Thus, the different political and value systems, and the perceived compatibility of the national interests of the member states determine divergent policies and define the limits of appropriate mutual obligations. The Horn of African sub-region lacks both the subjective and objective conditions for cooperation and the creation of a strong regional organization. ***An underlying hypothesis on which this analysis proceeds is that neither the political arrangements nor the economic modalities of each country in the region look to be up to the task of regional peace and cooperation.***

Thus a new approach should not be ruled out. This is the more so because there is difficulty to create consensus among the member states of IGAD countries on the principles that should guide relations among neighbors, and the balance of power between the states in the sub-region has not allowed for stability founded on a hegemonic state or coalition. Cooperation and common security requires the attainment of strategic consensus on the management of regional security within IGAD than having just an organizational structure. The attempts so far tend to focus on organizational solutions than strategic consensus. Worse, IGAD's institutional capacity and political backing to promote and sustain such a role is in question.

Before embarking on discussing a new approach to conflict resolution, peace and security, and meaningful integration in the sub-region, it is essential to make the following concluding remarks:-

The roles and responsibilities of sub-regional powers need examination. This entails deepening relations among and between states around a clearly situated nexus of power. Secondly, the homogeneity (or diversity) of the political and

economic values (interests) to which the member states subscribe, will determine the scope of the reciprocal economic and security commitments (including sharing of intelligence, doctrine and joint training) that will be honored over time. These values, and the perceived compatibility of the national interests of the member states, define the limits of appropriate mutual obligations; hence the need for common agendas and strategies.

Thirdly, regional peace and security is an ongoing process with different phases, different actors taking the lead, it is clear that different variables are important at different junctures and stages. And finally, states that share common purposes and demonstrate the will and the ability to progress more swiftly should not wait until the others join. That they should not be hampered by the deplorable situation in the other member states and the requirements of consensus and collective ratification of all programs by all member states.

Thus, as far as creating collective security and economic cooperation is concerned, due to the complicated and confused picture in the region a multi-speed approach is more appropriate. Multi-speed refers to the time dimension, raising issues related to the rate at which integration should proceed. All states may, or may not agree on a common objective, but progress at different speeds to that objective.

Hence, it is important to ask a number of questions about what is necessary to put in place to create a workable 'security and economic community' in the Horn? What are the preconditions in terms of an inter-state order? Does a security community require an established inter-state hierarchy. The situation in the Horn of Africa today poses a number of theoretical and practical challenges, which require alternative mechanisms for creating regional integration and durable security order.

I have now made it clear that inter-state cooperation as well as regional peace and security is an ongoing process with different phases, each demanding its unique prerequisites, supportive conditions and catalytic events. **In this context, it is argued that, all IGAD members states are unlikely to progress in unison towards a common, desirable end.** Thus, there should be a new start and the process in the Horn must take probably a different character. This requires that the leading state or group of states must go out of their way to ensure that their own commitment to regional security and economic cooperation should lead the region to integration. In this context, Sudan and Ethiopia must take the lead. There are strong points in favor of this argument.

The first is that cooperation on solid, selected, and core economic interests often provide much more tangible integrative ties than high level politics. Yet, such a process should be based on conscious political decisions in which similar political, economic and security variables shape the beginnings of each integration grouping. There is ample experience and evidence in other parts of the world in support of this assertion.

The European Union which started from a humble beginning as the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951 is one clear testimony. Indeed, European security was driven by the concerns of two European states, Germany and France (Steinberg, 1993:5). In this respect it is not difficult to locate a comparable role in the Horn of Africa. The establishment of Southern Common Market (Mercosur) in Latin America in 1991, largely centered around Brazil and Argentina is another evidence.

Definitely the above point throws in to sharp perspective the otherwise-puzzling questions surrounding the leading role that Ethiopia and the Sudan might have had played in creating regionalism in the Horn of Africa. Given that progress in

regional integration is partly dependent on a leading sub-regional powers' readiness to play a larger positive role, why the two countries failed to take the lead, so far, needs careful and serious consideration. For many years there was suspicion and rivalry among Sudan and Ethiopia. Hence, the dramatic turn about in relations after 1998 must be taken seriously so that it could serve as a corner stone for progress towards regionalism in the region. Old antagonism seem to have receded with the positive steps taken to build mutual confidence; to which end Sudanese oil played key role. This analysis is also informed by impression that well developed and self-sufficient Sudan could not become erratic and a basis for a new security threat.

Towards An Energy-Led Integration in the Horn of Africa

The fact that Sudan is now an oil exporter is beginning to transform its relations with its neighbors, notably Ethiopia. This is likely to result in the development of strong economic interests among Sudan's neighbors in stable relations with Khartoum. More widely, we can see the emergence of oil diplomacy in the Horn. Although security will continue to be an important variable, the relationship between Sudan and Ethiopia is mainly based on new untainted vision, and ambition to advance the cause of their countries. And the resources that will prove most critical in the future relations between these two countries will be natural resources, mainly oil and water.

Clearly energy-led integration acts as a stimulus to other areas of cooperation such as infrastructure and port linkages. The continuing significance of oil in the improvement of relations and inter-state peace has already been noted. This significance could well expand over the next decades as a result of increased demand and the exploitation of large, newly proven reserves in the Sudan, other countries of the Horn and Egypt.

Ethiopia is well positioned to exploit its water resources and export electricity to all its neighbors which was expected to begin in 2005. **The exploitation and transport of these resources over the next decades will be a dramatic new element in regional politics.** A variety of alternative routes will be considered (as in the case of oil in Gambella through the Sudan or gas in the Ogaden through Somalia or Djibouti) for the shipment of "early and long-term oil pipelines, corridors to the sea and expansion of hydro-electric power lines across the region.

This research argues that the economic aspects of the Horn's geopolitics is receiving considerable attention as a result of primarily oil and water. Over the next decades, it is likely that new energy, water, and infrastructure issues will substantially alter the strategic environment. The broader point is that new energy-led relationship will change long standing assumptions about choke points and economic interdependence. Major producers of energy will not have the luxury of enjoying its economic benefits without peaceful and cooperative relations with their neighbors.

The implications of this trend could vary substantially depending upon the overall stability of the Horn of African sub-region. New vulnerabilities and opportunities for leverage in conflict will emerge. On the other hand, more diverse energy routes could also reinforce economic interdependence and help to dampen the potential for conflict where energy revenues and pipeline fees are at stake.

Notwithstanding the above fact energy-led economic interdependence will also help to revive overland links. **Recently overland links are being renovated and new links are beginning to emerge, with potentially important implications for regional politics.** The recently opened Gondar-Gadarif road (including the relations created among

regional states in Sudan and Ethiopia) open the possibilities of overland shipment of oil from Sudan to Ethiopia.

Similarly, a comprehensive peace settlement between Eritrea and its big neighbors (Ethiopia and Sudan) in the future would open up the possibility of direct overland trade relations among the northern parts of Ethiopia, Eritrea and the Sudan. Eritrea and the northern Ethiopian(mainly Tigray) region will be linked to the oil-led economic development of the Sudan, which will have long-term political and economic implications. This will promote cross border trade, the movement of people; and may be an increasing number of migrant labour to Sudan both creating new opportunities for a broader movement toward regional economic interdependence. The political and strategic ramifications of this development will be enormous, which needs careful examination.

Another contentious element but potentially key driver of regional peace and cooperation is water. Competition over water resources is widely seen as a key source of conflict in the region over the next decades. Leading water related flash points will include Sudan, Ethiopia and Egypt over the Nile Basin and Ethiopia and Somalia over the Wabi Shebelle waters. Of these the dispute between Egypt and Ethiopia is probably the most dangerous. Energy-led economic integration and peace building in the Horn will be impacted, for good or for worse, by the negotiations on the use of the Nile waters. Curiously, positive developments are emerging in this regard.

The Nile 2000 conference and other attempts such as the Nile Basin Initiative(NBI) have gone some way to break some of the psycho-political hurdles surrounding the Nile basin. There is a realization now that the Nile offers great potential to all concerned including the Sudan, Egypt and Ethiopia. Given the vital need for a regional water development plan that incorporates the political realities of the region as well as the limitations imposed by economics and

hydrology, the countries involved should remain engaged in constructive dialogue, until an agreed –upon criteria for fair ownership and distribution of the Nile waters. In this way water could lead the direction for conflict resolution of a regional magnitude.

Continued and sustained dialogue to break the Nile impasse will be crucial for *energy-led* economic integration and a second most important substantive requirement for establishing regional peace and security order. This will greatly change the geopolitics of North-East Africa and alter the age-old security order in the region. It will be a good example of the complementarities between conflict resolution and development.

Water is already an increasingly prominent issue in the security perceptions of the three countries. Conventionally, the persistence of water dependence, its energy use and, above all, perceived vulnerabilities will make control over downstream water supply a source of leverage in crisis and conflicts. Ethiopia could for instance use such a leverage over Somalia.

In reality, however, tempering with the downstream flow is not easily accomplished without environmental and political costs to the upstream states, suggesting that instances of a large-scale strategic interference with water supply will be a rarity. Where the general evolution of relations is positive (as is evident among the three countries), cooperation over increasingly valuable water resources could spur the peaceful resolution of disputes.

This cooperation has already been evident in the closer links between Sudan and Ethiopia as well as the ongoing Nile Basin Initiative.   The prospects for a wider settlement will require more serious treatment (such as equitable share) of water issues.   Under these conditions, Ethiopian water

resources will be a key asset for encouraging and consolidating peace in the wider region.

Just as the European Union emerged from the European Coal and Steel Community, the desired cooperation and Horn's economic community could grow out of initial co-operation in these two sectors. But it is worth noting that the economic, institutional and political factors that led to Europe's success are absent in the Horn. European economic cooperation was effected among democratic governments, which had almost similar kind of value system and compatible political systems.

The reality in the Horn is basically different with highly diverse, reciprocal and even contradictory political systems engaged in the mutual cross-border subversion against each other. Thus, the minimum requirement for economic cooperation and eventual integration is some form of parallel democratization. Any effort at regional cooperation should bear in mind that there is a kind of dialectical relationship among economic integration, democratization and security in the Horn of Africa**.**

Hence, the whole process should be punctuated by further democratizing the state and promoting the role of civil society organizations in the process; incorporating ***human security*** in to the parameters of the security equation, the creation of a regional   ***anti-destabilization regime***, and the adoption of a ***collective security system.*** This will go a long way in meeting the substantive requirements for cooperation and a durable regional peace and security order.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

ACRONYMS

ADF……….Alliance of Democratic Forces
ADLI……….Agricultural Development Led Industrialization.
BPLM………Benishangul Peoples Liberation Movement
DOP………..Declaration Of Principles
DRC………..Democratic Republic of Congo
EEBC………Ethiopia-Eritrea Border Commission
EPLF……….Eritrean Peoples Liberation Front
EPRDF…… Ethiopian Peoples Revolutionary
                          Democratic Front
GOS………. Government Of Sudan
IGAD……… Inter-Governmental Authority for Development
IGADD……. Inter-Governmental Authority for Draught
                          and Desertification
IIRO………. International Islamic Relief Organization
IPF…………IGAD Partners Forum
LRA………. Lords Resistance Army
MCC……… Military Coordination Commission
NBI………. Nile Basin Initiative
NDA……… National Democratic Alliance
NIF………. National Islamic Front
NRA……… National Resistance Army

OLF……… Oromo Liberation Front
PFDJ……. Popular Front for Democracy and Justice
RPF……… Ruwandese Patriotic Front
SAF……… Sudan Alliance Force
SADC…….Southern Africa Development Community
SFA……….Status of Forces Agreement
SPLA……..Southern Sudan Peoples Liberation Army
SPLM…….Southern Sudan Liberation Movement
TNG………Transitional National Government
TPLF…… Tigray Peoples Liberation Front

TSZ……….Temporary Security Zone

UNMEE….. United Nations Mission to Ethiopia and Eritrea
WNBLF…… West Nile Bank Liberation Front

INTRODUCTION

The Horn of Africa is usually understood to comprise Djibouti, Somalia, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Sudan and the Northern region of Kenya. In strictly geographic terms, however, only Djibouti, Ethiopia and Somalia comprise the Horn. Nonetheless for the purpose of this study, the 'core' of the Horn is understood to include Sudan, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia (including its various parts), Kenya and Djibouti. It will be argued that these countries are linked by history, over lapping peoples and cultures that means that conflicts in one country are likely to directly impact on their neighbors.

The discussion, however, extends to areas on the periphery of these states such as the Nile /Red Sea drainage basin and the Great Lakes region. Regions also have linkages and for the Horn the outer rim of countries that have the most impact are Egypt, Yemen and Uganda. The focus of this study is mainly on the geographic Horn and all the countries that have land boundary with Ethiopia- as constituting the 'core' of the Horn. But as a conflict formation, the 'Greater Horn' also covers almost all the countries mentioned above, in which Sudan is the epicenter of what could be described as the Conflict Triangle that stretches from the Red Sea to the Democratic Republic of Congo /DRC/.

The Horn of African sub-region is one of the most unstable and conflict-prone areas in the world. The sources and types of conflict have become more diverse and less predictable, even if less dangerous in the worst case. In terms of regional security concerns, the demise of the East-West competition has not brought a radical change to all the countries of the Horn. To the extent that security agendas across the region continue to be dominated by questions of domestic stability, very little has

changed, although the substance and severity of these internal challenges have evolved considerably since the end of the cold war.

This study is concerned with the intrastate and inter-state conflicts and external challenges facing the countries of the Horn and the place of these countries in the broader regional security environment. It primarily deals with the issues of internal conflicts and inter-state security order in the sub-region. A sustainable peace and security order in the Horn of Africa requires the establishment of a 'security community', that is, a community that transcends national boundaries in which the settlement of disputes by anything other than peaceful means is unthinkable.

Peace and integration in the Horn is made problematic by political and economic differences and difficulties which at times have resulted in political failures and conflict. Even for those in the process of democratization operating as they do in an unstable regional milieu, the stability of the region is critical to the success of their own transition.

A regional peace and security order could be achieved by a number of different routes. However, the Horn of African situation is not conducive to the conditions necessary for a united progress for a deeper, wider and more sustained process of regional peace and integration. This study is intended to identify the necessary pre-requisites for regional cooperation. It argues that inter-state power relations need to be re-defined. Hence the analysis is based on the assumption that Sudan and Ethiopia will be the key players in transforming conflicts into cooperation in the Horn of Africa.

The two countries should plan for a large and prolonged economic interdependence without which it is difficult to achieve peace and regional integration. This study concludes that, with parallel democratization and confidence building

security measures in place, an *energy-led integration* is the most promising route to economic cooperation, peace and security order and regional integration in the Horn of Africa.

THE STUDY APPROACH

The study objective is to provide a systematic description of the nature of conflicts and the mechanisms that need to be adopted for a prolonged but successful conflict resolution. The study description took three forms: 1) Analysis of key sources of internal conflict affecting inter-state relations; 2)The nature of the state and the politics of destabilization including a discussion on the changing nature of the regional security environment; and 3) Suggestion on the approaches that need to be adopted for establishing regional peace and security; in which focus is given to the growing economic dimensions of conflict resolution.

In general terms the objectives of this study are:
- To identify the root causes or key determinants of the conflicts in the Horn.
- To explore the mechanisms towards an expanded framework for conflict resolution, and
- To identify prospects for economic cooperation as a means of preventing future conflicts.

Clearly, this study deals with on-going political and economic developments in the countries of the Horn of Africa. It is just like documenting history in the making. Writing on this issue has its own shortcomings. Most of the reliable sources remain chronicled in the archives of foreign service and security agencies. As a result, most of the accounts for regional politics are built upon information gathered from years of personal academic engagement, discussions with important players in the region, verified media reports and a review of published materials and unpublished articles. It brings together a selection of memos and briefing reports calibrated over the years from state and non-state actors.

Most of the sources used (or appearing) in the study were drawn entirely from open sources, and a great deal of effort has been made to reconcile this information with data (and interviews) of a classified nature. The purpose of the analysis on the changing character of regional power relations and suggestions on the way forward is not to provide a precise quantitative assessment of the future, but rather to suggest patterns with strategic implications and worthy of attention.

Given this objective, the study offers original analysis and some thoughts for scenario building on what we can and cannot expect in few years time with regard to regional conflicts and their resolution. However, the study does not claim to be exhaustive. Nonetheless, the researcher believes that the treatment of the issue is more than adequate to stimulate broader debate and map out practical steps of transforming conflicts into cooperation in the Horn of Africa.

CHAPTER ONE

THE ANATOMY OF CONFLICTS IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

Conflicts continue to constitute one of the greatest challenges facing the Horn of African region. Indeed the Horn of Africa is one of the most fragile crisis regions in the world. It is often described as the most turbulent region in the world ' set to go over the edge! It also continued to be a venue for a typically intricate story of a regional conflict. The civil war in the Sudan, clan violence and famine in Somalia, are just a selection of the on-going conflicts. Internal conflict, environmental and political upheaval is also prevalent in almost every country of the Horn. Some of them are intra state conflicts of the most brutal kind. The causes of these conflicts are deep-rooted and long term, leaving many observers thinking there is nothing more that can be done.

1.1 The Cold War Primer

During the cold war, the Horn of Africa was the scene of super power rivalry between the Soviet Union and the United States. Particularly in the 1970's, conflicts in the Horn were overshadowed by the rivalry between the super powers. The Horn of Africa represents what (Caroline and Wilkin,1999: 130) calls as a reverse theory of hegemonic stability, in which superpower hegemony deepens rather than lessens political stability. Political leaders in the region were able to play-off external actors against each other and to attract huge sums of military and economic aid for their regimes' survival. The persistence of internal and inter-state conflicts increased the dependence of the countries of the Horn of Africa on the superpowers, which exerted political leverage over them. The search for outside resources to maintain domestic power

structures was central to the foreign policy of the great majority states in the region.

The end of the cold war ushered in a new, co-operative mood for the management and resolution of conflicts. There was progress towards a peaceful transition to democratic governance in many African countries such as Mozambique and Ethiopia. Thus, the final years of the 1980's saw many favorable developments that seemed to portend a reduction in conflict in Africa.

All this apparent progress toward peace in Africa was occurring under the influence of potentially favorable changes in the regional and international state systems. In the Horn of Africa itself, a hope for peace and a new spur of pragmatism and cooperation seemed to be aboard.

However, in the final months of 1989 and in to 1990, the wars in Sudan, Ethiopia and Somalia intensified and peace initiatives faltered. In short conflict remained a serious problem for the Horn of Africa as the 1990's began, despite the favorable developments in the regional and international systems, in the final years of the previous decade. It become increasingly evident that the end of the cold war or bipolarity has not contributed to the creation of a regional context for peace. Indeed it created a power vacuum. This coincided with major political upheavals: the deconstruction of the state in Somalia, the fall of the " "Dergue Regime" in Ethiopia and the independence of Eritrea. The political developments underway in Sudan, Ethiopia and Somalia would make relations among the countries in the region contentious irrespective of the interests of the major powers in the new international order.

Evidently the decline of bipolarity has not reduced the intensity of the civil wars in Djibouti, Sudan and Somalia. Most

of the conflicts have in fact taken on new magnitudes and dimensions. The National Islamic Front (NIF) regime of General Omer El-Beshir came to power in Sudan through a military coup in may 1989. The silent civil war in the port state of Djibouti between the Issa and the Afar opposition continued, and the Republic of Somalia ceased to exist amid a brutal civil war between the warring factions. The civil war in the Sudan not only continued but was further complicated by political Islam, oil and the split of the SPLA in the early 1990's. Three years after independence (by 1994) Eritrea was at loggerheads with its neighbors.

The Horn of Africa was an area of considerable conflict between the super powers during the cold war and as a result there is a tendency to see various disputes and wars in the region as being caused or furthered by outside powers or at the very least exacerbated by these powers. It will be contended here that this is all together too simplistic and that the Horn's conflicts were in almost every instance locally generated. Thus, contrary to expectations that the end of the cold war would usher in a period of peace in the Horn, conflicts have continued.

1.2. *The Complexity of Internal Conflicts*

Unlike inter-state conflicts, which are monitored and mediated from the early stages, the origin and escalation of internal conflict is difficult to trace with certainty. Internal conflicts are defined primarily as conflicts, which arise within state borders. Although there may be outside factors, which influence these conflicts, they are mostly and primarily conflicts over governance, identity and resource allocation within a particular state (Kumar, 1996:7). The definition of conflict varies depending on the objective of the issue under consideration and the methods employed. According to Dougherty and Pfaltzgraf (1990:187), the term " conflict refers to a condition in which one

identifiable group of human beings (whether tribal, ethnic, linguistic, cultural, religious, socio-economic, political, or other) is engaged in a conscious opposition, to one or more identifiable groups because these groups are pursuing what appear to be incompatible goals." The incompatible goals usually revolve around a competition over scarce resources, power and prestige. Sources of conflicts in general are too many to be exhausted one by one in this study. The definition and dimension of conflict seem far more complex than any one factor can encompass. But in understanding the factors behind the conflicts in the Horn of Africa the nature of the state, mainly the nation-state, and economic aspects figure prominently.

A brief overview of the dimensions of the conflicts in the region and some of their more apparent causes suggests that the problem is very grave and deeply rooted in the societies and states of the Horn. And a full assessment of the origin, course and pattern of conflicts would require an in-depth examination of the many factors that lead to warfare and violence, and an evaluation of all the changes that might some how be affecting those factors. Such an examination is the primary focus of this study.

In discussing conflicts always a tension arises between focusing on the immediate crisis and addressing the deeper structural and political conditions that underlie the crisis. Understanding the real origins, patterns and possible outcomes of conflicts is indispensable for developing the concepts and means to reduce or resolve them. Studies of conflict in the Horn of Africa have identified many underlying causes: identity fault lines derived from complex internal factors such as ethnicity, religion, culture and language, porous borders, competition for limited resources, over population - all inspire and perpetuate conflict.

State insecurity is further aggravated by vulnerability to external economic shocks, weak institutions (further weakened by HIV/AIDS), and poor governance.

In addition, small arms and low-intensity conflicts, such as cattle rustling, spread beyond national borders. Among these, however, key drivers of conflict are systemic political problems. The most consequential trends in this context include, problems of economic growth and reform, dysfunctional societies and the erosion of state control, and crises of political legitimacy and the challenges of radical Islam and nationalism. The relationships among these factors, and which are independent rather than intervening variables, are far less clear.

Taken together, these trends have encouraged and will almost certainly continue to support a pervasive sense of insecurity within Horn of African societies. The drivers represent deep systemic factors that will be at the fore front of challenges to stability in the region for the next several decades. But at the heart of many of these drivers lie the nature of the state with its corresponding impact on hard security issues like sovereignty and self-determination as well as dissatisfactions with the current political systems and patterns of governance (Fischer, 2002: p. 13).

1.2.1. *Resource and Ethnicity: Myths and Realities*

The countries of the region not only belong to the poorest countries in the world; in the Human Development Index they figure in the lowest ranks. They are also affected by various types of environmental problems such as draught, water scarcity, soil erosion, desertification, erratic precipitation patterns, or overuse of scarce renewable resources. In reality wars of the recent past, widespread poverty and environmental degradation form a triangle, each angle of which has a casual impact on each of the two others (ECOMAN, 1996: 26).

Mainly water scarcity and soil erosion are the major threats to environmental security in the Horn countries. In the words of Markakis (1998:20), "scarcity remains the harsh fact of life in the region- mobility is increasingly constrained and no longer massive but the need for it remains as valid as ever." Thus, scarcity and mobility made conflict inevitable. The Jebel Marra mountains in western Sudan, province of Darfur, is a good example. Particularly, since the draught of 1983/84 the nomads have been increasing their pressure on the Fur farmers penetrating the semi-arid and humid mountain areas with their herds more deeply, much longer, and in greater numbers than they ever did in the past.

Another example are the clashes between the Baggara Arab pastoralists in South Kordofan and the Dinka of Bahr el Ghazal province in Sudan. To this could be added the conflict between the Borana Oromo's and the Somali in Southern Ethiopia. (Medhane, 1998:5). From a security perspective, ecological issues include population (demographic) pressure, migration, land degradation, forests, fisheries and fresh water resources, and wars. A similar event is the continued migration of farmers from the degraded highlands in Eritrea to the lowlands of Gash Setit where Kunama minority protest against the threatening growth of an alien population in the area of Barentu and neighboring villages such as Shambiko.

The pastures of the Haud in the Eastern Ogaden are the objects of contention between two Somali clans i.e the Ogaden from Ethiopia and the Isaq in today's Somaliland. A long-standing conflict over land has made struggling parties of the Issa Somali and the Afar, both pastoralists. In this context, to continue to treat conflicts in the region as pure political and /or ethnic/ tribal conflicts and ignore the growing impact of the degradation and depletion of renewable resource base can only lead to a distorted understanding of the real situation and

consequently drastically limit the possibility of genuine conflict resolution.

Scarcity of renewable resources transforms ecological boundaries in to ethnic political boundaries of dispute. It is not accidental that ethnic, religious and cultural dichotomies remain very potent in people's perception of violent conflict. For decades, the notion of ethnic (tribal) difference dominated most attempts to explain violent conflicts in sub-Saharan Africa. By painting the rich spectrum of ethnic diversity found in the continent with the culture of competition induced by a harsh environment and restricted access to natural and social-resources, intra-ethnic violence came to be regarded as the natural state of affairs. While they are weak as root causes, ethnic and cultural dichotomies come in to play the longer a conflict persists, fuelling the violence long after the initial causes have petered out. Marginal lands are often a flashpoint of much larger structural conflicts between neighboring groups. As each contender seeks to attract maximum support, ethnicity is the loudest rallying cry (Suliman,1999: 38).

The character of the state and the nature of resource allocation is also central to the problem. Resource shortage and ecological degradation could also be the result of uneven social measures that manufacture scarcity all over the world for the economic and political gain of powerful interests. *Self-interested and highly partisan agendas of small groups within society whose occupation with ethnicity is rooted not in a celebration of cultural diversity but in a desire to dominate others, perpetuates ethnic violence* (ibid, 21). Scarcity emanates not only from ecological degradation but also as a result of denying or limiting access to renewable resources. In almost all the group conflicts in the Horn, access to natural and social resources expressed in terms of justice, fairness, equitable sharing and equal development was the primary concern of people in arms. With

this, conflict research enters the realm of politics, the economy and the state. Hence, technical solutions to violent conflict situations are no longer adequate.

Somalia is a land of great ethnic, religious and cultural homogeneity but competition over control of the state and the economy and for a greater share of renewable resources-mainly land and water, the contestants evoked sub-ethnic, clan difference and fought along these clan lines for economic gain and state control. The forceful occupation of rich fertile lands of Southern Somalia which belong to the Bantu and Digil- Mirifle by the Habergedir is a telling commentary of a pervasive resource-ethnic conflict axis. The penetration of the South by the northern elite in the Sudan and SPLA's attacks on the construction site of the Jonglei canal and oil fields clearly signifies the centrality of resource in the Sudanese civil war. Even if two different types of conflict co- exist on a manifest level, then the ethnic (political) conflict takes the upper hand over the class conflict in the sense of being the one along which people identify themselves primary.

Monopoly over resource being central, the violent conflicts in the Horn have different manifestation displayed at various levels. These are: national conflicts mainly over state political power; regional conflicts usually over local political power i.e. war lordism, and local conflicts, typically over renewable natural resources.

National conflicts take place among the so-called national elite over control of the state, which in many countries is almost equivalent to controlling the economic, social and political levers of power and all tools of coercion. Regional conflict, however, although similar in aims and objectives to the conflict at a national level, is an outcome of the weakening of the central state. While the third type of conflict takes place among people competing over renewable resources-mainly soil, water, fauna

and flora-which have become scarcer through environmental degradation and/or through the limiting or denial of access to these resources (ibid, p. 41).

Curiously environmental stress can play different roles along the conflict dynamic. It can be structural sources as well as a catalyst for conflict or a trigger for violence. *Therefore, the socio-economic and political context, in which environmental stress occurs, has to be taken into consideration while assessing the conflict potential of different environmental stresses* (Environmental Change, 1999: 41). This coupled with the demographic effect to many babies born-certainly creates stresses which will become a fertile ground for conflicts. Population trends in the countries of the Horn are following this frightening pattern. Mention could be made on some aspects of demographic pressure

1.2.2 Demography :What Is It?

Overall, the Horn's population is expected to double by 2025, with annual growth rates of roughly 2.5%. Experiencing population growth on the order of 2.5 and above with the result that per capita GNP has dropped sharply is a dangerous pattern. The population in Ethiopia is likely to reach 120 m. not long after 2020. From a social view point, it is perhaps more significant that the proportion of people under 15 years of age in these highest growth areas is believed to reach 50 % by 2025. Demographic change of this kind has and will continue to have a number of potentially destabilizing consequences. First it will reinforce long-standing trends towards urbanization across the region as populations move to the cities in search of jobs and social services, hence uncontrolled urbanization.

The challenges of housing, feeding, and providing transport and medical care for ever larger and younger populations will be most acute in the cities. The inability of states to adjust to the problems of urbanization is also having

political consequences for established regimes leading to social violence and militancy mainly in the form of Islamic movements, which made their first mark in urban politics where (in other countries) they registered striking electoral successes. This will also change the conduct of politics and the nature of locus of power. Traditional rural relationships, among families, clans, land owners and peasants have remained as a basis of political stability in these societies. Politics in the Horn will now turn increasingly on economic relationships and new systems of patronage based in the cities. It is also important to bear in mind that the presence of a high proportion of young men (without the necessary social and economic safety valve) increases the risk of conflict. According to collier (1999:5) some societies are more prone to conflict simply because they offer more inviting socio-economic prospects for rebellion. Low education is one of them. The greater the educational endowment the lower is the risk. In this context it is hardly surprising to see population growth, migration and urbanization simply change the nature of the countries in the region.

In some cases, disparities in population growth along ethnic and religious lines fundamentally alter political balances and the prospects for stability. Demographic changes along these lines will continue to be a source of friction with in the societies as old political arrangements and ethnic compacts loose their relevance. For this reason among others, ethnic and separatist conflicts are likely to be a feature on the regional scene over the next decades. Prominent examples include the steady erosion of Orthodox Christians in Ethiopia in the face of a growing Moslem population and ascendancy of new Christian religions; the over expanding and increasingly assertive Hawiya clans in Somalia, the relatively rapid growth of Tigrigna speakers in Eritrea and Issa Somalis in Djibouti; the high birth rates among the Oromo in Ethiopia.

Clearly population size and growth will be a factor in the

power and potential of states. In the Horn of Africa, however, large populations can be a source of vulnerability when coupled with low economic growth rates and the pressures noted above. The most stable and powerful states in the future may be those where demographic pressures and economic performance have been brought into line, allowing regimes to devote additional resources to investment, economic and social safety valves and acquisition of modern military forces without risking domestic chaos.

Again population pressure and scarcity of resource could not be a serious problem by itself. Here comes the nature of the state and its role in the management of resources. It all depends on the ability of households and individuals to command access to food and, hence, on the distribution of economic and political power within society. Indeed, the deliberate manufacture of scarcity now provides one of the principal means through which powerful state and private interest monopolize resources, control markets and suppress the demographic majority. Recall ethnicity as a mobilizing factor for control over resources.

This analysis does not have the intention to deny the fact that ethnicity is a potent political force by its own. It is rather to insist that the shared values, histories, customs and identities that generate ' ethnicity' are socially constructed, not biologically determined; and that, at root, ethnic conflicts result not from blood hatred but from socially generated divisions which, more often than not, reflect deep-seated conflicts over power and resources both between groups and within groups.

Scholarly studies of conflict (Environmental change, 20) have cited poverty and deprivation as one of the primary underlying causes of endemic conflict and civil violence which could result in the collapse of state authority. Indeed   many of

the state failures emanate from the inability of weak states to provide the basic needs of people. The links between hunger and violence emanate from subsistence crisis and the denial or loss of entitlement as both a result and a cause of armed conflicts in poor countries. Thus, the cause of poverty, hence, violence in the countries of the Horn is not only caused by structural but also political factors. The political economy perspective offers the theory of urban bias, anti-peasant policies and rent-seeking that blames distorted markets and dysfunctional political processes.

The fundamental grievances that motivate collective political action arise from the same political processes that generate food shortages, under-development, and conflict. After all the collapse of state is attributed primarily to the failure of existing policies and state institutions to ensure socio- economic development and alleviate deprivation. It also erodes the legitimacy of whatever level of power is exercised by the elite. No wonder that governments in the Horn have been unable to mobilize the population for development in a constructive manner. As many people began to draw a direct connection between their economic plight and the paucity of basic liberties, local grievances very quickly escalate into popular challenges to the established systems of government.(Fantu, 1992:7) And for obvious reasons such challenges will have an ethnic dimension.

No doubt there are conflicts over the definition of "self" in the struggle for self-determination. The demand for autonomy has kept the issue of self-determination very much alive and constitutes the core of the conflicts in the Horn of African countries. Compounding the problem have been incomplete nation building and the chronic problem of the nation state in Africa. The nation-state as a political organization suffers from several deficiencies. The relationship between nationalism and democracy has never been properly defined in post colonial Africa. Similarly the most vital issue confronting the states in the

Horn is the absence of a viable socio-economic and cultural Contract to govern the relations among the diverse units within the state, while recognizing and ensuring each units need for identity, security and participation. By suppressing these identities and the accompanying politico -economic aspirations, the artificial African state has, in fact, continued to politicize them.

The outcome is that like many in Africa, the governments in the Horn could not enjoy legitimacy and exercise sufficient credible political power to manage the affairs of the state. It is not accidental that ordinary people now want to construct a new political and economic reality, one that based on participation, representation, local control, and on meeting human needs. This has a direct link with the tension, conflicts, and violence that arise from socio-economic and political imbalances and underdevelopment with in the Horn of African countries. In short most of the governments in the region does not reflect both the interest and the character of the society as a whole. Worse, they have failed to develop either a viable political formula or a viable economic formula for governing their peoples.

Some argue that it is impossible in the long-run for people to make compromises or to capitulate when their human needs are frustrated. When these needs, such as the need for security, identity, meaning or acceptance, are frustrated, deep - rooted conflict is the result (Track Two, 1995: P.4). Curiously it appears that absolutist states with geographically and functionally centralized governments under autocratic leadership or a clique with narrow interests and agendas are likely to be most belligerent, while constitutional states with geographically and functionally federalized governments under democratic (and truly representative) leadership are likely to be less-belligerent and most peaceful (Rummel May, 1998"11). The nature of

political systems and state - society relations impacts a lot on t nature of governance as well as peace and stability. Thus the level of democracy variable is relevant to the study of conflicts (Ibid:53).

Democracies are less vulnerable to internal strife and state failure than partial democracies and autocracies. Partial democracies that combine democratic and autocratic features on the other hand have higher risks of conflict and state failure. Despite hopeful trends and developments since the end of the cold war, major changes that would democratize the state of the Horn have not yet taken place. Squeezed between the international call for democratization and openness and the calculus of domestic political power the majority states in the Horn have either drifted to partial democracies or illiberal democracies. Worse, some of them (such as the state of Eritrea) have mutated to dictatorship and autocracy.

Particularly in lower-income countries where the quality of life remains poor partial democracies are far more vulnerable to conflict and state failure than are either full democracies or autocracies. Curiously the nature of conflicts in the Horn is more or less in line with the above geometry. Thus, at the root of the conflicts in the Horn lay a political crisis. The character of the state, which become a threat to domestic political stability, social cohesion, economic development should be regarded as constituting security threats at the national and sometimes sub-regional levels. The bottom line, often less obvious but glaringly evident, is that, domestic political structures are unstable and ill established; they are causes for both domestic turmoil and regional instability. The same lies behind the inter-state conflicts in the Horn of African region.

In reality, there can be no separation of the domestic and external sources of conflicts in Africa, because of the dynamic interaction between the two. Intrastate conflicts coul easily become interstate (for example, the conflict in Somalia and its linkages with the Ethio- Somalia war). Conversely, inter-state conflicts could have decisive effects on a domestic power struggle (for example, the Ethio-Eritrean war). Thus the nature of political systems, the delegitmation of the state and the parochial policies it adopts has opened up considerable room for both internal strife and regional instability. This coupled with differing ideology and competing (sometimes antagonistic) political systems aggravates inter state conflicts in the Horn.

1.2.3. **The Challenge of Radical Islam and Terrorism**

The point had been made that it is not the mere differences of ethnic or religious identities but the incompatibilities of their objectives or interests that generate conflicts. Assertive ethnicities and exclusive belief systems can be used to transform incompatibilities into boundaries of conflict and violence. Incompatibilities can relate either to such tangible issues as the distribution of power, wealth, and other assets, or to the intangible and more elusive issues of the definition of the nation in ways that affect the relative position of the various identities in nationalistic, cultural, or moral and spiritual terms (Francis Deng, 1996:66). The same holds true for Islamic revivalist movements.

Indeed, in Africa in general and the Horn of Africa in particular, Islamism as a movement developed in response to colonial rule and injustice. The Mahdist movement in the Sudan in the 19th century and the uprising led by Mohammad Abdille Hasan in Somalia at the turn of the 20th century are the perfect examples. Although nationalist in character; both movements were energized by religious particularity vis- à-vis the enemy i.e. the colonial power. This study specifically encompasses the political challenge of Islam in the countries

15

of the Horn.   In dealing with this issue, the discussion is informed by the following themes:

1. Islamic revivalist movements from ancient to modern times developed in response to a political challenge posed by illegitimate political authorities. And religious conflicts become particularly acute when there is religious oppression and the politics of alienation. It is closely linked to the specific nature of the state and dissatisfaction with patterns of governance.

2. External factors have stimulated the proliferation of modern Islamic movements primarily Sudan and Somalia, and of late in all the countries of the region. The Islamists in Sudan and Somali were inspired by the Egyptian Muslim brothers and schooled in Saudi religious institutions.

3. A non-African revivalist movement that has recently had major impact on Islam in the region is the Wahhabi movement. Except in the early established Islamic movements (Sudan and Somalia) in the other countries of the Horn there is an increasingly Wahhabi influence.   The incipient Wahabbianization of Islam is the major threat to religious tolerance and peace in most of the countries in the region.

4. To the extent that external intervention is low, the overwhelming majority of Moslems remained peaceable and tolerant. International connectedness is key to political Islam and the politics of Jihad in the Horn of Africa. It has facilitated the operation of financial services and has enabled access to Islamic philanthropic resources. Weak institutions and socio-economic crisis in the countries of the Horn meant that Islamists would command a comparative advantage in terms of organization and resources.

5. Islamic Fundamentalism flourishes and becomes particularly acute when there is a dictatorial, totalitarian, repressive political systems. The Sudan under successive governments,

6. Somalia under said Barre, Ethiopia under Mengistu and Eritrea under Isayas are clear indications. To this could be added widespread poverty, the failure of the state to provide basic social services and the bankruptcy of secular ideologies in providing hope and a model for the future.

In the case of Ethiopia after 1991, lax religious policy and devolution of powers to the regions have created a fertile ground for the spread of the Wahabbi and other revivalist movements.   From this vantage point the Horn's partial democracies fared little better than neighboring autocracies.

As an ideological driven party with a missionary zeal to export political Islam in to sub-Saharan Africa, Ethiopia's large Moslem population was an obvious target for the NIF in Sudan.

This was the more so because in the immediate aftermath of taking power, the EPRDF and to some extent the EPLF, appeared to concentrate on forming and protecting their interests for which they needed at least a respite from confrontation. Besides Ethiopia was opening up its own diversity and intensively reconnecting to the region and neighboring middle East. This enabled foreign Islamist groups to create followers in Ethiopia mainly through Islamic Humanitarianism, philanthropic organization, Islamic scholarships and migrant labour to the middle East.

The NIF offensive was multi-faceted and involved a major expansion of its embassy in Addis Ababa, the rapid proliferation of Islamic NGO's, the welcoming of Ethiopian Moslem students to Sudan for education, and the growing use of

the Sudanese state radio to propagate Islamist messages (Young, 1999:333). The Ethiopian government regarded these threats as containable, at least until 1995. Meanwhile, Sudanese influence seem to be increasingly overwhelmed by the Saudi factor in Ethiopia.

For three decades, the Saudis courted and funded hundreds of neo-Wahabbi groups across the Moslem world to spread Wahhabism and gain influence within the Islamic movements around the world. As in other countries, the Saudi embassy in Addis Ababa and the International Islamic Relief Organization (IIRO) have played key role in the project. Thus, the period after 1991 heralded the beginning of well-organized Wahabbi movements in many parts of Ethiopia (Medhane, 2003:8).

In his thesis-the Saudis and Ethiopia-which islam? Haggai Erlich (2003:12) noted that Ethiopia is undergoing a fundamental revolution, perhaps the deepest in its history. This process of change is evident in the way Moslems are entering the core of Ethiopian life in all conceivable dimensions and the way the country is reconnecting to the neighboring Middle East. According to Haggai, whether this opening up will be either destructive or beneficial will depend on the nature and scope of external involvement.

Reportedly two militant Islamic groups, Wahabbi and Jam'at Takfir (Egyptian variant), who compete against each other, are currently active in the country (Medhane, 2003:9). Hence, poverty at home and financial and organizational support from abroad is dramatically influencing the nature of political Islam in Ethiopia. The phenomenon is too young to be fully assessed.

This analysis is a preliminary attempt to construct the dynamics of Islamic militancy in Ethiopia, aimed at stimulating discussion. It lacks details. However, it throws in to sharp perspective some of the otherwise-disturbing elements of the silent religious revolution or fault line in Ethiopia. Present day Ethiopia is vulnerable to externally imposed religious militancy and it is only a matter of few years before the age-old religious equilibrium collapses completely. After all, it is difficult to challenge Haggai's assertion that the voices of those in Saudi Arabia who interpret Islam's historical legalies as calling for a total Islamic victory in and over Ethiopia, is by far the louder.

Similar developments are taking place in other countries of the Horn. Prominent examples include the expanding and increasingly assertive role of Moslems in Kenya, Islamic revivalism and the growing role of two Al-Tabliq movements in Uganda and the relatively rapid growth of Islamic Jihad movements in Eritrea. There is significant (but largely underrepresented) Moslem minority in Kenya and Uganda. Both countries should try to address the sensitivities of their Moslem population and ensure proportionate sharing of power and resources. Mainly Islamic discontent in Uganda is partly the legacy of the former period, when Idi Amin harassed Ugandan Moslems along with Asian traders.

Islamic militancy, however, owes much to the particular circumstances (as is the case in Ethiopia and Kenya) of foreign influence. As discussed in earlier sections Moslem discontent in Eritrea is largely the result of domestic political discontent. The EPLF failed to provide political space for the leaders of Eritrea's Lowland Moslem communities, and most of those who joined the government and party were quickly relegated to

19

marginal positions. Besides there are justified economic grievances. Government backed population movements to the lowlands have created (mainly land) insecurity among the Moslem population.

So the problem in Eritrea is one of economic justice as much as it is political power-sharing. EPLF's answer to such credible grievances is increasing repression (US Dept. of state, 2003:4). Only three years after independence, the Eritrean

government started a crackdown and arrested "fundamental Moslems" arbitrarily identified as *"chehamat", meaning those with long beards*. Indeed the government have been denying Eritreans of other religious variants the right to worship. This goes to the extent of stripping the citizenship of those accused of subscribing to 'foreign religions'. No doubt, persecution will only increase religious militancy, and will in the long-term prove terminal to the future relations between the religions in Eritrea which has co-existed peacefully for many years.

Somalia has been the breeding ground of militant Islamic movements, the prominent of which is Al-ittihad Al-islami. The deplorable economic and political situation compounding the Somali civil war has greatly contributed to the prominence of Islamic groups in that war torn country. The Islamist' venture in to law and order took the form of sponsoring Islamic courts, which in turn developed their own militias. With the backing of international Islamic agencies and relatively dominant control over Somalia's black economy, Islamists in Somalia are militarily mobilized.

Using a combination of international connections and finance, and appeal to certain local constituencies, Islamist forces in Somalia have played a more pivotal role during the civil war and the formation of the TNG in 2001 and after than have the more traditional Islamic groupings (Medhane, 2003:183). Thus, Islamic fundamentalism in Somalia can be better understood in the context of contemporary Somali political history, state dysfunction, international connection, the civil war, and the efforts made at new political reconstruction of the Somali themselves (Ibid).   In 1996, Al-ittihad's strategy of becoming part of the wider Islamist militant front against Ethiopia backfired when the Ethiopian army decisively intervened and overran its

headquarters at Luuq in Gedo region.   Thereafter, Al-ittihad reverted to a strategy of influencing the major factions in Moqadisho.   It also directed its attention to control the socio-economic life in Somalia.   Even though radical Islam is not officially in power, it could exert considerable influence over the character of politics and policies in Somalia in the near-future.

Many scholars agree that the only Sunni and Arab country where radical Islamic fundamentalism has fully taken power is Sudan. In 1989, Junior officers courted by the National Islamic Front, staged a coup and continued to influence the policy of the regime in Khartoum. The nature of the NIF and its modus operandi was discussed somewhere in the study and will not be analyzed here.   But few aspects of its domestic and external policies warrant some attention.   The role of political Islam came to the fore in Sudan at a time of the collapse of the Soviet Union and, hence the end of the Cold War.

Political Islam had little to do with Sudan's civil war, but it did complicate it and undermine relations between Sudan and its neighbors, particularly Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Uganda. Islamic law is an important aspect of the conflict, but it is by no means its profound cause. Forced conversion of the non-Moslems has become one of the pillars of domestic policy which is buttressed by ethnic cleansing. There has been wide spread human rights violations (including slavery) in the Sudan under the NIF than any other government after independence.

Non-Moslem officers were replaced by the NIF recruits and tens of thousands of paramilitary forces ('Mujaheedin') were mobilized to spread and defend what the NIF projected as international Islamic revolution. The tragic outcome of all this is an outgrowth of the protracted civil war in many parts of the

country as "much of the fighting on the government side is conducted by unpaid local militias, and the NIF allegedly encourages soldiers to compensate themselves through looting. The most vulnerable war booty turned to be women and children (Altaye, 1998:4). What can we make out of all these?

Clearly the policies of the NIF had obvious security implications of aggravating the violence in the country as well as antagonizing neighboring countries. It had also isolated the country for a couple of years. The point has been made that the NIF mainly under the influence of its mentor, Dr. Hassan al Turabi pursued ideologically driven expansionist foreign policy which pushed Sudan and the region in to a precarious situation. Although it is too soon to say the leaders in Khartoum have totally abandoned their policy, many of them seem to be increasingly careful not to expose Sudan to the dangers of an adventurist foreign policy.

After the debacle of the failed terrorist attack against Mubarek of Egypt, which led to regional isolation and the imposition of international sanctions against Sudan, Khartoum gradually changed course and established reasonably good relations with most of its neighbors and slowly tried to improve its image with the international community. A number of factors are behind this change.

First, Sudanese isolation and the military advance made by the SPLA in the 1996-98 period with regional backing must have stroked terror among the top leadership of the NIF. Easing tensions with neighbors was (correctly) believed to minimize domestic military pressure. Second was the failure of Khartoum's efforts to export political Islam and its attempt from the late 1990's to end its isolation by improving relations with its neighbors. And lastly, and most significantly was the September 11 terrorist attacks and U.S war against terrorism, which led a frightened Khartoum to make a turn around. As usual the NIF was concerned overwhelmingly with the calculus of power, and was ready to compromise long-term principles for the sake of maintaining its grip. Generally, the rise and development of radical Islamic movements is directly linked to the protracted political crisis in the Horn of Africa. Nonetheless, so far Islamists in the Horn by themselves are unable to conduct large scale terrorist attacks and failed to build a strong political constituency. But as long as the continuing socio-economic crisis and the capacity of the state to respond to this crisis remains weak, it is inevitable that they will be able to challenge the dominant political forces in the region. Where peace remains elusive, and democracy is either denied or postponed, one could expect an Islamist influence in the countries of the Horn.

CHAPTER TWO

INTER-STATE CONFLICTS IN THE HORN:
CONTINUITY AMIDST CHANGE

This section seeks to discuss how the character of the state affects the decision making process and the conduct of foreign policy by the governments of the region, its impact on inter-state relations and how it perpetuates the politics of destabilization in the Horn of Africa. After a brief overview of the pattern of conflictual relations in the sub- region this chapter attempts to detail the changing nature of inter-state relations with in the context of one regional conflict formation. It will also try to identify the state actors, which served as the main drivers of conflict with a sub-regional magnitude.

Few would question that most of the countries of the Horn are experiencing violent internal conflicts and this pattern of conflict is also reflected in inter-state relations. The common, almost universal pattern in the Horn is of rebel groups starting armed struggles in one country, but only achieving a measure of success when they are able to operate from a neighboring country. As such the dictates of statecraft in the Horn and in North-East Africa at large in the first decade of the 21st century, as in previous decades, have demanded engagement with the affairs of neighbors. This is mainly dictated by the very complex nature of the conflict map of the region, which displays certain common features that include, interalia, polarity of borders between various religious and ethnic actors, shared ethnic groups-between the various countries, the flow of refugees, shared resources and common environmental problems (Mwagiru, 1995:10).

The conflicts in the sub-region are interconnected by complex internal and external factors. Besides, some

(2001:125) argue, that due to the nature of power consolidation and security, in the Horn, domestic state building is too closely associated with regional politics for the two to be kept apart. It is not an exaggeration to say that, at the level of the neighboring state the principle dictum is frequently one of "the enemy of my enemy is my friend" and that becomes the rational for supporting dissident groups, invariably producing a tit for tat situation and a pattern of mutual destabilization in the region. As a result, some claim that the Horn of African countries have never been able to fully subscribe to the doctrines incorporated in to the charter of the OAU on non-interference (ibid: 119).

This state of affairs often marked by some dramatic swings in regional and international alignments! and was punctuated by acts of terrorism, retribution and clandestine subversion constitutes real threats to the security of neighboring countries. Some may point to the role of ideology in one country, which may then become threatening to moderate or conservative neighbors. Others attribute it to the fault lines in the conduct of foreign policy and problems in decision making process. Quite often parochial economic and security interests prevail. One way or the other the democracy-level variable is relevant in analyzing this state of affairs.

The majority of governments in the Horn are incapable of defining their national security interests. One can extend the discussion from this perspective alone to understand the nature of the state. The underlying assumption which this analysis proceeds is that the militarized mentality and selfish behavior characteristics of some governments leads to leaders invariably resorting to force to try to resolve issues that are better addressed through longer-term diplomatic processes. Governments dominated by small elite groups with parochial interests, that run their countries in a secretive and authoritarian

manner contributes to insecurity in the long-term, by making

governments less predictable. (The African Union and peace and security, 2003:3). Unrepresentative governments with out accountability for their actions by their people exhibit the tendency towards belligerence. The same political systems that motivate grievances and cause internal problems are the ones that generate inter-state conflicts.

While a truly representative and democratic government cannot guarantee the pursuit of balanced foreign relations, it does at least reduce fears of conflict arising because of the pursuit of narrow hegemonic interest in the state, or that the people are brought in to conflict unknowingly with neighbors. There are clear testimonies to this effect. An ideal example is the export of political Islam by the Sudan under the NIF in the 1990's. Eritrea's contentious relations with all its neighbors and its ambivalence towards dialogue and regional cooperation is another indicator.

Recall that one of the contributory causes of insecurity is the fact that many governments are unpredictable. Worse, in a region beset by systemic stresses and violent political conflicts responding to short-term threats in an ad-hoc military ways exacerbates long-term threats such as poverty, weak governance structures and grievances of victims of abuses. Indeed most of the states are institutionally weak. What follows is brief overview of the inter-state conflicts in the region since the end of the cold war, which has the intention of making the above point in some detail.

2.1. *NFI' and Export of Political Islam*

The National Islamic Front (NIF) regime of General

omer El-Beshir came to power through a military coup in may 1989, and in may 1991 the sixteen year long anti-Derg struggle brought the Ethiopian Peoples Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) to power in Addis Ababa. The Eritrean Peoples Liberation Front occupied Eritrea, hence it become an independent state. Somalia entered a period of anarchy after the oust of General M. Siad Barre by a coalition of clan armed factions. These regime changes were results of long-standing internal contradictions in each country and the instability of the region at large. The same is true with the NIF in Khartoum. The attempt to create strong and centralized states in one of the poorest regions proved to be economically unsustainable as well as politically disastrous. The various governments of Sudan faced resistance from a marginalized south since independence. The eruption of the Sudanese civil war was not centered only around issues such as the degree of power held centrally (functionally dominated by Northerners) and its economic ramifications but also the character of the state itself.

So in the late 1960's Sudan was experiencing violent political conflict with a spill over effect on the region. As in many parts of Africa most of the conflicts in the Horn and in this case the Sudan is rooted in the politics of identity and competition for power and scarce resources, which often clash with the demands of nation building. An abiding theme of this study is that the multifaceted crisis of the states in the region emanates not only from the conflict between the exclusive and inclusive notions of identity, but also from the tendency of the dominant, hegemonic groups to try to impose their identity as the framework for the national identity and a basis for power-sharing and resource allocation. Human dignity demands, in other words-equal treatment with full rights and duties of citizenship, within a broader political framework.

A further factor threatening security in the Sudan was the instability and violence in neighboring states as Ethiopia experienced turmoil in the late 1970's and 1980's including swaths of the countries western areas. During the same time, in Uganda the collapse of the Amin regime brought an influx of refuges, guns and money in to southern Sudan. All contributed to the re-opening of the second and more serious phase of the civil war in 1983 (Peter Woodward & Murray Forsyth, 1995:89). Some attest that the rise of Islamic fundamentalism) (or the NIF) in Sudan may be attributable to the misery created by the structural adjustment programs, which weakened the Sudanese state and reduced its resolve to act as guardian of the public good (Caroline Thomas and Peter Wilkin, 1999:138). To this could be added the frustration of the army with regard to the war and its distaste towards the civilian political parties.

As Brigadier Omer El Bashir lunched his coup, Sudan was already embroiled in civil wars in Chad and Ethiopia / Eritrea, while thousands of Ugandan troops were fighting on Sudanese territory. Thus, the incoming NIF in 1989 inherited both a civil war led by the SPLA, a set of loose alliances with the EPLF and TPLF, as well as hostile relations with Uganda. For many years Sudan hosted the Eritrean liberation movements, the Tigrean Peoples Liberation Front /TPLF/ and other dissident Ethiopian organizations. This in turn led the Derg, with Libyan money and Soviet armaments, to meet virtually every need of the SPLM/A after the latter's founding in 1983. Indeed some observers claim that, not only did the Derg played pivotal role in the formative period of the movement, but it also had a crucial role in the movements' adoption of Marxist ideology (Adwok, 2000:37) . As a result in June 1989, the civil war in the Sudan was highly regionalized. Indeed it followed a dangerous trend largely due to the expansionist tendencies of the NIF.

Sudanese governments prior to the NIF did not attempt to export their version of Islam and their foreign policies were largely reactive. However, since the 1989 coup, the traditional parties have been marginalized as the NIF that runs the government believes it has a mission to expand by revolution and imposition (Altaye, 1991:3). It espouses violence as a means for political ends. Its agenda was regional (even international) as much as it was domestic. The power base of the regime seemed narrow, centered around a fraction of Islamists and junior officers. After all, having failed to command popular support in previous elections, the NIF led a coup overthrowing the elected government of Sadiq El-Mahdi.

By early 1990's the NIF was pursuing an aggressive Islamist based foreign policy parallel to its domestic policies. Despite this vision, the coming to power of the NIF in 1989 was cautiously accepted by most countries in the region and even warmly welcomed by Egypt, which mistakenly saw the incoming regime as similar in character to its own. It is widely agreed by regional observers that Egypt pre-emptively welcomed the coup believing that the new leaders would be friendly towards their northern neighbor (Altaye, 1996:7) . The Umma party and Egypt had never looked favorably on one another mainly because it strove to achieve a more independent foreign policy, while strengthening ties with Libya. So Cairo was happy to see the last days of the elected government of Sadiq El -Mahdi.

NIF's foreign policy becomes centered around giving support to Islamist movements everywhere, but particularly in the region and sub-Saharan Africa. While the new regimes in Ethiopia and Eritrea were thinking in terms of improving their relations with the Sudan (former host country) Khartoum slowly but discreetly began supporting the Eritrean Islamic Jihad in Eritrea and the Benishangul People Liberation Movement

(BPLM) and the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) in Ethiopia (Young, 1999:33). The incursions in December 1993 of a multi-national group of Islamist force in to the Sahel in Eritrea proved pivotal in the decline in relations between Khartoum and Asmara.

Initially upon coming to power the EPRDF was pre-occupied with domestic concerns, the impending referendum on Eritrean and adjustment with Eritrean independence. At the outset, the EPRDF had decided to end the long antagonistic relations of Ethiopia in the sub-region and a desire to develop friendly relations with its neighbors. Clearly, there was an effort to stay clear of foreign entanglements. To this effect it expelled the SPLA from its territory party because the movement sided with the Derg in a bid to stop the advancing EPRDF army in western Ethiopia in the final days of the war.

Evidently the coming to power of the EPRDF had disastrous consequences for the SPLA. The expulsion of the SPLA from Ethiopian territory was warmly welcomed by the Sudan government because it almost brought about the total military defeat of the SPLA and internal split and factionalism in the SPLM.

Nevertheless, NIF leaders seem to have believed that a regionally offensive strategy could be an integral part of defending the security of their revolution. Ethiopia's large Moslem population was an obvious target. The NIF saw the good gesture of the EPRDF as a s sign of weakness and tried to exploit the new situation in Ethiopia to its advantages- as opportune moment to introduce its Islamist politics to the country. The NIF seem to have expected a kind of "pay back" from the new leaders in Ethiopia in the form of having a free hand to its cadres and Islamic NGO's in the country. No doubt

31

this will become a major cause of hostility between the two regimes when Islamic intrigue reached its height in mid-1995

Expelled from Ethiopia and being weakened by internal infighting Garang's SPLA was forced to depend on Uganda. Ugandan regimes of various political complexions have consistently shown sympathy for southern Sudanese dissidents and preferred to have their northern border under the control of Christians and "Africans" rather than Moslems and Arabs. Indeed Uganda was Sudan's first and most constant adversary. Moreover increasingly in the 1990's, the Lords Resistance Army (LRA)grew as a threat to the security of northern Uganda, and particularly Acholiland. It should be noted that the marginalization of the Acholi people in terms of power and resources lies at the heart of the conflict in the area.

A bizarre Christian fundamentalist movement, the formation of the LRA around 1987 is the result of the extreme demoralization of Acholi society. Whatever level of reform pursued by the Musevini led National Resistance Army (NRA), the non-inclusive character of the regime had created disaffected communities in northern Uganda. In simple terms, the problem in northern Uganda is caused by the political failure of the Musevini regime to include the Acholi in the political and economic reconstruction of Uganda. Thus, partly due to the threat from the LRA and partly because of strategic reasons, in the early 1990's Uganda become the SPLA's principle regional backer and the major conduit for its external support.

To this could be added president Musevini's personal commitment to the cause of Southern Sudan and his personal friendship with Dr. John Garange. Musevini's policy was part and parcel of the grand regional strategy of confronting Sudan and engagement in Zaire Congo and the Great lakes region.

In response, Sudan provided support to the West Nile Bank Liberation Front (WNBLF) , the Alliance of Democratic Forces /ADF/ and more significantly to the LRA. This had created another web of regional conflict in the Great Lakes region when ablest officers of the Uganda army joined the Rwandese Patriotic Front (RPF) in the struggle to topple a Hutu dominated genocidal regime in Rwanda. As relations went on to a war footing between Zaire and Uganda, when the latter increasingly supported anti-Mobuto dissidents, Sudan endeavored to win the favour of Kinshasa and reputedly sent troops to the country from where they could attack SPLA forces in southern Sudan and also pose a threat to Uganda. Zaire's Mobutu Sese Seko was happy to cooperate with the ADF envisaging it as a counter-force to the imminent Uganda-Rwandese offensive.

Sudan's western borders proved less contentious. The NIF continued Sadiq's policy of supporting Libyan foreign adventures in Chad from bases in Darfur. Seeing themselves as sponsors of Idris Deby's seizure of power, Sudanese leaders thought they have created a friendly regime in Chad. Not surprisingly when the Moslem Idris Deby seized power in N'Djamena in December 1990, the NIF quickly established close relations with the new government. The Sudanese civil war and policy of the NIF had also affected relations with Kenya. While Kenya-Sudanese relations never reached such low ebb, they become increasingly tense as Khartoum objected to Nairobi's logistical assistance of SPLA political and humanitarian operations. The fact is that the Kenyan government pretended to be unaware when military supplies sometimes crossed through its territory destined to the SPLA. But Sudanese support to Kenyan Islamic movements in the port city of Mombassa was at the heart of the mutual suspicions that developed between the two governments in late 1990's. Be this as it may, for obvious reasons Sudan's most turbulent relations

were with Uganda, Eritrea and Ethiopia. The Ugandan aspect has been discussed, and will not be detailed here. Suffice it to say that Musevini's active involvement in the DRC and to a lesser extent the Sudan will continue for some time.

As was expected from about 1990-92, security cooperation between Sudan and Eritrea was extremely good. But things began to deteriorate when disgruntled Eritrea Moslems looked for support from Khartoum. But the revival of Islamic Jihad movements in Eritrea in the 1990's is the work of the Eritrean regime as much as it was boosted by political and moral support from the NIF. Basically Islamic movements sprang up in Eritrea in the context of Eritrean politics mainly due to grievances against the politics of the EPLF - now Popular Front for Democracy and Justice (PFDJ) (Tesfatsion, 1994: 81; Medhane, 1998:143). By 1996, western Eritrea was becoming increasingly dangerous, with the landmines laid on roads and other guerrilla attacks. The response of president Isayas Afeworki was total military and political onslaught against Khartoum.

Ethiopia, however, showed maximum restraint towards the NIF in the face of Sudanese assertive export of political Islam to the country. Mean while Sudanese hostile activities against Ethiopia crossed the red line after Egyptian Islamic terrorists, reportedly supported by Sudanese security apparatus, made an assassination attempt on the Egyptian president Hosni Mubarek when he was coming to attend an OAU leaders summit in Addis Ababa on June, 1995. In response, Ethiopia reacted rapidly and decisively. Until this time and in line with its regional policy, the EPRDF was constantly cautious about getting too involved in the Sudanese civil war. But the need to counter-balance the hostile activities of the NIF necessitated confrontation. After all, the security of the country was

34

compromised by adventurous moves of Khartoum. This abruptly changed Ethio-Sudanese relations.

The NIF's aggressive attempts to export political Islam in the region, the resistance of the region to this campaign, and the stymied peace process, together galvanized the countries of the Horn, and in particular Eritrea, Ethiopia and Uganda, to launch military operations against Khartoum. The policy of regional confrontation escalated. The so-called 'Africa's new leaders' seem to have created loose alliance against Khartoum. This alliance which could be referred to as the Kampala-Addis - Asmara axis become part and parcel of a larger conflict axis which stretched beyond the Horn to include the Great Lakes region.

The RPF, which took power in Kigali, joined the group sometimes promoting the common political agendas of the 'Asmara-to-Kigali' axis of states. The former Rwandese army and 'interahamwe' militia stationed in Zaire-Congo were not only threatening Rwanda, but also Uganda. Considering the ADF as an actual -potential force, Sudan also entertained the idea that Uganda and Rwanda were threatened by an opposite Khartoum-Kinshasa-Gomma axis. But this alliance lacked energy and will collapse shortly. This aside, the opposing military camps had covered large part of Africa, which could be described as a 'Conflict Triangle' stretching from the Red sea up to the Congo.

The anti-Khartoum alliance was, not surprisingly, backed by the US as part of a regional policy of containment against the NIF's Islamist expansion. But this should not obscure the fact that either the engagement of the US as the unipolar power in the post-cold war period, not that of any other external power was decisive in determining the regional conflicts and inter-state relations.   The crux of the matter is that

35

sudanese regional policy during the 1990's could be characterized by regional aggression (of exporting Islam) that ended up antagonizing all its major neighbours by 1995. And it is not accidental that Sudan's regional adversaries were engaged in a covert action intermittently aimed at containing or removing the government in Khartoum. Had it not been for the Ethio-Eritrean war of 1998-2000, the Sudanese regime was close to virtual collapse.

2.2 *Eritrea : Shooting to Every Direction*

In may 1993, after two years of defector independence, multi-ethnic Eritrea emerged as a new state, defying the post-colonial African map. Eritrea is the latest addition to the Horn, in fact the newest member of the family of nations- new to the inter -state system.

Following thirty years of deadly and disruptive conflict, many expected that the region will experience peace, tranquility and economic development. Many hoped that Eritrea would strive to establish a viable multi-ethnic, secular but democratic state, interalia, by rebuilding its natural-resource base and economic and political systems to achieve self-sufficiency in basic needs, participatory governance, and a harmonious alliance within the family of nations. With the appallingly destructive war of independence still fresh in every one's memory, its leaders ought to have recognized that their efforts to achieve sustainability would be hampered, if not prevented, by engaging in further armed conflicts. But what was developing in the Horn's newest nation, Eritrea, and the sub-region at large, was against this assertion.

In many respects the nature of the Eritrean government resembles the typical post-colonial African state of the 1960's

and 1970 's. The EPLF-led government became obsessed with the old formula of building a nation from above. The leaders in Asmara feared that reorganizing the country along ethnic lines might increase ethnic awareness and tension. They shared the old African concern that the recognition of ethnic and other political groups' right for equitable participation in the political, economic, social and cultural life of the country has also been a source of tension and conflict, and cannot be a viable option in nation building. Notwithstanding the prevalent mood towards pluralism and decentralization in Africa, multi-ethnic Eritrea was declared a unitary state divided into units of administrative provinces. Lowland Moslems were marginalized from the political and 'economic reconstruction' of Eritrea. As such, the EPLF has given a further boost to the Jihad movement.

Clearly in Eritrea democracy is either postponed or completely denied. As Mesfin (1997:6) observed the war of liberation allowed a small but authoritarian guerrilla group (the EPLF) to develop and impose its vision on the country; hence the strategy of building a nation through coercion from above has in the end produced an authoritarian, hegemonic and interventionist state. But events will show that EPLF's hegemonic project was never purely domestic. Its idea of leadership is consistent with its paternalist approach that inherently belittles pluralism, autonomy and participation of the masses in national political life.

For the same purpose of creating unity, political pluralism, as manifested in a multiparty system, trade union and professional movements, freedom of the press and other institutional means of expressing opposition or dissent, was often discouraged, indeed represses. Politically speaking one-party rule and authoritarianism became pervasive features of governance. It is difficult to dispute Mesfin's assertion that to

date no society in the Horn of Africa is as penetrated and influenced by the tentacles of state machinery as post independent Eritrea.

In fact increasingly definitively the government of president Issayas Afeworki become highly personalized and erratic. The repercussions of this state of affairs incrementally manifested themselves in Eritrea's contentious relations with its neighbors. The implication of these was the adoption of policies and strategies that were to prove disastrous to the well being of Eritrea as well as for the security and developments of many countries in the sub-region.

This explains the armed confrontations that the new state has experienced with its neighbors Yemen, Sudan and Djibouti as well as the brutal two-year long 'border war' with Ethiopia. Some argue that one major cause of conflict in the region is related to borders and questions of sovereignty (Francis Deng and W. Zartman 1996:154). Here again the nature of political systems matters a lot both in reducing and intensifying border crisis. Mainly the nature of decision-making process on the part of the parties to the conflict is relevant. For instance it is true that border issues and for that matter economic relations was one major area of difference between Eritrea and Ethiopia, should this produce war, however, speaks more strongly to the nature of the state, Eritrea's hegemonic project and to the failure of the EPLF to oversee a democratic transition, even of the weak kind being carried out in Ethiopia, than of border disputes that were never a problem for the two governments and the peoples who lived in the border areas. Somehow the Eritrean- Ethiopian war may belong to interstate rivalry over rank and status.

Competition between states for leadership occurs in all state systems, unless a clearly recognized and accepted hierarchy is established. Such a system is absent in the Horn of

Africa. EPLF's jostling for position and its hegemonic ambitions was left unchecked because the Horn's state system was relatively new and power relations were only beginning to be worked out. In addition, the artificial nature of Africa's borders means that any state that is looking for a conflict (due to other structural problems) with a neighbors can always find a border issue as a pretext.

The analysis of border conflicts reveal the persistence of serious geopolitical rivalries driven by an idealist foreign policy, often reinforced by resource and stability concerns, in which attempts to overturn the territorial arrangements into line with the control of people - to consolidate the national "space"- continued to be a highly destabilizing feature of the Horn of Africa. The impulse could also spell regional instability and the fragmentation of key states where "ethnic separatism" is already a threat to the unitary character of the state.

More important to our discussion is the regional impact of the Eritrean - Ethiopian " border war"; which changed the entire political landscape in the Horn of Africa. Indeed it could be considered as the major defining event, which significantly complicated the nature of inter-state relations in Africa since the end of the cold war. Not only did the Horn's inter-state system entered a new phase but also the war significantly altered the security order in the Greater Horn. A summary of this phenomenon is presented below.

To start with, the conflict led to the collapse of the regional alliance against Khartoum and the downfall of the Asmara - Kampala - Kigali axis; initially cemented by a regional support provided to Rwanda during Kagame's Kivu operation, which resulted in the coming to power of Laurent Kabila in the DRC. Besides, Sudan came out of isolation as Ethiopia and

Eritrea quickly but separately sought rapprochement with Khartoum. Ethiopia for both tactical (military) and strategic (economic) reasons upgraded its relations first. To this effect it quickly withdrew its support to the northern Sudanese forces and scaled down its cooperation with the SPLA. Eritrea, largely for security reasons, was also keen to re-establish relations with Sudan, tough more slowly and with less clarity. Eritrea's move has been less dramatic partly due to fear of upsetting the US. This marked the transition from Sudan being under assault by the region to moves to achieve more conciliatory relations with neighboring countries.

Besides, the role of the US supported 'Africa's new leaders' in the affairs of the region have become greatly weakened. Indeed it is not an exaggeration to say that US engagement in the region, which was focused on enthusiasm for these ' new leaders', support for their programs of regenerating their countries and energizing their confrontation with Khartoum entered murkier waters. Few would question that, having invested so much time, energy and political capital, Washington's policy towards Khartoum was totally undermined by the Ethio-Eritrean ' border' war. No wonder, the Bush administration is forced to abandon its policy of confrontation with Khartoum; increasingly became evident in the post-September 11 period.

The war had also opened an opportunity for Egypt to come out of its relatively passive diplomatic standing in the North-East African region. From 1991 - 1998, Egyptian influence in the Horn was at its lowest. Its diplomacy had dismally failed to produce strong bondage with the Somali factional militias. In addition, Cairo was aggrieved by the increasing hostile tendency of the regimes in Khartoum, Asmara and Addis Ababa towards its hegemonic postures. The NIF was

not ready to play a subservient role to Cairo. Indeed the Egyptian leadership was alarmed by Turabi's assumption of a leading role in the internationalist Islamist movement and Sudanese growing relations with Iran. This coupled with proactive engagement of neighboring states on the affairs of the Sudan served to further alienate Egypt. By 1997 Asmara had become the political and military headquarters for the northern Sudanese forces- the National Democratic Alliance /NDA/ which gave a disturbing signal to Cairo that it could loose its influence over northern Sudanese political elite.

Devoid of any leverage and energy, Egyptian engagement in the Horn was characterized by obstructionism towards regional peace processes. Egypt no longer has a powerful constituency in Khartoum or Moqadisho that can determine the outcome of IGAD sponsored peace processes. But its position was clear. It does not want to see a peace agreement proceed in Somalia and the Sudan without its involvement. Moreover, it was against such processes if they contain (mainly in the Sudan) the smallest hint of self-determination and active role of the neighboring countries. Basically it is a policy of obstruction, conditioned by Cairo's narrow and Orthodox security interest.

Egyptian leaders believe that their country's virtual monopoly over the benefits of the Nile could only be sustained by underdevelopment and anarchy in the upper basin countries mainly Ethiopia. So the emergence in 1991 of a stable Ethiopia with a strong and dynamic government committed to rural development meant that greater utilization of the waters of the Blue Nile would become a priority. (Medhane, 2002:170). The easiest way to stop this from happening, according the military-security nexus in Cairo, is to pursue a policy of subversion aimed at keeping Ethiopia weak by supporting its neighbors

.

41

Egypt is also fearful of any sort of Ethiopian regional influence and/or Addis becoming a hub of a coalition of states that control the river's headwaters. In this context, it is not accidental that the center of gravity in Ethiopia's calculation of its long-term national security interest is largely focused towards Egypt.

An underlying hypothesis on which this brief analysis proceeds is that the continuing identification with narrow security interests of the state and a steady pursuit of limited set of aims fused to beggaring ones neighbor is at the root of the chronically unstable and volatile regional security regime that characterizes the Horn.

2.3. *EPRDF's Ethiopia: Survival In a Rough Neighbourhood*

The Horn of Africa is defined by the security linkages between Ethiopia, the 'core' state in the region, and its neighbors, Djibouti, Eritrea, Kenya, Somalia and Sudan. Beset by systematic stresses arising from dysfunctional economy, growing environmental and resource scarcity, mounting unrest, social tensions and ethno-regional conflicts, Ethiopia failed to lead the region on the way to stability. At the same time, the Horn as a conflict system had negatively impacted on Ethiopia's management of its internal and external environment and limited its capacity to rise to prominence in the modern era. This is rooted in the deep ambivalences both in the make up of Ethiopia itself, and in its relations with its neighbors, which often prevent it from exercising that stabilizing, hegemonic or a diplomatically leading role that its size and position suggest. These ambivalences derive from its peculiar past and are entrenched in the structure of Ethiopia and the Horn.

Contemporary Ethiopia, in both its territorial context and ethno-linguistic architecture, only become defined at the end of the nineteenth and the turn of the twentieth century. This was

accompanied by the imposition of imperial power over different ethnic groups, which resulted in a deeply unequal political architecture in which power was monopolized by the Christians of the historic core, mainly the Amharas. The complicated nature of the issues of nationalities in Ethiopia should, thus, be understood on the very foundations of the modern -empire state. The conflicts in Ethiopia could be characterized as a rejection of the hegemonic state, seen as a symbol and expression of domination in all its political and economic forms by one ethnic group. Upheavals in Ethiopia since 1974, led to the installation of a revolutionary military region, known as the Derg, in which the answer to Ethiopia's problems was repression and ' socialist' centralization.

The Derg's most effective opponents were the TPLF and the EPLF and in May 1991, they finally defeated the demoralized central government army, and ousted the Derg from power. The new Ethiopian government recognized the right of the people of Eritrea to decide their fate by referendum and accepted their choice of independence; while in the rest of the country it embarked in a new revolutionary experiment of reconstructing the Ethiopian state. Attempts by generations of rulers of Ethiopia to centralize the state were virtually reversed in 1991, with the coming to power of the TPLF-led EPRDF, which facilitated the independence of Eritrea, and has pursued an innovate and bold experiment of transferring authority to ethnic based regional administrations.

The overthrow of the Derg not only produced a government of very different political complexion in Ethiopia it also produced a new country, Eritrea. Mention has already been made that in the decade since it was established, Eritrea has had major difficulties in establishing its position and ranking in the Horn inter-state system and its frequently contentious relations with its neighbors. This partly explains why since the

new government took over, Ethiopia has been embroiled in the chronic instability of the Horn.

No doubt, the new political system in Ethiopia-ethnic federalism- must have generated concern within and outside Ethiopia. But the EPRDF did not try to export its ideology outside of its borders. Ethiopia's foreign policy in the early 1990's was one of adjustment to Eritrean independence and was largely based on the premise that any unnecessary conflict with outside forces (primarily the EPLF) was believed to significantly damage or undermine the Ethiopian state. The daunting task of reconstructing the Ethiopian state based on a new model must have convinced its leaders to stay clear out of any sort of conflict, war and foreign involvement. Thus, like its predecessors, the EPRDF for much of the 1990's pursued a realist and not idealist foreign policy.

Before very long, however, it became clear that domestic state building in the Horn of Africa is too closely associated with regional politics and it was only a matter of time before the EPRDF was drawn to the regional conflict system.

Thus a consist pattern of behavior in EPRDF's foreign policy was that it was committed to change the age-old conflictual relations of Ethiopia with its neighbors and pursued a policy of good neighborliness but slowly and surely getting drawn ever deeper into the concerns of its neighbors as its security was felt threatened. The war with Eritrea brought this to a climax. The war has also exacerbated Ethiopia's already complicated relations with Somalia and sustained Ethiopia's involvement in the war torn country. As such the Ethio-Eritrean war could be considered as a turning point (or a watershed) in Ethiopia's foreign and security strategy.

2.4. Resource and Power In A Stateless Somalia

The Ethio-Eritrean war of 1998-2000 led to the intensification of the civil war in Somalia as it became a proxy battle ground for both countries. The spillover of the Somali conflict mainly Islamist terrorist attacks against Ethiopia had began long-before the war with Eritrea. The EPRDF responded by a cross-border military operation to the Gedo region in Somalia and destroyed Al-ittihad's main base in the locality of Luuq in 1996. In 1998 Ethiopia took a pre-emptive military action against an Eritrea backed coalition of forces in Baidoa town deep inside Somali territory.

This Ethiopian action did not only frustrate Eritrean attempt to open another front from the east. It had also long-term repercussions on the military balance of clan forces inside Somalia. After its disastrous defeat in Baidoa, the faction led by Hussein Aideed entered into a period of military decline. The event also marked the decline of the Sa'ad sub-clan's political power and led to the emergence of the Air sub- clan with a preponderant position in the Somali political – economy. Southern Somalia is still in a state of perpetual anarchy. Many attempts at creating a central government were frustrated. Through time, conflict constituencies have become more powerful than peace constituencies in Somalia.

The description of the Somali civil war as a war between clans obscures the very important ways in which control of resources lies at the heart of the conflict (Alex, 2002:1). Indeed clan identities (as opposed to class) in Somalia are notoriously fluid, subject to unpredictable schism and fusion. In reality the conflict in Somalia dates back to the 1960's, mainly due to competition over office, and the economic benefits it generates.

This became aggravated during the 1980's when Siad Barre continued to harness state power for his own clan interests. This left a bitter legacy in Somalia. Clan militia groups (including TNG) fight to gain control over the state to use it to accrue economic resources at the expense of others and to wield the law, patronage politics, and its monopoly on the legitimate use of violence to dominate the rest.

Some rightly argue that many of the factions and interest groups in today's Somalia are against any state formation mainly because it threatens to change their operational environment in ways which made it difficult to predict impact on business and politics (Menkhause, 2002:37). Control over instruments of state power to acquire enormous wealth as well as control over large areas of agricultural and pastoral land continues to perpetuate the conflict in Somalia.

Many of today's conflicts are a legacy of the land grabbing and asset acquisition of the former period. The motivations of the factions in Somalia turned to be no different from those of past regimes. Corruption, rent-seeking (to the detriment of the productive forces) and nepotism, which led to the implosion and disintegration of Somalia in the first place, have remained the hall mark of the Somali elite. As observed by some the creation of the TNG in 2000 at Djibouti conference and the nature of external attempts to revive a central state indicates just how little had been learned about the political economy of Somalia in the intervening decade (Alex:3).

At the heart of the civil war, stateless situation and war lordism lie issues of land grabbing in the fertile areas of South Somalia. The Somali clan system has many patrimonial traits- a clan could be viewed as an insurance and remittance company, channeling sums of money from relatives, paying collectively to

cover expenses when a crime is committed, and providing for members when rain fails to emerge. The role of protecting that source of power and guarantee is often the prerogative of the warlord. Hansen (2003:8) argues that like the medieval warlord, the Somali warlord acts as a source of protection and stability in a fluid society were an effective state is absent. As such, the importance of clan lies in the fact that clan identity is the locus for physical security and military mobilization. Evidently peace making and state building in Somalia necessitates a different mechanism than that of promoting a power-sharing formula designed to satisfy the needs of clan factions.

The spillover effects of the civil war in Somalia, have direct impact on neighboring countries. Given weak sovereignty and permeable borders, instability from one internal conflict often is transmitted to neighboring states, particularly because the neighbor generally suffers from similar conditions. The connection between the civil war in Somalia and instability in the Somali region of Ethiopia is clear. The same is true with Kenya as Southern Somalia and North-Eastern regions of Kenya feed each other's violence. Whether in terms of refugees, arms flows, illegal trade, social violence or terrorism, it is clear that it was a matter of time before neighboring countries are drawn in to the Somali conflict.

Both political Islam and black economy still pose a major national security threat to the countries bordering Somalia, mainly Ethiopia and Kenya. It has also become a cause for the differences and the diplomatic skirmishes among states in the region. It led to the fragmentation of the diplomatic landscape in the region and is a contributing factor for lack of cohesion among IGAD member countries. Except for the ambivalent

accommodation between Ethiopia and the Sudan, the Somali crisis has led to conflictual relations among all the countries of the region. No doubt this has adversely impacted on the responsibility of the regional organization IGAD and its collective mediating efforts to end the civil war in Somalia.

2.5. Djibouti And Kenya: consumers of Security

The relatively peaceful enclaves in the Horn are Djibouti and Kenya. **Djibouti** is an ethnically diverse country where the two dominant ethnic groups are the Afar and the Issa. One major impact of the Somali civil war on Djibouti is demographic. The relatively rapid growth of Somali communities in Djibouti is one major indicator. Former president Gouled had tried to maintain some degree of ethnic balance within the government, but increasingly the Afars seem to have felt slighted by successive regimes in which the Issas have dominated the civil service, the armed forces and security. Unpublicized Afar insurgency was going on during the 1980's and first half of the 1990's (Schraeder, 1993:203).

Both Eritrea and Ethiopia were not sympathetic to Afar insurgency in Djibouti mainly due to a concern that it could strengthen separatist Afar movements within their territories. They seem to support the status quo. Despite internal problems, both Gouled and the current president Ismail Omar Gelle appear unwilling to put in place fair and workable socio-political consensus. Such a scenario is very unlikely, not least, because establishing a truly representative government implies wide distribution of national wealth. The Djibouti state is basically an economic enterprise for a self-interested elite with a narrowly

defined (often personal) objectives. This became more evident during Omar Gelle.

The ambivalent ethno-political accommodation became sustained without creating serious threat to the state of Djibouti. Ethnic Violence seems to have subsided and Djibouti remained less turbulent partly due to French protection and its policy of disengagement in regional conflicts. Former president Gouled pursued scrupulous observance of neutrality in conflicts within and between the neighbouring countries. This is, however, changing with the presidency of Omar Gelle that would eventually prove terminal to regional stability as well as the future security of Djibouti. Since 1999 Djibouti became drawn into the civil war in Somalia. Omar Gelle has been the driving force behind the Arta process which created the TNG.

Prominent businessmen associated with the Djibouti leadership have been involved in more extensive commerce and investment in Somalia (Medhane, 2002:154). Driven by narrow economic interests Gelle, through the TNG, tried to transform the civil war in Somalia into an instrument of private economic enterprise. The implications of this proved to be disastrous in which peace zones were destabilized and Somali entered in to another round of anarchy. Djibouti is an ideal example in which an elite group driven by selfish interests could intervene in regional conflicts. Personal connections and economic bondage with TNG leaders in Moqadisho continues to influence Djiboutian role, regional diplomatic stresses and its sometimes unhealthy relations with its neighbors.

Kenya is a case of relative stability despite sporadic environment and resource related conflicts in the rift valley region. But its security has always been under threat due to the spillover of regional conflicts. For long, the personalistic rule of

49

Moi was masked by multi-party democracy. Be this as it may, Kenya took up the role of leading regional facilitation, mainly the IGAD peace process in the Sudan.

The pattern of the peace processes was, however, complicated by the personal economic interests of the leadership and the rag-tag military-security nexus. As a result, the course of peace initiatives often suffer from deep flows of inconsistency. While Kenyan leaders can see the advantages in peace, they often seem to be comfortable with the short-term gains from the status quo. However, Kenyan role has remained unchanged despite recent changes in government. The Kenyan special envoy to the Sudanese peace process, General Sumbeiywo has continued as a mediator general. But with the proactive engagement of the US-Britain-Norway troika, Kenyan role is increasingly becoming secondary.

The conflicts in the Horn form a wider inter linked system, as analyzed in the previous chapters. All the conflicts have significant regional repercussions, as instability in one state generates spillover and demonstration effects in neighboring states. Stateless Somalia aside, the two states which has been exporting conflicts in the region since the end of the cold war, were Eritrea and the Sudan. Sudanese regional policy during the 1990's could be characterized by regional aggression (of exporting Islam) that ended up antagonizing all its major neighbors by 1995. Eritrea's war was also conditioned, among others by EPLF's hegemonic project, although economic reasons could not be discounted. So Asmara's stance must be seen in the context of the EPLF (now PFDJ) leadership's bid for a regional role.

Both the Sudan and Eritrea pursued idealist foreign policies which served as a main catalyst of regional destabilization.

50

While Sudanese foreign policy of exporting political Islam triggered an opposing military camp in the form of Asmara-Addis- Kampala axis, Eritrea's hegemonic project and belligerence eventually led to Ethio-Eritrean war and the creation of Addis-Sa'na-Khartoum axis. Meanwhile there are signs of new security order in the Horn. And the Sana-Addis- Khartoum entente could be considered as clear example of the evolution of a new pattern of security relations in the region.

A cursory look at the above analysis reveals the importance of six broad-correlative themes central to the whole discussion of conflicts in the Horn of Africa. To the extent that they are the guiding themes in this study it is hoped that they will, contribute to a broader understanding of the problem and definitely the way forward. This section will try to summarize some of the main elements.

1. Conflicts in the Horn are in almost every instance locally generated. Neither the US as the unipolar hegemony nor that of any other external power was decisive in determining relations in the region in the post-cold war period. Whatever upheavals occurred in the inter-state system, the critical elements remained to be the changing perceptions of indigenous interests. While they had to be increasingly responsive to globalization, the governments of the region continued to command considerable capacity to shape their policies with respect to foreign relations within the Horn of Africa, which remained to be their principle area of concern and engagement.

2. Traditional conflict analysis, relying almost entirely on ethnic, religious and cultural dichotomies, has been unable to explain the origin and spread of conflicts in the Horn. Thus it has failed to provide useful advice in the most important area of conflict

3. research, namely conflict resolution. This approach to violent conflicts often confuses causes, perceptions, manifestations, triggers and catalysts. It has, therefore, been unable to appreciate fully the importance of economic and ecological factors in precipitating violent conflicts. The link between natural resource management and conflict is strong.

   Limited access to and shortages of renewable resources lead to severe stresses and this fused with ethnic political elite interests transforms competition to conflict. Only severe inequalities of economic relations in a given socio-cultural environment, punctuated by self-interested and highly partisan agendas perpetuates ethnic violence. In reality, resource, ethnicity and conflict form a triangle, each angle of which has a casual impact on each of the two others.

4. Islamic fundamentalism (or for that matter any kind of religious militancy) in the region and the politics of Jihad is locally rooted in the grievances and strategies of specific groups and individuals. To date, Islamism as a political force and instrument of terrorism is dependent upon international political and financial patronage.

5. At the heart of the conflicts in the Horn lies the nature of the state and various interest groups, the politics of alienation, and mismanagement of natural resources. It perpetuates violence and misery; ultimately eroding the legitimacy of state actors. The present governments in the Horn are in serious difficulties. They have failed to develop either a viable political formula or a viable economic formula for governing their respective countries, and secure broader acceptance from their people. The major fault-line is the state's failure to protect the collective interest of its citizens.

   The states in the region are unable to create either a strong constituency for themselves, or a political structure for

their respective countries as a whole that could offer any plausible prospect of managing their countries political problems. State security interest (as opposed to human security) prevails in the Horn of Africa. Indeed in much of the region the dominant threat to citizens is their own government.

Most of the governments in the region are the products (and not the solutions) of the historical contradictions in their respective countries. So at the root of the crisis lay a political crisis. The non-participatory character of political systems and the lack of democratization is central to the socio-economic problems; hence conflicts. In short the issue is not whether the state should exist or not; but on whose behalf should it exist. And conflicts emerge not due to nature of the state as such, rather due to the nature of some states. Clearly the nature of the state and the parochial policies it adopts has opened up considerable room for both internal civil strife and regional instability.

Thus, addressing the conflicts would require the development of solutions to internal political conflicts and the institutionalization of systems of governance that encourage participation and inclusion, rather than resistance and alienation. Clearly the answer lies in emphasizing democratization, respect for fundamental individual and group rights, increasing the involvement of civil society in public life, a more efficient management of the economy, fair distribution of national wealth, and above all, a leadership that is responsible, responsive, transparent and accountable.

5. An abiding theme in this study is that continuing identification with narrow security (as opposed to human security) interests of the state and a steady pursuit of limited set of aims fused in

to the militarized mentality and selfish behavior characteristic of somegovernments will continue to stand in the way of defining a clear commonality of interest among the states in the Horn and the emergence of a common security doctrine for the sub-region.

Governments dominated by small groups that run their countries in a secretive and authoritarian manner are incapable of identifying and defining their countries national interests. Such governments have narrow definitions of security, based on considerations of military defense and regime stability. They resort to force to try to resolve issues that are better addressed through longer-term diplomatic processes. They easily slide into foreign adventures and unwanted wars.

While democracy does not ensure that governments do not pursue policies that lead to unwanted wars, it is still the best insurance against such catastrophes. For instance it is clear that the aggressive Islamist foreign policy of the early years of the NIF and for that matter Eritrean belligerence did not reflect the will of the Sudanese and Eritrean peoples. Because decision making in these countries is very secretive, neither party is seriously constrained by organized public opinion, civil society groups or the media. Thus, returning these countries to democratic rule is perhaps the best insurance against narrow based groups pursuing destabilizing regional relations.

6. Another underlying theme is the economics of conflict. Strong economic interest among countries contributes to stable relations. The recent production and export of oil that has proceeded in spite of the civil war suggests that Sudan is capable of becoming an economic giant in the region and this

has significant implications for regional relations. There are already some indications that oil agreements will in turn be used to advance the interests of Sudan in the region.

To the extent that oil continues to be an instrument of economic bondage among the countries of the region, tensions between Khartoum and its neighbors are likely to be settled by diplomatic means.

In this regard Ethio-Sudanese relations deserves careful consideration. Although economy is the prime motive, these relations are also motivated by a common threatening neighbor; Eritrea. This will have a wide range of implications for regional integration and peace and security order, that needs to be carefully studied.

2.6. <u>Conclusion</u>- The Horn's Inter-State System: Emerging Regional Trends

The final years of the last century saw a dramatic swing in the international relations of the Horn. The most dramatic developments were taking place in the realm of inter-state relations as well as the course of regional peace processes. The principal cause is the Ethio-Eritrean war. But the apparent change was occurring under the influence of a new international event i.e the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks.

As noted above, the outbreak of hostilities between Ethiopia and Eritrea led to a lessening of tensions between Ethiopia and Sudan as the latter's strategic significance in the conflict became apparent. Khartoum was more than ready to improve its relations with Adds Ababa due to both internal security and regional power politics. Both seem to have acted primarily to protect regime survival. Ethiopia quickly withdrew its

support to the Northern Sudanese forces (such as SAF) which had bases in Ethiopia and scaled down its communication with the SPLA. The subsequent efforts by President Beshir to marginalise Tarabi were warmly welcomed in Addis Ababa where the elderly Sheikh was held responsible for Sudan's aggressive policies in the region. This served as a confidence building move that encouraged Ethiopian leaders to work with Khartoum on long-term issues of national interest.

The most significant of these, which could serve as an example for future inter-state relations in the region, was the economic aspect. Although the NIF has given much attention to reaching security agreement with the EPRDF, it was Sudan's success in building its oil pipeline and exporting its first oil in August 1999, that served to attract and sustain Ethiopian interest. The two governments have signed several economic agreements the most important of which is on oil which will be transported to Ethiopia over the Gedarif-Gondar road. Sudan has agreed to provide oil to Ethiopia on a long-term basis. Closely linked to this development is the future of the oil discovered in the Ethiopian region of Gambella, which, according to some, is only commercially viable to pump it out through the Sudan. Ethiopia also showed an interest to make use of port Sudan. Probably even more important, in addressing regional conflict than oil, will be how these relations effect future agreements on the use of the waters of the Nile Basin.

In keeping with the NIF's obsession with security, it sees the developing relations with Ethiopia largely in terms of reducing its vulnerability while Ethiopia is mostly concerned with the economic benefits to be derived. With a laser like focus on economic diplomacy, Ethiopian leaders seem to be eager to develop close commercial links with Khartoum. The rapid development of the oil industry in Sudan has created a

permanent Ethiopian interest in Sudan. Hence, although still suspicious of the other side of NIF (i.e Islamist hardliners), it is unlikely that EPRDF leaders will return to their pre- 1998 policy of backing anti-Khartoum armed camp. Indeed, Ethiopia prefer to see a united, secular and democratic Sudan as a viable long-term partner in the region (strategy paper, 2003:34). Thus, its chief regional (security) concern will remain overwhelmingly Eritrea and secondarily Somalia which is becoming a fertile ground for Islamic militants.

Sudan-Kenya relations have also undergone marked change. Consultations in Kenya on proposals to import oil from Sudan, show how sentiments are being changed in Nairobi. But Kenya's evolving perspectives is also the result of its leading role in the Sudan Peace process. Clearly Kenya's relations with the Sudan is showing significant improvements.

No comparable improvement of relations was achieved between Sudan and Uganda. Both sides, however, showed a measure of political will to ease tensions and the breakdown of the regional alliance against the NIF, as a result of the Ethio-Eritrean war, meant that Uganda alone in the region will continue to confront Khartoum. Although personally committed to the cause of Southern Sudan, Musevni seems to have lost enthusiasm to pursue hostile relations against Khartoum. Besides his gamble in the DRC, the recently soured relations with Rwanda and the negative opinion at home seem to have convinced him to focus on domestic security issues. Mainly Mussivine's involvement in the DRC and to a lesser extent Sudan is an issue of growing controversy in Uganda.

Besides Sudan has (at least in theory) stopped its support of the LRA mainly because the group was listed by Washington as a terrorist organization in the wake of September

11 attacks. During the January 2002 IGAD leaders summit in Khartoum, Uganda and Sudan agreed on military cooperation. Curiously, Sudan formally accepted the Ugandan army to cross its borders in pursuit of the LRA, which had long been terrorizing the people of northern Uganda.

However, Ugandan military operations (Operation Iron Fist) against the LRA have failed in their stated aims. This could be explained in many ways. First unless the feeling of alienation and desperation among the Acholi is not politically addressed the situation in northern Uganda will remain volatile. In addition the spillover effect of the war in South Sudan continue to aggravate the situation in northern Uganda.

The Acholi are adamantly opposed to the SPLA because they (correctly) attribute Khartoum's support for the LRA as a response to Kampala's assistance of the south Sudanese rebels. In addition until there is unity and cooperation among the different south Sudan armed groups, the LRA will definitely continue to have space in which to operate politically and militarily.

Meanwhile, the government of Uganda gives no indication of any willingness to end its relations with south Sudan rebels, while some Sudanese military operatives have continued to covertly sympathize with the LRA. Despite these obstacles the changed regional and international circumstances meant that the regimes in Uganda and Sudan will continue to cooperate. Countries in the region (except Eritrea) are all moving to improve their relations with Khartoum. Relations between Khartoum and Asmara have soured significantly.

Eritrea's role continues to be one of disturbing the region. Asmara remained the military and political base of the

anti-NIF and anti-EPRDF forces. For its part, the NIF continues to condone the Eritrean opposition within Sudan's borders. Although slow to act and ambivalent, Ethiopia also tried to energize the anti-Isayas forces in terms of moral and political support. Eritrea's policy can be interpreted in one of several ways. Issayas tried to use the presence of the Sudanese opposition as a tool of entering a dialogue with Khartoum in a bid to get some economic concessions. Definitely there is an element of influence peddling.

It could also be the result of a failure to identify where exactly Eritrean national interest lies. One common feature in Africa is that leaders often use their relationship with neighboring insurgents to attempt to compel, coerce, or persuade that neighbor to change a policy or alter its leadership. The events which led to the Eritrean invasion of Ethiopia in may 1998 are clear indications to this effect.

Eritrean policy towards its immediate neighbors could also be driven by internal problems. In some cases vulnerable leaders will exaggerate an external threat in order to solidify their hold over their society and enable them to delegitimize internal opposition by characterizing it as the proxy of an external power.

It also indicates the fear on the part of the Eritrean leadership that progress in reducing conflict at the inter-state level may contribute to the release of pent up domestic conflict. Thus far, Eritrea under Isayas has surprised observers with its firmness and sustained focus on the politics of destabilization in the region. While relations between Sudan and Eritrea remained strained, there has been no major military conflict along the countries borders for approximately one year.

The two year long bloody war between Eritrea and Ethiopia comes to an end in 2000 and since then an uneasy

truce had been declared and observed by both sides. The Algiers Agreement of December 2000 marked the culmination of the war and subsequent no-war and no -peace situation between Ethiopia and Eritrea. While the agreement and the subsequent border ruling left the major issues of sovereignty and border demarcation unsettled, it has held. The Ethio-Eritrean border deadlock and the way forward will be discussed later, and will not be detailed here.

The main thrust of this section is to examine the nature of the new regional dynamics which led to the improvement of inter-state relations in the Horn. It is noteworthy that most of the changes (mentioned above) in Sudan's relations with its neighbors were being pursued long before September 11,2001; hence no external event was decisive in determining the newly evolving inter-state system in the region.

With the NIF's recent moderation, the lure of oil imports, and changed international circumstances, notably, present US-Sudan cooperation in the area of terrorism, countries in the region are all moving cautiously to improve their relations with Sudan.

CHAPTER THREE
PEACE AND SECURITY ORDER IN THE HORN: TRENDS, PROBLEMS AND PROJECTIONS

The normative goal of this study is to understand the nature of conflicts in the Horn and to elucidate what mechanisms can be devised that will produce enduring peace in the region. This final part of the study attempts to identify the main tasks that must be taken up in promoting regional peace and security. It seeks to provide an answer to three basic questions:

1. What are the necessary political and technical resources required for the successful conclusion of the peace processes in Sudan, Somalia and the Ethio- Eritrean border crisis? This question will be addressed at a national level. This overview will also include an appraisal of some of the political trends in the countries of the sub-region.
2. What are the substantive and institutional requirements for transforming conflicts in to cooperation on a long- term basis?
3. Related to the above is, how can a comprehensive approach be developed for durable regional peace and security order in the region?

The three parts of this section explore, in succession, these three questions. It will be helpful if, at the outset, I indicate the basic elements in my approach to this subject. This discussion will begin with an overview of the various peace initiatives and emphasize the preconditions as well as the necessary requirements for the success of the peace processes. As such it will briefly identify the key issues that remain to be solved. It does not detail what IGAD and the international community should do, only lay out the concerns that need immediate addressing and sustained attention. Then it will proceed to a discussion on the regional mechanisms that needs to be adopted to ensure economic and security cooperation among IGAD member states.

61

3:1 An Appraisal of Unresolved Political Futures

3.1.1. The Sudan Peace Process: The Beginning of the End?

The mainstream peace initiative for the Sudan has been the IGAD peace process. The drafting of the Declaration of principles /DOP/ by IGAD with the help of regional leaders mainly Ethiopia forms the basis of the peace initiative under Kenyan facilitation. It's acceptance by the government of Sudan (GOS) only in 1997 under considerable regional and international pressure could be considered as the main political victory for south Sudanese struggle in general. The isolation of Sudan and the marginalization of the leaders in Khartoum precipitated the adoption of the DOP by the GOS. The DOP consecrates the right to self-determination, the separation of state and religion and fair sharing of wealth. These key issues remained the most contentious and it was evidently clear peace in Sudan meant that they had to be tackled realistically.

There is a powerful momentum for peace in Sudan. IGAD and its partners seem determined not to slow down the peace momentum. At the time of writing (mid-December2003) the IGAD peace Initiative on Sudan appears to be on the verge of achieving what other efforts and processes have failed to do in more than twenty years. A partial deal is real; a comprehensive settlement, I fear, remains as distant as ever, for several reasons: I will try to summarize some of the major challenges:

- The anticipated signing of a formal peace agreement between the SPLM/A and the government of Sudan is only the first stage in the peace process. The most daunting task will be overseeing a transition   whose key elements   are

62

bringing together other key political interests in to the peace process. A further challenging preoccupation is the holding of local and national elections, reforming Sudan's regional relations, and conducting a vote on self- determination. Clearly the steps of implementation should be tied in to a clear and sequenced process of democratizing the Sudanese State.

- There are powerful forces in Sudan who feel left out of the process and call for an inclusive peace conferences to be held in both the South and the North. Hostility between groups in Khartoum and the strong influence of the security nexus remain serious threat to any peace deal. Besides, incorporating the different militia forces in the South in to a future peace deal will not be an easy task, as it involves power- sharing with the SPLA. Thus there is a need for expanding the peace process from inside.

- A new element with wider implications for the political dispensation in Sudan has appeared recently. This is the rebellion that broke out in Darfur. The implications of the insurrection in Darfur (western Sudan) need careful consideration. It could jeopardize the power-sharing formula that the international community hopes to achieve. All the groups in Darfur seem to question the very meaning and foundations of the Sudanese State. Some of them "call for a secular Sudan with equality for all citizens and justice to the marginalized areas".

So far the military capability of the rebels is considerable. As Gerald Prunier (interview, June 12, 2003) argues, the peace process is so lopsided and excludes so many stakeholders that it eventually collapses from the periphery inwards, with Darfur and the "marginalized areas" going back to

war and possibly picking up in the process the disgruntled SPLA and NIF elements who will not accept GOS-SPLA version of the peace deal. The problem in Darfur could also open a new round of inter-state conflicts between Chad and Sudan.

- The best approach will be to achieve a peace settlement for the South and then for the new national government to approach the problem of Darfur and seek a negotiated settlement. Lasting peace can not be achieved unless the present authoritarian nature of political leaderships, both north and south, are transformed into more democratic, participatory systems. Finally, Sudan and in particular the South, will require a robust development effort; punctuated by south-south and north-north reconciliation processes making the negotiating process more inclusive and durable.

Peace in Sudan will undoubtedly lead to a shift in the axis of power in the Horn of Africa and the Nile valley, a radical and possibly lasting change not just in the real politic of the region, but in the way in which security and foreign policy is conducted.Sustaining the peace and ensuring democratic transition will form the most important basis for sustainable peace and security order across a sizable part of Africa. Definitely this will be the single largest variable and requirement for regional peace and integration.

3.1.2. Somalia: State Building Versus Peace Building

Except for the Somaliland Republic, central and southern Somalia is still in a perpetual anarchy. While lacking official international recognition, Somaliland is actually the only functional state in the Somali peninsula. It has also the nearest thing to genuinely representative government, multi-party democracy, two houses of parliament and vibrant civil society.

The rapidity with which power was transferred to president Riyale (after the death of Ibrahim IGAL) with in hours in a constitutional, peaceful and smooth manner is evident that Somaliland has reached political maturity, more than most African countries. This was done with out any external support. In contrast to the unsuccessful attempts made in southern Somalia to build the state from the top, in Somaliland state-formation is achieved by building from the bottom, through traditional processes of local negotiation, starting at the district level. The situation in the south is totally different.

With the wider momentum towards peace in Somalia in high gear, technical and political approaches adopted by the mediators are threatening to derail the process. As such this overview is designed to illustrate the diverging and sometimes conflicting interests of the large number of individuals, organizations, and governments that have taken up the task of peace-making in Somalia, and make clear that many of those conflicting interests and wrong approaches must be confronted and tackled drastically. The Kenyan (Eldoret) peace process launched in October 2002 is unique from initiatives that have taken place since 1991, in some respects.

It appears to be more inclusive bringing together as many Somali political forces, armed factions and civil society groups as possible. Besides it is the only peace initiative supported by the majority of the IGAD member states under close scrutiny of the international community. The process was also structurally well designed. Unlike many of the previous peace making efforts, it tried to deal first with substantive issues and address power-sharing at the last phase. The broad participation criteria was intended to give broad popular ownership of the outcome. Equally important was the mediators' (frontline states) 'holistic approach' to the negotiation strategy.

There was enough positive development before some Somali actors and their foreign backers pushed the process in to a near- collapse situation. The Somali Peace Process is in intensive care. The last month has illustrated a number of serious dangers to the peace process. Identifying some of the underlying currents in the Somali conflict and the principal issues surrounding the Somali peace process will definitely help to project the way forward. Observations and Suggestions:

- Peace conferences which presume that a rebuilt central government is a solution are incomplete and likely to result in disappointment and /or dismal failure. The subjective and objective conditions necessary for the establishment of a central state are absent in the Somali context.

    A central state viewed as parasitic, exploitative or abusive is not welcome in many parts of Somalia. It is a natural reaction of a people who have only ever known state power to be predatory; worse the factional groups did not fare better and failed to construct a different agenda for the would be Somali state. The competition among different actors is for the spoils of office and neither of them showed inclination to reform the state to serve the collective interest of all Somalis.

- State building and peace building have become contradictory and at times antagonistic processes. Due to its economic ramifications the factions perceive state building as one of zero-sum game; not a win-win solution. From this perspective the promise of international assistance is an obstacle to peace to any resolution of the Somali crisis, because it stimulates rent-seeking political competition among Somalia's parasitic elite. It seems paradox, but it is real. Matt Bryden (2002:2) correctly observed that the prospect of a central government continues to divide Somalis more than it unites them.

66

Attempts to create central authority often disturbs the periodic respite in many parts of Somalia. Building the state often destroys the existing peace and vice versa. Recent attempts to revive a central state structure such as the TNG have only exacerbated armed conflicts to the extent of destabilizing peace zones such as Punt land and the Somaliland Republic.

Hence the priority should be peace building in the regions and not state building at the center. Indigenous peace processes should be supported. No wonder, despite the absence of a central authority-some places and communities, enjoy relatively high levels of peace and reconciliation, security and lawfulness. On the contrary external attempts to revive a central state tend to produce deadly clashes and destabilize existing local systems of governance.

The creation of the TNG at Djibouti conference and some of the recent twists in the Kenyan peace process indicate just how little had been learned about the nature of the Somali conflict, the requirements for peace and the preconditions for creating a state. This analysis has clear implications and import for the type of state structures that should be established in a future Somali government.

In the Somali context long-term projection for state building should only follow the bottom up approach. The situation in Somaliland and Pant land suggest that indigenous popular processes of peace building are effective in creating law and order in Somalia. It is difficult to achieve a power-sharing formula at the level of major clans without first conducting peace conferences at sub-clan level. Inter-Hawiya, Inter-Mejerteen and Inter Digil-mirifle clan and regional peace conferences should come first. Leadership and authority are more fragmented than they have been before. They need a formative period of respite.

Popular peace conferences at a regional (or district) level will be a necessary prerequisite that could help solidify the chances for a national broad-based government in Somalia. Historically, Somalis are accustomed to a weak state. The only central state they new was a dismal failure. Hence any effort at political construction should project extreme decentralization as a solution. It could be federal or con-federal arrangement.

Recent attempts, at the peace process, of circumventing the federal charter worked out before will be disastrous. Besides the tendency to marginalize the existing administrations and recognized leaderships in the conference is will have fatal consequences to the peace process. Equally dangerous is the mediators tendency to make compromises bit by bit on core issues agreed upon by long process of negotiations. The future of the on-going dialogue should not be relegated to a footnote of criticisms by narrow and highly partisan agendas. The effort should be to attend to the majority; which should guide the move towards a final, inclusive and robust settlement.

3.1.3. Prognosticating Eritrea

The post independent Eritrean state, remains unstable, as this paper tried to show. This creates dual menace; internal and external. The assumption on which this overview proceeds is that, although democratizing Eritrea is now thought to be remote, the nature of the leaders in Asmara makes it difficult to affirm with any certainty that the EPLF can survive the next decade or even the next 36 months.

The EPLF under Isayas Afeworki has made it abundantly clear that it doesn't care for internal grievance; it is not prepared to accept any dissent, uses repression as a main tool of conflict management and continues to mobilize the

meager resources of the country to ensure its grip on power. It's economy is worthless. There is serious socio-economic and political crisis in the country, while the Eritrean regime is not inclined to make even controlled reform. The EPLF has developed in to an extreme form an authoritarian government, alone in its world with its own interest, and without any support around it. It applies rigid rules to which society must conform and repress those who do not. The government has a shrinking constituency and is only ruling through terror and fear. Perpetuation of a repressive system beyond a moment of emergency is likely to raise more opposition that it overcomes and end up either in state collapse or in civil war. Eventually the Eritrean 'state' will find itself confronted with emerging groups that contest its heavy hand. The situation in Eritrea remains highly volatile and dangerous.

An overview of Eritrea's performance as an independent state shows that any hint of pluralism is suspended indefinitely. Worse, many of the policies of the EPLF have not been helpful in the consolidation of statehood. Eritrea has yet to become a state; albeit the EPLF became a state itself. Surely it is not the conventional type of state.

The regime seem to have passed the point of no-return; hence it could not be reformed. Such regimes can not easily reform because once rulers tinker with them they lose control and the regime collapses. They fear that any reform, coupled with the economic crisis, could undermine social controls. While the probability of a peaceful transition to democracy and socio-economic reform in Eritrea is very low, the possibility of a regime breakdown can not be ignored.

Reports of corruption, cross-border human trafficking, widespread defections are a sign that the regime may be loosing

69

its grip, despite its efforts to maintain the current totalitarian

infrastructure. The degree of internal dissent could be more pervasive; it is not exactly known because the seclusion of the regime makes it difficult to gather data about the country. It is nevertheless possible, if not probable, that the EPLF running a single party government, militarized economy and very limited and controlled intercourse with the outside world, will not last another decade.

Although Eritrea is small, weak and very poor, it is a major threat to its neighbors. Its location and allocation of resources allow it to remain a relatively significant military power despite its poverty. Eritrea ranks first in the world for being the most militarized. Based on a percentage of its GDP, Eritrean military expenditure ranks the third highest after North Korea and Angola (The Pencil, 2004:5). This totalitarian state has continued to pour resources into its military, to the detriment of other needs and has manipulated its food shortage to feed in to its militarized economy. The potency of the regime's military forces may have been degraded by economic crisis and political crisis, but it has still the potential of disturbing its neighbors. However, it's belligerence means that it will continue to suffer much diplomatically or economically.

Although both its neighbors enjoy economic and in some cases military superiority they continue to pursue a policy of containment. So far they have successfully deterred the threat from Eritrea but the situation has continued to create a climate of apprehension and unpredictability in the region. This clearly shows that a menace from a small country can affect an entire region for the worse.

The nature of the Eritrean state and its wild ambitions to play a dominant regional role has led to inter-state wars and tens of thousands of fatalities. Meanwhile after the year 2000 the North-East African balance of power was totally altered. Eritera was defeated and it was no longer a significant regional actor. Indeed it became increasingly isolated and nervous, though economically weak and politically fragile. Neighboring countries and the international community can not fully control the way in which Eritrea will develop, but it would help avoid fatalities if they jointly develop a framework for how they should engage with Eritrea in a constant and focused manner.

For instance, major powers can consistently push Eritrea to change the often-unhealthy unilateral impulses. It also might make sense to put the agenda of *demilitarization* before any kind of donor support and trade relations. One of the problems of the region has been a lack of coordination between the major powers in dealing with common threats to regional peace. If a stronger sense of multilateral alliance and approach could be developed in the region, it might restrain some of Eritrea's hostile inclinations. This is the more so because regime survival becomes under severe threat. In this context, the Sa'na Forum could serve as a mechanism to oversee developments in Eritrea and serve as an instrument of early warning system. This could some how restrain Eritrea from antagonizing its neighbors. A carefully phased and prioritized approach could also enable the Forum develop capabilities for conflict prevention and management in the event Eritrea drifts to anarchy.

But even after some kind of awkward transformation, Eritrea will remain a small country surrounded by two big neighbors, Sudan and Ethiopia, a regional economic and military power respectively. EPLF's failure to create the *modus vivendi*

with its two big neighbors is an economic and security loss of strategic significance for Eritrea. Abandoning Eritrea to its own perils will be seriously detrimental to both a robust security order and for the much needed regional economic and political integration. The negative gravitational pull of Eritrea will be hard to resist and it is nearly impossible that Eritrea could become a stable and healthy society on its own.

The most realistic and beneficial short-term course should be peaceful co-existence and to pursue a middle course of selective partial engagement. Peaceful co-existence (negative peace), however, has to be only a brief transitional stage toward controlled interaction and economic linkages. The long-term course should be to envisage possibilities of a transition to bring Eritrea towards confederation, federation or an economic and political union that will probably be consummated in the not too distant future. The existence of a strong constituency for peaceful co-existence and economic relations in the region is out of question. Nevertheless there is a strong force in favor of a new security order which Eritrea can not afford to ignore. This section concludes that neighboring countries should plan for a large and prolonged engagement with Eritrea.

3.1.4. Ethiopia: Power and Political Challenges of Ethnic Federalism

With all its confusing signals and internal troubles, Ethiopia seem to be the only country in the Horn of Africa that has some democratic credentials to show. Upon coming to power the EPRDF led government has taken several constructive measures both at domestic and external fronts. The new government devolved power to ethically organized regional administrations. This dramatically altered the nature of

the Ethiopian state. For at least the period of transition, the move could be considered as a creative and constructive way of managing the age-old conflict between the center and the constituent parts in Ethiopia. By ascribing to the right of national self-determination, a fundamental democratic right, and carrying out a radical decentralization of the state, the EPRDF has gone far to ensuring that marginalized minorities are given a role in the state. In addition, the EPRDF has moved cautiously, but considerably further than any other country in the Horn, to accept opposition parties, a free media, and the birth of a civil society.

There is remarkably diversified press, much of it highly critical of the government. There is an enabling environment or a kind of political space, albeit with considerable constraints. The EPRDF adopted a development strategy known as the Agricultural Development Led Industrialization (ADLI). By concentrating on the development of its major economic sector (agriculture), ADLI aims at industrialization; the major focus being strengthening inter-sectoral linkages among the three sectors (agriculture, industry and service). Suffice it to say that the EPRDF had showed considerable seriousness to develop the economy and commitment to pro-peasant policies. Meanwhile in foreign policy, it adopted strict adherence to good neighborliness and sought to end the old antagonistic relations with neighbors.

The EPRDF had conducted, more or less, a smooth transition. But the factors that helped to a successful transition happened to be less than enough requirements for the democratic transformation of the Ethiopian state. Achieving an outright military victory meant that the EPRDF would continue to monopolize the process. Besides as a vanguard party it sought to have an overwhelmingly dominant position   in Ethiopian

society. The concern here is that even the presumed gradual transformation is not sufficiently advanced. The opposition's capacity to campaign effectively is severely restricted; abundantly making it clear that the EPRDF is still not prepared to accept any even contest for popular support. The regime's human rights record also remains extremely poor, and there is no indication that it is improving. The opposition is relegated to a footnote of the multi-party democracy. The decentralization story is very similar.

Generally, EPRDF's experiment with ethnic federalism is proving positive in meeting the EPRDF's goals of ending the hegemony of the center and giving a role (albeit with some constraints) in administration to the marginalized nations, while at the some time ensuring the unity of the country. Again here rhetoric is not often matched by practice. There is still a wide gap between the promise of ethnic federalism and the actual benefits it delivers. The springtime of freedom brought to the surface demands for more and real political rights by many nationalities seeking to distance themselves from the ruling party. However the EPRDF has not showed any inclination to provide political space for independent ethnic movements. This is creating the basis for further conflicts.

Hence, the major threat to peace in the present system arises from the discrepancy between the promise of ethnic federalism, and the amount of autonomy that is actually delivered. Ones the hopes that its policies of ethnic federalism promises have been aroused, the EPRDF can not afford to back-pedal without creating the risk of a bitter and violent response. There is concern that the creators of the system could themselves be its detractors. This development certainly clouds the prospects for peace and unity in Ethiopia.

The other critical question confronting the EPRDF, on which in turn the survival of the new political system and the country as a whole depends, is the challenge of economic development. The EPRDF government obviously faces the grim realities of the country's deeply impoverished situation, notably including its dependence on a very fragile system of subsistence agriculture, under circumstances of mounting population pressure and environmental decay. Obviously Ethiopia needs to mobilize internal and external resources for development. This is fully conditional, among others upon fully developing the waters of the Blue Nile Basin. Improvement on the economy as well as security will also depend on Ethiopia re-establishing other port linkages than Djibouti.

The security of Ethiopia in the long-run relate to EPRDF's readiness to make some more adjustments to the very composition and identity of the state. For instance increasing the substantive and political role of ethnic groups in the management of the state at the center. Besides to not to democratize risks the EPRDF increasingly taking on the appearance of the Derg, holding back the political development of Ethiopia, and loosing its domestic and international legitimacy.

Once ethnicity is mobilized as a political force it is difficult to reverse it by back-tracking bit by bit on the core issues. As such it is not difficult to locate the problem. Governments may be persuaded to give up a degree of power to regional bodies of some kind; and regionally based resistance movements may be persuaded to settle for half a loaf and surrender any dreams of secession. The problem, however, is not that simple. It is about the character of the state as well.

The critical question confronting the EPRDF, on which in turn the survival of the Ethiopian state in its present form depends, is therefore whether it is willing and committed to

construct some kind of political settlement, which on the one hand creates a sense of empowerment among ethnic groups, and on the other links this into some acceptable formula for managing the state as a whole. It is only by assuring formerly subordinated groups an equal place within the state that the survival of Ethiopia will be guaranteed. Such a formula should be supported by the component democratic structures which will require considerable skill and capacity if they are to function effectively. Hence, Priority should be given to the development of institutions.

This paper seeks to reflect on some of the principal political and economic factors that have propelled and hindered democratization and a robust framework of ethnic federalism in Ethiopia. Most of the legal and political provisions for the establishment of a democratic system in Ethiopia are already in place. The structures need to be adjusted and refined. Sustaining such a system also requires peace and stability at all levels: local, national, and regional. A further requirement is close relations with the west and attracting external investment, trade and aid. The invariably turbulent regional scene will remain a problem for the EPRDF and one that threatens internal disorder as well as difficulties in relations with the west. In this regard Ethiopia's biggest challenge remains to be, Eritrea as is evident in the international relations of the Ethio-Eritrean border crisis.

Three major themes recur:

The first is the constant tension in Ethiopia's federal system. EPRDF's great experiment in giving legitimacy to ethnic nationalism that brought decades of war to Ethiopia must remain in doubt. The EPRDF preserved the Ethiopian state when it came to power in 1991 by carrying out far-reaching reforms, and

in particular introducing ethnic federalism. And now if the state's survival is to be ensured, the Front must again embark on a major reform program, this time combining the achievements of its years in power with committed efforts at democratization and reconciliation. To the extent that it has the capacity, civil society must be involved, but given its weakness-a product of state and societal authoritarianism-broadening the government to include key opposition elements must take the lead. Thus, the transition in Ethiopia still continues.

The second is related to peace and development. Economic development in Ethiopia, with the right policies in place, requires the development of the waters of the Nile and strong linkages with all the ports in the sub-region. Hence a regional economic and security approach is relevant to peace, development and democracy in Ethiopia.

The third concerns the external threat posed by Eritrea. Unless there are diplomatic and political instruments of conflict resolution in place, the Ethio-Eritrean border crisis will have fatal consequences for peace and regional integration.

3.2. Unblocking The Ethio-Eritrean Peace Process: Challenges And Prospects

It was mentioned earlier that on12 May 1998, the entire political landscape in the Horn changed, when Ethiopia and Eritrea went to war over (at least theoretically) the disputed border area of Badme. The war was not only the latest addition to the already conflict-ridden North-East African region; it also altered the post-1991 inter-state system and security order (or disorder) in the sub-region. The two year long bloody war came to an end in 2000 and since then an uneasy truce had been declared and observed by both sides. But at the time of writing

(mid-November) the Ethio-Eritrean peace process appears to be on the verge of collapse.

This research and the corresponding analysis seeks to understand the substantive and the rhetorical gulf between the two governments and attempts to explore the parties red lines, which stand in the way of compromise and dialogue. The study also discusses the policies that the international community should adopt in dealing with the border crisis.

What follows is a short expose of the Ethio- Eritrean peace process. This section will begin with an overview of the Ethio-Ertirean peace process after the Algiers Agreement and the wrangling over the border ruling culminating in the Ethiopian rejection of Ethiopia-Eritrea Border Commission's (EEBC) observations of spring 2003. This will follow by on analysis of the present and probable future peacemaking efforts and outlines a kind of road map for the peaceful resolution of the conflict. Finally there will be a summary of the study's possible conclusions and a discussion on the implications of those research findings for the engagement of the international Community.

The Problem

The Algiers agreement in 2000 marked the culmination of the war and subsequent no-war and no peace situation between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The Algiers agreement came in large part due to Ethiopia's military victory but also partly because of the pressures that the two regimes have been under. The Algiers 'peace' could be considered largely as an Ethiopian peace. Surely it is dictated by Ethiopia. The international community headed by the U.S. and the EU, has equally made it clear that the option of continued war is not acceptable. This had created

an environment within which the two have come to an agreement.

The two countries, which belong to the poorest nations in the world-exhausted by the war which drained their scarce resources-were forced to sign a truce. As such the no-war/ no-peace situation prevalent in the last two years could be largely considered as a product of mutual economic and military exhaustion, which resulted in a balance of power between the two countries, than an outcome of political will and mutual commitment to durable peace.

The bloody and devastating conflict came to an end after both parties signed the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement in June 2000 and the Framework for Comprehensive Peace Agreement (Algiers Peace Agreement) in December 2000. The Algiers Agreement was the culmination of various proposals and agreements that were accepted in principle by both parties dating back to May 1998, when the "U.S-Rwanda" plan was proposed. In article 4.15 of the agreement, Eritrea and Ethiopia agreed that the boundary between the two countries would be the one delimited by the Commission based on colonial treaties and pertinent clauses of international law.

Both parties also pledged their obligations to treat the commission's delimitation resolve as " final and binding" and " to cooperate with the commission, its experts and other staff in all respects during the process of demarcation(Algiers Agreement,dec.12,2000).   Thus, the Ethio-Eritrea Boundary Commission (EEBC) was established under the terms of the Algiers Agreement.

The key areas in question had been administered by Ethiopia prior to may 1998, at which time Eritrea occupied them

by force. As dictated by Ethiopia, a temporary Security Zone (TSZ) supervised by the UN had to be created 25 kms inside the Eritrean border. Following the expulsion of the Eritrean forces by Ethiopia in May 2000, the newly created TSZ and the frontier area was patrolled by a UN force, the United Nations Mission to Ethiopia and Eritrea /UNMEE/, pending final resolution of the frontier.

The EEBC was empowered to work on the basis of very wide criteria, notably including 'relevant colonial treaties' and applicable international law, and the two parties bound themselves in advance to accept its verdict. The commission started work on 25 may 2001, and reported its ruling on 13 April 2002(Delimitation decision of the EEBC,13 april,2002).

While awaiting the decision of the Commission both countries did nothing to ease the tension and improve their relations. Indeed they have adopted contrasting strategies in the aftermath of the Algiers Agreement. Ethiopia evacuated from Eritrean territory i.e. the TSZ and allowed the UN force to come in, scaled down its hostile propaganda and military overtures and demobilized its army by at least 1/3, while Eritrea speeded up its recruitment of additional military force, accumulated new military arsenal and continued a policy of destabilization in a bid to weaken the regime in Addis.

Thus, concerning their relationships both sides continued to maintain their previous positions. While Eritrea intensified its military support to the anti-EPRDF forces, Ethiopia, although slow to act, tried to energize the anti-Isayas forces in terms of moral and political support. Irrespective of the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement in Algiers, both sides pursued the politics of destabilization, to take advantage of the uncertainties inherent in the post-Algiers peace process and the final decision of the Border Commission.

Both sides also tried to mobilize important segments of the international community in support of their respective positions and specific interests. But these acts did not represent a strategic threat to the peace process. They only illustrate the dangers of fragile peace, the lack of political will and the absence of a comprehensive peace settlement.

As the commission announced its ruling on April 13,2002, both sides welcomed the decision. The Ethiopian government could be said to have pre-emtively announced its acceptance because it anticipated (and reportedly the commission had implied) that the disputed areas were given to it. Indeed it characterized the ruling as a victory for Ethiopia because it was sure that Badme, on whose name Ethiopia waged a war of defense, was east of the common border.

Some rightly believe that Ethiopia expected as is the norm in the international system, after the reversal of Eritrean aggression regardless of whether there was any case in international law for it to have claims over the disputed areas and the status quo ante was restored and the Commission would easily certify that (Clapham,2003:3). It also expected that the Commission will not base its findings entirely on colonial treaties by discarding the international law provisions –a provision that Ethiopia insisted to be emphasized in the Algiers Agreement.

Not surprising Ethiopia from the very beginning viewed both the Algiers Protocol and the EEBC as essentially legal devices designed to smooth over the consequences of the war and as an added value to peace, without challenging Ethiopia's right to hold territory that it had administered continuously in modern times, and from which it had been ejected only by force (ibid).

From an Ethiopian perspective, the normative role of the EEBC would be to provide firm legal confirmation of Ethiopia's right to the disputed areas, and uphold the well-established principle in international law that existing territorial arrangements should not be reversed by force. Ethiopian leaders could not have imagined that the Commission would give these Ethiopian administered territories to Eritrea, which they view as nothing short of rewarding an aggressor.

Nevertheless, amid the jubilation over the decision in both countries, it could not have been overlooked that both countries must have cautiously accepted the ruling, as there were some ambiguities regarding key border areas. The Commission's strategy of presenting its decision on key disputed areas without first having briefed them on its contents, political ramifications and obtained some indication, whatever the decision demarcation would be able to proceed, proved to be a tactical error.

A year later when the Commission clarified its ambiguities and said that Badme lie in Eritrea, the Meles government expressed "regret" but said it would not reject the ruling; it would just seek adjustments by a peaceful and legal means (Ethiopian Ministry of Information, April 2,2003).The government's opposition to the ruling arising out of elaboration by the Commission in the spring of 2003 provides clues to Ethiopia's position. Important outstanding issues objected to by Ethiopian leaders fall in to three areas, namely –the legality and fairness of the ruling, the integrity of the judges and deviations from the spirit of the Algiers Agreement, i.e. ensuring long-lasting peace.

Following initial hesitation, the Ethiopian government has moved increasingly definitively towards rejecting the EEBC

allocation of key areas as unfair, unbalanced, unworkable and impossible to implement. Eritrea has accepted the decision, as it is close to the position that it has itself articulated and called for its speedy implementation without any preconditions (Issayas's letter to the UNSC, Sept.17, 2003). This has created both a substantive and rhetorical gulf between Ethiopia and the Commission on the one hand and Ethiopian and Eritrea on the other.

Ethiopia did not only reject the Commission's observations as a basis for demarcation but called it unbalanced, biased and major departure from the Algiers Protocol. The Ethiopian government further challenged the credibility of the members of the Commission especially its president(Foreign Ministry Statement,sep.29,2003).

Ethiopia's outburst was mainly on the issue of awarding Badme, a town attacked by Eritrea and on whose name Ethiopia launched a bloody two-years long 'war of liberation'. This impugns the political legitimacy of the EPRDF led government mainly its core group the TPLF. This appears to be the red line that the Ethiopian government would not cross even if that means walking away from the peace process.

Indeed acceptance of such a proposal in its totality amounts to political suicide by the TPLF. Having mobilized its supporters and allies to defend that specific area during the war, to surrender on such a fundamental point and then subject itself to the verdict of the electorate, would leave the TPLF /EPRDF squeezed between the wider Ethiopian opposition and popular anger from its main political constituency, the Tigray region.

But rhetoric of rejection could not be matched by any political, diplomatic or legal alternative. There is solid regional and international support for the peace process, so that both

governments has nowhere to turn. This partly explains the reason why Ethiopia asked the Security Council to look in to the matter and set up an alternative mechanism for demarcating the contested part of the boundary (Meles's letter to the UNSC, Sept.19, 2003).

Latest Ethiopian position has created unpredictability in the peace process. As the peace process enters its final stage the challenge on both countries and the international Community is to prepare for a successful completion of demarcation. The peace process is entering a new phase. It is unclear whether the parties would reach an agreement, even if entails a loss of territory and meet the deadline of a mutual agreement on the start of demarcation. Thus the high expectations that followed the April 2002 EEBC decision have not, so far, been fulfilled.

This introduces a new set of risks. Even if the parties are committed to achieving peace, each side will be very nervous about the political, security and diplomatic risks associated with implementing the deal, especially loosing symbolic areas associated with the start of the conflict. This nervousness could potentially be sufficient to slow down the pace of implementing the Algiers Agreement raising the likelihood of destabilizing events in the wider Horn of African region.

The role of the international community is to bring the parties to a compromising position so that the peace momentum is not lost by protracted wrangling on procedural matters. Both governments has so far succeeded in drawing the attention of the international community to their concerns, and perhaps reassured some of their internal constituencies that they have not forgotten them. Nonetheless they have no alternative but to stay in the peace process.

The issue of Badme not only occupies center stage in domestic politics but it is also a major plank in both countries foreign policy. Hence, the parties are busy mobilizing the support of regional and international partners to their respective interests.Since both are narrowly concerned with their own internal security and political power base, and see external actors and the major powers as tactical allies in these maneuvers, then little will change.

As in the other conflicts, the border war and the crisis that follows is closely linked to the nature of the state. It has also become apparent that domestic state building is too closely associated with regional politics for the two to be kept apart. The ferocity with which the war had been fought speaks, among others, to political cultures in both countries that live little room for compromise. At the risk of over simplification, this study distinguishes the long-term structural causes of the border impasse as is evident in both countries political systems and the major shortcomings of the EEBC's decision that have clearly emerged over the last seven months.

The approach of conflict management applied by the EEBC is largely responsible for the current deadlock in the peace process. Surely the people appointed to serve in the commission are well versed with the legal and technical aspect of the problem, the key question will be do they have the right combination of professional skills and local (or political) knowledge? The key weakness of the EEBC allocation is that it runs counter to the basic principles of conflict management. As such a big chunk of the problem lies in the actions of the EEBC, hence it has increasingly become part of the problem.

The decision also disturbed the structure of implementation, which remained in place for three years. Whether it is implemented or not, the EEBC's allocations have

succeeded in one thing i.e. poisoning the relations between the two conflicting parties for long in to the future. Indeed the EEBC's decision runs the danger of feeding into the conflictual nature of the Horn's international system.

As the peace process enters its final stage, the challenge on both countries and the international community is to prepare for a successful completion of demarcation acceptable to both sides. The current progress in the peace process threatens a loss of momentum; a slowing that is compounded by inaction and disorientation. Although there are no immediate prospects of the peace process being totally derailed, such delays are causes for concern.

North-East Africa is chronically conflict prone and there is a constant potential for unforeseen circumstances to destabilize the peace process. Unexpected events inside the Sudan or the region always hold out the potential for creating problems. Narrowly concerned with their own internal security and political power base, both parties have long experiences of working with third party guarantors, and also of manipulating them. This is evident in the way in which agreements has been repeatedly compromised and the way the Status of Forces Agreement governing the TSZ have been undermined over the last two years.

So far, a busy round of diplomacy has ensued and vigorous attempts to salvage the peace process are underway, with the UN, U.S and the EU pushing for Ethiopia to accept the ruling as final and binding. This approach seem to be very simplistic and suffers from lack of enough knowledge about the complexity of the problem. Diplomatic pressure on one of the parties to implement the ruling in its totality runs the danger of

derailing the whole process. Strict adherence to the EEBC's decision could only be implemented by starting another war.

Experiences of the successful conclusion of peace processes indicates that the final stage of implementation is just important as the earlier stages of opening negotiations and reaching an agreement. In most if not all peace agreements, the parties reach a compromise but do not trust one another to adhere to the terms of the agreement in good faith, without external guarantees and the necessary political will in place.

In the absence of such guarantees, hard-liners and extremists in either camp could derail the peace process by repeatedly testing its limits, to the point at which it becomes vacuous. On the contrary, more robust and credible action by third party guarantors has enabled mutually distrustful adversaries to engage in a constructive dialogue and implement a peace agreement.

Propositions

The psychological and political framework surrounding the Ethio-Eritrean border crisis has changed: the peace process in entering a new phase. This part of the study is concerned with a broad range of issues relevant to the nature of Ethio-Eritrean border impasse and the future of the peace process- at large.

In a study of problems like this, one must begin with the question: what is it? I shall indicate what and how I understand the current deadlock, and then proceed to consider the question what it takes to solve the problem and ensure long-lasting peace between the two countries? I will try to look in to all conceivable dimensions of the border crisis, but the main concern will be on

the major structural and political lod-gam that stands in the way of making demarcation a reality and pushing the peace process to a successful conclusion.

The border ruling and subsequent strategy of the EEBC, regardless of how well-intentioned it was, did not provide the framework for the peaceful resolution of the crisis. First there is no legal or technical solution to the border crisis. It should be recognized that this is a political problem. As repeatedly underlined by President Isayas Afeworki of Eritrea, the border dispute was only the flash point for deeper differences of political and economic nature between the parties.

May be mutually exclusive systems are in conflict until one of them collapses? May be control over some of the key border areas could easily destabilize the other? The issue is that the problem is not border; and the Algiers Agreement was basically a political and security agreement. By failing to address these core issues, the EEBCs allocation sow the seeds for future conflict, which would defeat the overall goal of the Algiers peace agreement, namely to achieve lasting peace. Secondly it is unworkable.

Conflict management requires using local and international mechanisms in place, which could transform conflicts to peace building. The decision failed to envisage possible instruments of implementation ones verdict is passed. Indeed it challenges the post-Algiers peace. Clearly, as a status quo power, Ethiopia, dose not support any significant territorial change. Eritrea do not posses enough military power and lacks reliable allies to uphold the ruling and overturn the post-Algiers order.

The problem area is too hostile, too politicized, too militarized and too large for Eritrea to achieve peaceful and

smooth implementation of the ruling. Eritrea is less likely able to militarily change the status quo, knowing it would have to fight a stronger army, and if it did, it runs the danger of making the whole Algiers Agreement null and void. That will be a political suicide of historical significance that Eritrea can not afford to commit.

Ethiopia, with a strong army, a security infrastructure in place and support of the people in the areas in question, is in a far better position to achieve stability on its own. The UN mission can play an important role, but by itself it is not strong enough to provide the necessary infrastructure for peace. It's mandate is too small, its neutrality less clear, disoriented and lacks the military clout, thus requiring a useful ally-Ethiopia. Every body should recognize that, the peace between the two countries is sustained not because of UNMEE or the TSZ, but due to the nature of balance of power mainly dictated by Ethiopian capacity to keep the post-Algiers security order.

The decision is so lopsided that is did not take the political context in to consideration. It's political and security pitfalls are enormous. Ethiopia's mixed signals on speedy demarcation and eventual transfers of territory after the EEBC's clarifications is directly linked to the domestic political situation. As discussed earlier the decision threatens political survival of the regime; hence instability with regional implications. Failing to look in to this issue proves to be the major tactical and political error of the EEBC. And peace is the first causality.

Meanwhile, sticking to the final and binding' nature of the disastrous ruling also suffers from lack of adequate understanding of the decision making process in both countries. In simple terms, Prime Minister Meles' actions are subject to a democratic process however imperfect. A relatively open political

system is vulnerable to political criticism than a closed system. In Eritrea power is concentrated almost solely in the hands of one person-possibly with four generals. Therefore, president Isayas has more possibility for maneuver than Prime Minister Meles.

Eritrea's war (for land) against Ethiopia was not supported by many Eritrean. There is no possibility that any kind of peaceful settlement could lead to political problems in Eritrea. Quite the opposite; it would only creat relief. In addition, the disputed areas are more important to Ethiopia (with which their inhabitants identify themselves) than to Eritrea. The disputed area (mainly Badme) is significant to the Eritrean regime only to the extent that it serves as a reminder of Ethiopia's loss, and resultant political crisis to the EPRDF.

As such, Eritrea's position focuses on short-term political gains than normalization and long-term peace. This is short-sighted and runs the danger of feeding into future conflicts, detrimental to the survival of Eritrean independence. It is a truism, however, that the solution to every conflict creates the basis for further (more deadly) conflict, and this is certainly the same with EEBC's decision. There are also human rights issues. Mutual hostility between the Eritrean regime and the local inhabitants in the areas in question, as was evident during the war and after, raises a great deal of concern.

Against the above background, forcing Ethiopia to accept the disastrous ruling would ultimately imperil the whole peace process. Putting pressure on Ethiopia and statements in favor of one of the parties does not help. Failure to address Ethiopia's sensitivities could slow down the momentum for peace. Since it controls all the disputed areas, its military

dominance means that it can afford to sit tight, and wait for Asmara to fail the tests.

Sticking to the final and binding nature of the ruling also runs the danger of misleading the government of Eritrea, holding out the promise that the international community may give unilateral support to its position. It should not be allowed to use such statements as a pretext to reject dialogue or negotiate in bad faith. The international community should not underestimate the possibility of one of the parties abandoning the peace process if it is assured of a solid support in international and internal fronts.

Problems inherent in the border ruling, the requirements or its implementation, including its political, security and human rights ramifications, strengthens the argument for a new mechanism of conflict management. This could involve, pushing the two sides to take some confidence building measures; to be punctuated by a comprehensive political dialogue. Multi-track approach with global backing. The best place to start is the joint Border Commission. Both parties have rich experience in joint committee activities. Institutional knowledge from the pre-conflict years is still available and could be revived quickly.

Reportedly the Joint Border Commission established before the war had made significant progress in looking in to the matter before it was interrupted by the Eritrean invasion. The objective should be to assess and make use of the capabilities of local mechanisms of conflict resolution. This means re-instating the commission, resume from where it left and coordinate its task with the EEBC and the joint Military Coordination Commission (MCC) created under the patronage of UNMEE.

With international help and sustained encouragement such a body with representation of cabinet- level decision makers, including both commissioners (and civilian counterparts) could serve as a forum to examine ways of addressing political issues arising during the demarcation phase. It might be useful to include the diplomatic supporter group of UNMEE in the framework so as to use its leverage and respond quickly with practical support for sensitive areas of contention.

Important in this process would be to include possibilities that would allow the communities to decide whether they should be part of Ethiopia or Eritrea. Many people along the border are concerned that the ruling will leave them in an awkward and vulnerable position. Exploring the possibilities of a trade off of land and adjustment in territorial arrangements could be another. For instance the parties would almost certainly be open to limited swamps of territory in the central sector, from the necessity of dealing with intricate terrain and delimitation features. This would largely depend on negotiation and expert hearing under EEBC auspices.

There is a need for both face-to-face sessions between middle level officials of both countries, but the initial focus should be on bringing civil society actors and other stakeholders more quickly on board. People to people relations should be a priority. In this, religious organizations, mass associations, the media etc. can contribute a lot Citizen-based diplomacy and non-governmental organizations have an important role to play. Other confidence building measures include, interalia, re-assurance on shared security interests such as the anti-terrorist umbrella, mutual stability and anti-destabilization pact. However if this important process of mutual confidence building is to succeed it will require several additional elements.

As a result, the second and more important requirement for success is political dialogue. Thus, major leverage will have to be exerted on the parties, which primarily implies a stepped-up high-level involvement by the EU and the US. So far, a busy round of diplomacy has ensued and vigorous attempts to salvage the peace processes are underway. The principal issue of substance now is, in what areas will the mediators bend to Ethiopia's concerns? and to what extent will any such compromises jeopardize Eritrea's readiness to remain engaged in the peace process? Any effort at peace making should be based on the recognition that the EEBC has not provided a mechanism through which this conflict can be resolved. Thus there is a need for preventive diplomacy.

Despite the sympathy to their current position, the UN and AU with the full involvement and support of international backers should put in place diplomatic' plan B'. Thus far, undeclared diplomatic ' plan B' i,e diplomatic and political dialogue, appears to be working to ensure that Ethiopia stays in the peace process. Dialogue still presents the best chance for peace. A comprehensive political dialogue which involves investment and trade and issues such as port use, anchored on international financial support will help a lot.

This discussion has identified some of the principal issues surrounding the border impasse, the key elements in the peace process and its prospects. The guiding themes for a successful facilitation are not difficult to locate. The necessary requirements are listed below. Much needs careful consideration. Preliminary conclusions and suggestions include:

- The objective of preventive diplomacy should be to harness local capacities of conflict resolution of state and non-state systems in a coordinated and complementary manner.

93

- Dialogue must take on the political and economic aspect of the border crisis.
- The impact of the ruling on Ethiopia's stability must be analyzed   with care, as it will be a critical factor on the success or otherwise of the process and of regional peace. To this effect the border ruling should be viewed as binding but not final.
- The creation and role of the EEBC must be seen as a step towards building on the post-Algiers order; as a means of better enabling   both countries keep the momentum for peace which was already in place.

  The post-Algiers order has held, that must be thoroughly evaluated as peacemakers embark on a new process. Over turning the post-Algiers settlement should be avoided.

- It is to the interest of regional peace, if demarcation is accompanied by Eritrean commitment to demilitarize and democratize. This could serve as a confidence-building measure and a safety valve to dilute Ethiopia's fear of Eritrea's hostility along the border areas.
- The impact and relevance of the ruling to human security issues such as democracy, citizenship and human rights need to be properly analyzed.
- Pressure on Ethiopia should be balanced with the need for progress in the peace process. Thus far, there are still areas in which the EEBC and the international community at large, needs to show much greater flexibility.
- What is required, in essence, is a renunciation of violence and a comprehensive non-aggression pact between the two countries. This is a commitment to abstain from constituting- or permitting one's territory to be used to present –a threat to the constitutional or territorial integrity of the other state.
- Any effort at implementation must also reflect the distribution of powers and the structure of implementation on which external

mediation should capitalize. Finally this discussion would like to depart with a question: might it be better to depoliticize the economic issues, settling them first? And then proceed to procedural issues of border demarcation and peace building.

The discussion so far largely focuses on the question of internal peace in Sudan and Somalia and the nature of conflict prevention mechanism to be applied to the Ethio-Eritrean border crisis. However, these measures are short-term which could only lead to partial peace.

- Prevailing internal peace is an essential element, but not the only precondition for an inter-state security order. Meanwhile, there are also specific measures that can greatly enhance regional security and assist economic cooperation. After all internal peace and inter-state security need to complement each other or perhaps should develop simultaneously; hence the next chapter looks at the long-term mechanisms required for peace in the region as a whole.

CHAPTER FOUR
ECONOMIC INTEGRATION: THE PATH TO PEACE AND REGIONAL INTEGRATION

African leaders have always accorded high priority to regional cooperation and integration as a means to achieve peace and economic development. Apart from ensuring regional security, sub-regional cooperation and integration was considered as a vehicle for economic growth. The quite often rational is that, the future development of African countries depends on their ability to pool their natural endowment including their human resources.

Accordingly, many institutions for regional integration and cooperation were created, often without much planning and preparation, soon after countries gained their independence. To this effect, mainly in the past three decades a great deal of effort has been made by most sub-Saharan African countries to establish sub-regional blocks. The same is true with the Inter-governmental Authority for Draught and Desertification/IGADD/which was established in 1986.

- ### *IGAD Under Stress*
    Originally, IGAAD was conceived by six draught prone founding member states, in which its formal *cause belly* was to combat the effects of draught and desertification. This clearly shows the centrality of environmental problems in the Horn of African region. After the end of the cold war, however, the economy-led approach to integration in many parts of Africa has been slightly displaced by a political rational i.e the issue of regional security.

Similarly IGADD was revitalized so as to broaden its mandate and embraced conflict management, prevention and resolution. More emphasis was given to the pursuit of peace, without discarding the much broader and more ambitious sense of creating the structural conditions required for development within a globalized world economy. This led to the restructuring of IGADD.

A two day head of states summit held in Djibouti from 25-26 November 1996 marked the official launch of the revitalized IGAD; hence it became the Inter-governmental Authority for Development. The 'new' IGAD, covering Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda and independent Eritrea, reiterated the commitment of the member states to the key priority areas of food security and environmental protection, infrastructural development, and conflict prevention and humanitarian affairs.

A Consultative Group in the name of IGAD Partners Forum /IPF/ was formed to support and finance IGAD projects on the priority areas, mainly infrastructural development (Horn of African Review, 1996:3). Like in many regions of Africa, the establishment of IGAD, and the rapidity with which it was set up and revitalized, reflect (at least in theory) the tremendous urge towards unity in the East-African sub-region. What this organization could actually be expected to achieve, however, has been less clear and very uncertain.

Nonetheless measurable progress has been made in certain areas. The conflict management organ of the organization was able to launch peace initiatives in Somalia and Sudan. More disparate and less coherent, the common features

of the member countries engagement in the peace processes, were their commitment to the utilization of diplomatic and political strategies as the primary instrument for the resolution of conflict in the region.

Yet, there were inherent divisions among the member states which stand in the way of adopting a common approach in dealing with regional conflicts. In fact, in the few years after the revitalization of IGAD, the member states were more serious in mapping out common projects on infrastructural development than common approaches to regional security.

IGAD member states noted concern that poor infrastructure is hampering progress in the sub-region and constantly called on partners (the IPF) to fulfill their commitment by financing projects related to the expansion of road transport and telecommunication networking among IGAD countries. Pre-feasibility studies of four cross-border road projects were prepared ready for funding, among which some of them were financed by the European Union.

The road projects were the Isiolo-Moyale road linking Nairobi and Addis Ababa; the Dobi-Galafi-Yoboki -a triangle connecting Djibouti-Assab and Addis Ababa; Ali-Sabieh-Dire Dawa road which connects Addis Ababa with Djibouti and Gondar-Humera-Barentu-Gedarif   road,   covering   several sections which would connect Ethiopia, Sudan and Eritrea (IGAD Report, 1998:3).   Most of these projects did not materialized mainly because donors failed to provide the necessary funds claiming that the region is divided and not ready to achieve peace; a basic requirement for development.

Besides, it could be argued that, due to its geographic centrality, the projects would benefit Ethiopia more and other member countries were not enthusiastic to the plan.   Whatever

99

the reasons, one of the basic tasks for regional economic integration, i.e building inter-state communication linkage was postponed indefinitely.

Worse, the goal of IGAD will be frustrated by divisions among the member states. Few would deny that the region (and IGADD as an organization) was in crisis and that its transition to IGAD, has been more marred by dispute than distinguished by consensus. All that united, the architects of the revitalized IGAD, in the first place was the initial comradeship between the leaders of Ethiopia and Eritrea. This coupled with the isolation of the NIF in the Sudan, the quietness of Djibouti, the indifference of Kenya and Uganda and the collapse of Somalia, served to mask more fundamental divisions among the member states. No doubt, initially, IGAD was considered as an opportunity than a threat.

Increasingly, however, the pervasiveness of conflict in Somalia, Sudan and ultimately the Ethio-Eritrean war and its spillover effects dwarfed the organization. Optimal pace, extent and sequencing of the peace initiatives, fractured by narrow security interests and ideological differences, and divided by disputes about the purpose, autonomy and use of certain structures of the regional grouping, IGAD at the beginning of the new century is seen by many as little more than a hollow shell. The reasons for the fracturing of IGAD unity are too complex to analyze in detail in this section. I venture few observations in this regard.

It is important to remember that regional grouping can only be as strong as its constituent parts, or as strong as its constituent parts allow it to be. The failure is not merely from the particular circumstances of IGAD, but from the characteristic features of the member states and the regional integration

scheme as a whole. Progress in regional integration can only be founded on the democratic legitimacy of the various governments in their respective countries; hence the nature of the state.

Although, as discussed in previous chapters, these differences had much to do with the shared historical and strategic interests of certain countries within IGAD, they were also determined, to no small extent, by a complex web of ideological, personal and, in some cases narrow pragmatic interests. In some cases close links had existed between different countries of the region, common positions adopted (such as between Ethiopia and Djibouti on the issue of Somalia), these relationships were to sour as governments redefined their national interests.

In light of the above, the attempts within IGAD to forge a common approach to the sub-regional resolution of conflict have focused on structural reorganization than common policies and strategies. Central to this failure is the absence of political consensus and strong economic bondage. Indeed, many countries in the sub-region are unable to identify where their true national interest lies vis-à-vis regional conflicts. Many of them (Kenya, Eritrea, Djibouti) do not have even an institutionalized foreign policy.

Priority is often given to temporary political advantages, short-term calculus of power and regime survival. The main concern of most of the governments of the sub-region is the maintenance of their own sovereignty, and indeed the preservation of their own power within their states. The reasons are too many to mention.

The absence of common political values, such as democratic political cultures founded on tolerance and cultural diversity within an overarching national framework is another factor. Worse, the region is characterized by ideological polarization. It is also characterized by a multiplicity of regional organizations with overlapping membership. Except for Ethiopia most of the countries have double or triple loyalty. Uganda and Kenya are mainly concerned (in economic terms) about the East African Community; Sudan, Djibouti and Somalia belong to the Arab League and the Organization of Islamic Countries (OIC) and along with Eritrea they are members of CENSAD (Ghadafi's Sahle Saharan).

Outer rim states like Egypt also share the blame for the fracturing of regionalism in the Horn of Africa. Egyptian politics have been structured around its desire to control the headwaters of the Nile, and therefore sought to isolate Ethiopia and prevent an alliance of the states in the Horn from emerging to challenge its sub-regional hegemony. Egyptian attempts to torpedo the Ethiopian peace initiatives on Somalia is best explained by this Egyptian interest. Thus, the different political and value systems, and the perceived compatibility of the national interests of the member states determine divergent policies and define the limits of appropriate mutual obligations.

The Horn of African sub-region lacks both the subjective and objective conditions for cooperation and the creation of a strong regional organization. It is clear that neither the political arrangements nor the economic modalities of each country in the region look to be up to the task of regional peace and cooperation. The issue of peace at the level of each state was discussed in the previous chapter; and the focus here is on inter-state peace and durable regional security order. Peace could not be achieved by focusing on he superstructure for

negotiating peace and diplomatic intervention. There are other underlying issues of regional significance that should be accorded priority.

4.1. *Towards An expanded framework of Conflict Resolution.*

Hence, it is important to ask the question about what are the alternative requirements for creating regional integration and durable security order? A simple setting out of these requirements is enough to indicate that they provide a very demanding agenda indeed, and one which indicates why genuine cooperation has been so difficult to achieve.

From the authors point of view the major requirement for cooperation is political while its continuity is intimately locked in to shared economic interests. It is not disputed that there is a need for a two-track approach; democratization and economic cooperation moving in parallel directions but to the same end. The relationship between the two, which are independent and intervening variables is crucial to the success or otherwise of regional cooperation.

4.1.1 Democratization: Multi-Speed

The issue of parallel democratization implies about the meaning and character of the state and a process of development which forms an axis with economic cooperation, each angle of which has an impact on the other. All the countries are facing political and economic crisis (mainly emanating from the nature of the state) of varying magnitude, and require parallel political transformation and economic bondage, which feed each other, to both create the necessary political will and boost their economic cooperation. The reasons

for the adoption of this strategy is primarily economic and strategic.

None of these countries is democratic in nature (although there are variations), and many of them contains within themselves the seeds of potential conflict. They must have a relatively transparent democratic domestic political systems. This involves, at the minimum, creating an environment based on measures for improving political freedom and on measures aimed at developing a design for political governance to accommodate domestic social diversity and the various economic strata of their societies. Many wars and violent conflicts, can be avoided if each country cultivates a genuine democratic culture and develops effective systems in which people participate in the running of governments.

The state forms that emerge should reflect unique combinations of universal values-respect for fundamental human rights and the rule of law with the distinct political culture of each national society. This would require all governments (with varying speed but parallel attempt) in the region to be elected in accordance with basic democratic arrangements that secured the assent, both of the populations within the states concerned, and ultimately of the other states within the region.

Reinventing a democratic society also encompasses key ingredients, such as fostering civil society, establishing the rule of law, promoting political reconciliation and creating a climate for economic growth. Mainly the judiciary has been the weakest in Africa. Creating a strong and independent judiciary is crucial.

At its simplest, economic cooperation (indeed integration) between states presupposes that governments have

a strategic consensus, shared political values, an element of legitimacy, good governance, and a level of control over their economies that can be contributed to some regional pool. Progress in these areas can, moreover, only be founded on the democratic legitimacy of the various governments and the success that they and civil society achieve in nation building. Severe shortages of competent private entrepreneurs and cross-border linkage is also another variable.

The collapse of the most promising economic community, the East African Community, demonstrates how inability to narrow political differences can compound the problem inherent in any (economic) integration process involving countries at different levels of development (Malewezi, 2001:20). The regional community fall apart in the late 1970's over the sharing of benefits, political divisions, conflicts of interest between Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. This was aggravated partly by ideological disputes and partly of differences between the leadership of the three member states that greatly exacerbated by the overthrow of Obote by Amin in Uganda.

Similarity at the political level usually pre-supposes economic cooperation and integration. While economic cooperation is a basic variable for peace among states. Economic cooperation is not always a pre-requisite for political integration, while the reverse is true. As the East Asian experience shows, economic development is not necessarily (or always) based on political integration. But inter-state peace without close economic bondage and cooperation is very difficult to achieve.

The European Union is an important model for regional integration. From its modest beginnings as an economic community on selected economic sectors it has evolved in to a

105

strong grouping, mainly made possible by a wider democratic and cooperative European project. Shared political values of parliamentary democracies greatly contributed to a cooperative spirit.

Here we are talking about peace and conflict resolution. Thus, similarity of political systems and agreement over the basic elements of statehood provides at least the minimum conditions for economic cooperation with a positive trickle-down effect on the achievement of regional peace. Parallel democratization presupposes economic cooperation, and economic bondage presupposes peace. It reduces the intensity of conflict between states which have common strong economic interests at stake.

Evidently, shared political values are reflected in the nature of common security needs; hence the definition of security. Given the lack of real power in the sub-regional organization, much of the focus must be on developing the subjective conditions for security cooperation, namely developing common understandings of security. This could evolve an agreement on what constitutes regional insecurity and enriching the moral consensus against armed conflict and unconstitutional means of acquiring power.

4.1.2. Towards a Human Security Regime

Inter-state conflicts and the resulting level of hostility are the consequences of the inability of African states to maintain the domestic and regional security structures that economic development requires. Political consensus is required on the definition of a human security agenda, within the region

as a prerequisite for peace and sustainable development. The countries of the Horn rank among the lowest in the world in terms of human security, reflected in low life expectancy, low literacy, and low levels of respect for human rights. Unfortunately the security debate in the Horn has long been dominated by considerations of real politic and narrower considerations of military security. It is not the intention of this study to discuss the human security issue in detail, but its basic elements will be examined below.

The conventional approach to security was shaped by the political conditions of the cold war system characterized by rival ideological blocs with the terrifying possibility of nuclear war. In this context, the debate around security remained focused on states and military stability. As a result, 'security' has acquired virtually the same meaning as 'defense'. According to Laure Nathan (1994:12) this approach generally ignores the underlying reasons for conflict; it fails to take adequate account of the security of people and the many non-military threats to their security.

It contributes to a militarist ethos in civil society; it diverts resources from more productive ends; and it frequently fails to make use of the various non-violent forms of conflict resolution(ibid). The argument here is that in dealing with conflicts and the issue of peace and security in the Horn of Africa new definitions of security should be promoted and adopted. The security perspective should transcend the orthodox security approach by questioning the notion that nation-states can maintain regional peace and hence global tranquility on the basis of multilateral institutions dependent on the use of military coercion.

On the contrary, it is argued that a concept of security grounded on inter-state relations often overlooks the fact that the state itself can be a source of citizens insecurity (Salih, 1999:127). Furthermore, as an object of state actions, citizen security has often been sacrificed in order to maintain an element of security based on militarism. In the Horn of Africa (as in many African countries) the concept of 'national security' is distorted by states which lack internal legitimacy in order to justify the suppression of their citizens and advance the interests of elite groupings. In reality, state security amounts to little more than regime security. The principal source of peoples insecurity is their own governments rather than foreign aggression.

The central theme in this discussion is that human security should be used to broaden the debate from the threat, use, and control of military force to encompass non-conventional concerns such as ecology, human rights, social capital and HIV/AIDS, which if not properly addressed would pose similar threats to human survival.

National and regional security should not be restricted to military matters of regime survival but should include basic human security issues. Many claim that national security is a meaningless concept if it does not encompass the preservation of livable conditions on earth. Indeed, the well-being of nations and their individual citizens depends as much on economic vitality, social justice, good governance, and ecological stability as it does on safety from foreign attack (Williams, 2001:109).

Thus, there is a need for a new model of security for the Horn of Africa. The new model should define security as an all encompassing concept that enables the individual citizen to live in peace and harmony; to have equal access to resources and the basic necessities of life; fair share of national wealth; to

participate fully and freely in the process of governance; and to enjoy the protection of fundamental rights. Thus, a paradigm shift in the definition of security is necessary precondition for creating both domestic tranquility and regional peace and security order.

Such a departure from the state-centric conception to human security, will have a significant impact on the security of states themselves. Promoting human security agendas should not be seen as a threat to the national security interests of the countries concerned, but as complementary. Demilitarizing the notion of security will minimize the dangers of defining national security on narrow and partisan agendas and restrains governments from unwanted wars.

The objectives of security policy therefore go beyond achieving an absence of war to encompass the pursuit of democracy, sustainable development, social justice and protection of the environment.   Although, the prioritization of the security agenda would normally be left to the individual state (as it naturally differs from country to country), any serious internal challenge to them would be a legitimate matter for regional concern. The application of this new model will positively impact on parallel democratization, economic integration and be a boost for the creation of a regional peace and security order.

If such order is to succeed, the model to an analysis of the internal and external threats to each country has to be based on human rather than orthodox notions of security. After all, before looking in to the management of regional security it will be necessary to define what the conceptual parameters of the security equation are. IGAD leaders had endorsed the creation of an organ for conflict resolution and humanitarian affairs, but what was not outlined in detail, beyond the affirmation of broad

values and principles, was the political will and organizational processes that would bring about this desired end-state.

To ensure that the region proves capable of managing its security needs and its regional security is effectively addressed, it should first reach consensus on the contents of a regional security agenda, in which human security must be central. This also requires, among others, that the leading state and group of states must go out of their way to ensure their commitment to the principles on which the new security system is based.

Human security issues are increasingly regional and common problems transcend national borders. States can no longer protect their citizens through unilateral military means. They share an interest in joint survival and should begin to organize their security policies in cooperation with each other. It is also a desirable condition for confidence building and cooperation among states. This will definitely induce significant change in the Horn of Africa's regional political dynamics or to improve the mutual security of states and citizens. It will make also easy for governments to embark on practical confidence building measures to ensure that regional security is effectively addressed.

4.1.3. A collective Approach to Security

A part from political consensus on what constitutes human security agenda, countries need to take appropriate confidence and integrated security measures to ease mutual suspicion and hostility. This exercise should involve setting sub-regional standards for security cooperation. For many, it is difficult to imagine its practicality, but ones started, it is very helpful to ease tensions and improve relations between hostile

states. Regular meetings, information sharing and coordinated action between the military-security nexus of the different countries is essential to build a high level of trust and confidence among the participating armed forces.

As far as possible, the foreign and defense policies and activities of the member countries should be harmonized – particularly when this has to do with foreign and defense policy engagements with other members within the sub-region. In particular terms common security could be organized around four pillars. First, joint activities could be undertaken in a number of areas; such as military training, intelligence gathering and analysis; maintenance and procurement of weapons systems, border arms control and drug-trafficking.

Improving transparency with regard to military forces through information exchanges on policies, national strategies, budgets, force levels, major weapons systems and purchases, and existing and intended bilateral defense agreements with other countries are essential components of a confidence building security measures. Greater transparency in military matters is helpful to alleviate possible mistrust and prevent misunderstandings from developing in to crisis.

For instance an agreement between states to inform each other on annual basis of their force levels, military structures, doctrine, strategy, training and deployment is crucial. The need for such measures is highlighted by the on-going mutual suspicion over the nature of the military establishment in the countries of the region. The suspicion is largely due to the lack of official information. For instance suspicion over the modernization of the Sudanese army with the creation of the

new industrial village, mainly a military-industrial complex is one major example.

In addition, most of the states in the region always indicate that they feel threatened by Ethiopia for as long as it retains disproportionately large armed forces. Eritrea's militarization, more than its size and economy can afford, is another issue of concern. May be the suspicions are credible, and greater transparency would not eliminate problems of this nature but could substantially reduce the tension around them. Another important measure would be the introduction of formal procedures and mechanisms for preventive diplomacy. It is evident that preventive diplomacy represents a more cost-efficient approach to conflict management than troop deployment.

Preventive diplomacy defined as 'action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur should be the guiding principle of states. Despite a great deal of potential to prevent war and violence by introducing this mechanism, little emphasis is given to the non-military potential of both governmental and non-governmental organizations.

The effectiveness of preventive diplomacy, mediation and arbitration ultimately depends on the willingness of disputing parties to make use of them. Nevertheless, their existence may encourage states to resort to mediation and thus contribute to building a culture of peaceful conflict resolution. Hence, focus should be made towards an expanded framework for conflict resolution.

The international system today (including to some extent the Horn) is much more than a system of states. With a variety of transnational actors from business, academia, non-governmental agencies, civic groups and religious organizations, it is an ever-expanding network which cuts across the state system. Indeed, the development of civil society organizations is considered as one basic requirement of 'structural stability'. States can build the framework, for non-violent conflict management, under which a wide range of non-state actors such as NGO's, civic groups and business organizations, intervene in the cause of peace. The dynamic role of Somali business class in creating zones of peace and tranquilly in many parts of stateless Somalia is a good example.

Furthermore these forces can serve as pressure groups and a modality for inter-state peace advocacy. With regard to peace building and future security, there is a growing network of citizen based groups which are willing to shoulder much of the responsibility. Supporting the development of such groups will greatly help the cause of preventive diplomacy and conflict resolution.   In simple terms, priority should be given to finding means of engaging with civil society initiatives, so that they complement and augment inter-state processes.

4.1.4. Anti-Destabilization Regime

Finally, the most important instrument of collective security is multilateral (or bilateral) treaties on such issues as non-proliferation, disarmament, the renunciation of violence, non-belligerence and foreign military involvement in the region. The most important agreement would be a non-aggression pact which endorses the international prohibition on the threat or use of force. Incidentally, the situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia

113

requires the creation of such a pact. Events unfolding and whatever successes are achieved in preventive diplomacy, there will be a kind of 'negative peace' between the two. Pushing both countries to sign an anti-destabilization pact is crucial to maintain even the fragile peace.

The renunciation of violence is central to the principle of non-aggression. Countries can have different national interests but the outstanding pre-condition for conflict resolution is not to use force for pursuing those interests. An anti-destabilization regime is a basic requirement for peace and stability order in the Horn of Africa. This largely means creating a regional security framework, based on a comprehensive non-aggression pact and directed towards preventive diplomacy, conflict management and cooperation between national police forces in combating serious crime including arms and drug smuggling. In this respect, security sector reform and creating well functioning legal system will have its own impact.

The military component of a regional (collective) security system necessarily includes a multilateral non-aggression pact between the various states. This is a commitment to abstain from constituting-or permitting one's territory to be used to present –a threat to the constitutional or territorial integrity of another state. The commitment to regional security may, of course, extend further, if the states agree, to include a mutual defense pact. Immediate steps to build effective capacity, such as joint exercises and training and sharing of intelligence and doctrine, can however be implemented without the need to conclude a formal mutual defense pact.

Common security recognizes the interdependence of states and the potential for political and military cooperation.

The ambitious proposals outlined above need to be weighed against the factors which limit the affectivity of regional mechanisms in the Horn of Africa. Countries pursue divergent (even contradictory) national interests, mutual trust is absent, institutions are weak, small states fear that they may be undermined or overwhelmed by strong states, and all states are concerned about surrendering a measure of sovereignty on security to a higher authority. It is difficult to achieve a consensus, among the states, on the way forward within a span of few years. Partly as a result of these factors, the regional organization, IGAD is very weak it could not provide the necessary framework (foundation) for regulating inter-state behavior on the basis of shared values discussed above.

Thus a new approach should not be ruled out. This is the more so because there is difficulty to create consensus among the member states of IGAD countries on the principles that should guide relations among neighbors, and the balance of power between the states in the sub-region has not allowed for stability founded on a hegemonic state or coalition. Cooperation and common security requires the attainment of strategic consensus on the management of regional security within IGAD than having just an organizational structure. The attempts so far tend to focus on organizational solutions than strategic consensus. Worse, IGAD's institutional capacity and political backing to promote and sustain such a role is in question.

Mention has been made that, a robust security order and cooperation is more than creating a regional structure of a regional organization like IGAD. Then one should ask whether the substantive and institutional requirements are in place? The answer is no. Before embarking on discussing a new

approach to conflict resolution and peace and security in the sub-region, it is essential to make some concluding remarks.

1. It is imperative to recognize that IGAD did not make much during its first two decades. IGAD's problems are severe and complex, and the institution is weak, if not irreparable.
2. It is important to bear in mind that the subjective and objective conditions for cooperation are not met by all countries of the region. Regionalism is being 'constructed' amongst hostile, unequal and competing states.
3. The homogeneity (or diversity) of the political and economic values (interests) to which the member states subscribe, will determine the scope of the reciprocal economic and security commitments (including sharing of intelligence, doctrine and joint training) that will be honored over time. These values, and the perceived compatibility of the national interests of the member states, define the limits of appropriate mutual obligations; hence the need for common agendas and strategies.
4. The principal substantive requirement for regional peace and order is the presence of shared economic interests between states.
5. The roles and responsibilities of sub-regional powers need examination. This entails deepening relations among and between states around a clearly situated nexus of power.
6. States that share common purposes and demonstrate the will and the ability to progress more swiftly should not wait until the others join. That they should not be hampered by the deplorable situation in the other member states and the requirements of consensus and collective ratification of all programs by all member states and finally;
7. Regional peace and security is an ongoing process with different phases, different actors taking the lead, it is clear that different variables are important at different junctures and stages.

Thus, as far as creating collective security and economic cooperation is concerned, due to the complicated and confused picture in the region a multi-speed approach is more appropriate. Multi-speed refers to the time dimension, raising issues related to the rate at which integration should proceed. All states may, or may not agree on a common objective, but progress at different speeds to that objective.

Hence, it is important to ask a number of questions about what is necessary to put in place to create a workable 'security community' in the Horn? What are the preconditions in terms of an inter-state order? Does a security community require an established inter-state hierarchy? The situation in the Horn of Africa today poses a number of theoretical and practical challenges, which require alternative mechanisms for creating regional integration and durable security order.

4.2. Transforming Conflicts to Cooperation.

4.2.1. Sudan and Ethiopia: Too Mean or Too Lean

I have now made it clear that inter-state cooperation as well as regional peace and security is an ongoing process with different phases, each demanding its unique prerequisites, supportive conditions and catalytic events. In this context, it is argued that, all IGAD member states are unlikely to progress in unison towards a common, desirable end. Thus, there should be a new start and the process in the Horn must take probably a different character. This requires that the leading state or group of states must go out of their way to ensure that their own commitment to regional security and economic cooperation should lead the region to integration. In this context, Sudan and Ethiopia must take the lead. There are strong points in favor of this argument.

117

The first is that cooperation on solid, selected, and core economic interests often provide much more tangible integrative ties than high level politics. Yet, such a process should be based on conscious political decisions in which similar political, economic and security variables shape the beginnings of each integration grouping. There is ample experience and evidence in other parts of the world in support of this assertion.

The European Union which started from a humble beginning as the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951 is one clear testimony. Indeed, European security was driven by the concerns of two European states, Germany and France (Steinberg, 1993:5). In this respect it is not difficult to locate a comparable role in the Horn of Africa. The establishment of Southern Common Market (Mercosur) in Latin America in 1991, largely centered around Brazil and Argentina is another evidence.

Secondly, the absence of war (mainly the absence of a hypothesis of conflict) between neighboring states is regarded as a precondition for the initiation or meaningful integration. Economic policy convergence and commonality of interests, around free market principles, between the 'core' countries of regional grouping clearly helps integration efforts. In addition the complementary effect of democratization to regionalism should not be discounted. These terms of references more or less correspond (although in relative terms) to the situation of Sudan and Ethiopia in the Horn of Africa.

Given that progress in regional cooperation is dependent on building trust between members states, the evolving relations (previously discussed) between the two countries based on fundamental economic and security variables must be taken seriously. In addition, Sudan has an

interesting history of political pluralism, while Ethiopia has some democratic credentials (albeit weak) to show at least in the 'core' Horn of African region.

Since stability both inside a member state, as well as between member states, is essential to create a viable environment for cooperation, the recent progress in the Sudan peace process is very unlikely to embarrass this analysis. It is also presumed that, subsequent cooperation and economic integration can lock countries in to continuing along the democratic path, as regional partners press for democratic governance as a basic condition for membership.

At the very least, Sudan and Ethiopia, with relatively like minded leaders and modest levels of political pluralism will be able to adopt and maintain more comprehensive economic cooperation programs. The other two countries of the Horn with some semblance of democracy (Kenya and Uganda) are not included in this equation partly because they are not central to the 'core' of the Horn of African region. Besides they belong mainly (in economic terms)to the East African Community. In the context of the Horn of African 'core' region, Sudan and Ethiopia are the two most important countries.

The commonality between these two countries is, however, most pronounced and significant in terms of economic bondage and their actual-potential role as the two most powerful countries in the region. Developments in other parts of the world such as Europe show that where no hegemonic state, or group of states exists, integration and regional security order is difficult (if not impossible)to achieve. For sure, developments in the region are different from other areas. It is imperative to recognize that each regional integration project is unique. However, it is seldom possible to

transpose the experiences and 'lessons to be learnt' directly from one region on to another.

Evidently, political consensus and economic policy convergence between the leading countries in the Horn would facilitate economic interdependence and regional cooperation. This has foreign policy and security implications. Maintaining close foreign policy and security ties and cooperative relationship between Sudan and Ethiopia will turn on the continued perception of shared interests and objectives rather than on the organizational structures through which they arrange their affairs. Shared interests will definitely knit the two countries together.

Both countries also have a broader definition of national interest and security policy, with Ethiopia making it something to be discussed in the public arena. At least it is safe to say that regarding promoting their national interest both seem to have long-term thinking, an important variable for long-term cooperation. In short, in determining the future course of cooperation and regional integration, the variables to consider include geographic proximity, complementary economic contexts, converging political values and policies, allowing the flourishing of trade across national borders as well as the will and capacity to push the process forward. Sudan and Ethiopia fit into this analogy.

Driven by the shared belief that they have common destiny in terms of economic development and security, the two countries have embarked on creating closer links in all conceivable dimensions. Of these the economic aspect figures prominently. As discussed earlier the Ethio-Eritrean war

(1998-2000) heralded the beginning of long-term bilateral cooperation between Sudan and Ethiopia.

Definitely the above discussion throws in to sharp perspective the otherwise-puzzling questions surrounding the leading role that Ethiopia and the Sudan might have had played in creating regionalism in the Horn of Africa. Given that progress in regional integration is partly dependent on a leading sub-regional powers' readiness to play a larger positive role, why the two countries failed to take the lead, so far, needs careful and serious consideration.

For many years there was suspicion and rivalry among Sudan and Ethiopia.   Hence, the dramatic turn about in relations after 1998 must be taken seriously so that it could serve as a corner stone for progress towards regionalism in the region. Old antagonism seem to have receded with the positive steps taken to build mutual confidence; to which end Sudanese oil played key role. This gave the impression that well developed and self-sufficient Sudan could not become erratic and a basis for a new security threat.

4.2.2. Towards An Energy-Led Integration in the Horn of Africa

It was hinted in previous discussions that, the fact that Sudan is now an oil exporter is beginning to transform its relations with its neighbors, notably Ethiopia. This is likely to result in the development of strong economic interests among Sudan's neighbors in stable relations with Khartoum. More widely, we can see the emergence of oil diplomacy in the Horn. Although security will continue to be an important variable, the relationship between Sudan and Ethiopia is

mainly based on new untainted vision, and ambition to advance the cause of their countries. Indeed, Ethiopia singled out a future democratic and united Sudan as its major strategic partner in the region.

The peaceful and close cooperation between Sudan and Ethiopia are thus largely determined by the interests of the actors themselves and the resources they can bring together in pursuit of their interests. And the resources that will prove most critical in the future relations between these two countries will be natural resources, mainly oil and water.

The EPRDF government has reached initial agreements with Sudan on the import of oil and is clearly enthusiastic, although also anxious, at becoming dependent on its neighbor. This is also stimulating close linkages on other sectors of the economy. Ethiopia is anxious to make use of port Sudan and Khartoum is happy to oblige The economic relations are not limited to oil. Ethiopia wants to attract Sudanese investors while Sudan is projecting on the ever-increasing large market in Ethiopia.

Incidentally, Sudan, by the standards of the region, has a dynamic merchant class that with free access across borders and with the input of capital from oil resources is likely to play an important role in the region. Sudanese merchants could also serve as major force in strengthening regional economic integration. Besides, Sudan sees the economic benefits to be derived from such arrangements, but will also definitely see them as binding Addis Ababa to Khartoum and making it increasingly unlikely that the EPRDF would again support the Sudanese opposition.

The economic aspects of the Horn's geopolitics is receiving considerable attention as a result of primarily oil and

water. Over the next decades, it is likely that new energy, water, and infrastructure issues will substantially alter the strategic environment. Both oil from the Sudan to Ethiopia and hydro-electric power from Ethiopia to the countries of the Horn, including Egypt, will form the main basis of economic cooperation on which the survival of regional integration will depend.   Thus, Horn of African integration is being fundamentally anchored on energy-led integrative steps taken between Sudan and Ethiopia, probably including Egypt in the future.

Clearly energy-led integration acts as a stimulus to other areas of cooperation such as infrastructure and port linkages. The continuing significance of oil in the improvement of relations and inter-state peace has already been noted. This significance could well expand over the next decades as a result of increased demand and the exploitation of large, newly proven reserves in the Sudan, other countries of the Horn and Egypt.   Proven and potential oil production in Sudan is estimated at some 450,000 billion barrels per day by 2005 (Sudan Oil Analysis, 2003:2).   Meanwhile, estimates of Sudan's oil reserves are rising rapidly, Equatorial and Bahr El-Ghazal are being opened for exploration, and the country's assumed extensive gas fields in the Red Sea will soon be developed.

Countries in the Horn are so lagging in development that they in fact consume very little oil. However for countries like Uganda and Ethiopia, which are land-locked and have to pay a transport premium for their oil imports, the costs are especially onerous. And as observed by John Young (2000,6) in to this void steps oil exporting Sudan. Infact, Ethiopia's fuel consumption have grown sharply ;a 47% increase over the last

ten years(1993-2003).The Ogaden Basin Fields covering the Somali region of Ethiopia and Somalia is believed to be potentially rich in oil deposits, increasingly attracting oil exploration companies.

Ethiopia's Ogaden region is also rich in gas reserves prompting the establishment of the Calub Gas Share Company by the government. The Somali off share in general has a large potential of oil. Djibouti and Eritrea are also looking for exploration and production of oil along the Red Sea coastal lines. There is similar expansion of large and newly proven oil reserves in Egypt (Horn countries Analysis, 2004:5).

Ethiopia is well positioned to exploit its water resources and export electricity to all its neighbors which was expected to begin in 2004. Indeed, its foreign and security policy white paper released in mid 2003 clearly put power generation and export of electricity to neighboring countries as a priority in its economic relations (Strategy Paper, 2003:27). It also argues that, in return, Ethiopia will seek to use the ports of the neighboring countries. The exploitation and transport of these resources over the next decades will be a dramatic new element in regional politics.

A variety of alternative routes will be considered (as in the case of oil in Gambella through the Sudan or gas in the Ogaden through Somalia or Djibouti) for the shipment of "early and long-term oil pipelines, corridors to the sea and expansion of hydro-electric power lines across the region. On a cost basis alone, it is quite possible that oil from Gambella will go through the Sudan, while other commodities will go through Djibouti, but potentially Eritrea and Somali ports.

Energy resources and its exchange would be hostage to stability; hence the need for security cooperation. The broader point is that new energy-led relationship will change long standing assumptions about choke points and economic interdependence. Major producers of energy will not have the luxury of enjoying its economic benefits without peaceful and cooperative relations with their neighbors.

They will be dependent on stability within and stable relations with neighboring countries. Another example of this phenomenon is already emerging between Sudan and Ethiopia in which security cooperation becomes crucial. The net result is likely to be a more complex set of geopolitical relationships based on energy infrastructure.

Similar developments have been taking place in the Caucasus (FES-Crisis Prevention 2003:30-31), where energy infrastructure and transport networking is greatly improving the relations between Georgia and Armenia on the on hand and Georgia and Azerbaijan one the other (Hughes & Bradshaw, 1999:13). Thus, countries in the Horn should see regional economic cooperation not only as a precondition for economic development, but also as a pre requisite for conflict resolution or as a way to resolve the succession of conflicts.

The implications of this trend could vary substantially depending upon the overall stability of the Horn of African sub-region. New vulnerabilities and opportunities for leverage in conflict will emerge. On the other hand, more diverse energy routes could also reinforce economic interdependence and help to dampen the potential for conflict where energy revenues and pipeline fees are at stake. Notwithstanding this fact energy-led economic interdependence will also help to revive overland links.

Overland transportation in the Horn has remained backward and without any marked improvement over the last half a century. Transportation infrastructure within states has remained underdeveloped. More significantly, political obstacles have impeded the growth of Tran regional links. Recently overland links are being renovated and new links are beginning to emerge, with potentially important implications for regional politics. The recently opened Gondar-Gadarif road (including the relations created among regional states in Sudan and Ethiopia) open the possibilities of overland shipment of oil from Sudan to Ethiopia. Revitalizing the traditional transport system through the Baro river across the Nile will also serve the desired purpose, which needs careful consideration.

Similarly, a comprehensive settlement between Eritrea and its big neighbors (Ethiopia and Sudan) in the future would open up the possibility of direct overland trade relations among the northern parts of Ethiopia, Eritrea and the Sudan. Mainly Eritrea and the Tigray region will be linked to the oil-led economic development of the Sudan, which will have long-term political and economic implications. This will promote cross border trade, the movement of people; and may be an increasing number of migrant labour to Sudan both creating new opportunities for a broader movement toward regional economic interdependence. The political and strategic ramifications of this development will be enormous, which needs careful examination.

Another contentious element but potentially key driver of regional peace and cooperation is water. Competition over water resources is widely seen as a key source of conflict in the region over the next decades. Leading water related flash points will include Sudan, Ethiopia and Egypt over the Nile Basin and Ethiopia and Somalia over the Wabi Shebelle

126

waters. Of these the dispute between Egypt and Ethiopia is probably the most dangerous.

Energy-led economic integration and peace building in the Horn will be impacted, for good or for worse, by the negotiations on the use of the Nile waters. Curiously positive developments are emerging in this regard. A conflict over the Nile would hurt everything. A crisis in the Horn is so much a crisis in the Nile, that the two aspects must be taken into account together for there to be a meaningful perception of conflict resolution in the region. Its repercussion is two-fold. Egypt can obstruct Ethio-Sudanese relations due to its political influence over Khartoum; hence a challenge. But if the issue of the Nile waters is resolved, Egypt will be a crucial partner.

Due to hydro politics, Egypt has worked hard to undermine Ethiopian stability and influence in the region. It also fought hard to ensure that Ethiopia does not receive international financial loans for major (and even most minor) water development projects. This is, however, changing slightly. Major powers, financial institutions and mainly the US may have slowly begun to discount Egyptian positions and accept Ethiopian argument that security in the horn is ultimately dependent on development and the latter is conditional upon fully developing the waters of the Blue Nile basin.

Egyptian leaders also seem to realize that a prolonged impasse is counter-productive. Although still pursuing a go slow policy, a sober recognition of the value of the peace dividends of an agreement by way of opening avenues for constructive cooperation seem to be slowly accepted as a lesser-evil scenario in Egyptian policy circles.

The Nile 2000 conference and other attempts such as the Nile Basin initiative(NBI) have gone some way to break some of the psycho-political hurdles surrounding the Nile basin. As late as last year Sudan, Egypt and Ethiopia have formed a tri-lateral forum represented at the level of foreign ministers to discuss and forge common positions on the cooperative use of the Nile waters. Indeed Ethiopia and Egypt are meeting almost regularly since 1998 to foster better relations (Horn of Africa Review, 1998:2).

There is a realization now that the Nile offers great potential to all concerned including the Sudan, Egypt and Ethiopia. Given the vital need for a regional water development plan that incorporates the political realities of the region as well as the limitations imposed by economics and hydrology, the countries involved should remain engaged in constructive dialogue, until an agreed –upon criteria for fair ownership and distribution of the Nile waters. In this way water could lead the direction for conflict resolution of a regional magnitude.

As witnessed in the Middle East (Aron T.Wolf 2000:16) shared water resources and their management exemplifies the best and the worst of relations. They have brought nations to the brink of armed conflict, but they have also been a catalyst to cooperation between other wise hostile neighbors (ibid). Continued and sustained dialogue to break the Nile impasse will be crucial for *energy-led* economic integration and a second most important substantive requirement for establishing regional peace and security order. This will greatly change the geopolitics of North-East Africa and alter the age-old security order in the region. It will be a good example of the complementarily between conflict resolution and development.

Water is already an increasingly prominent issue in the security perceptions of the three countries. Conventionally, the persistence of water dependence, its energy use and, above all, perceived vulnerabilities will make control over downstream water supply a source of leverage in crisis and conflicts. Ethiopia could for instance use such a leverage over Somalia.

In reality, however, tempering with the downstream flow is not easily accomplished without environmental and political costs to the upstream states, suggesting that instances of a large-scale strategic interference with water supply will be a rarity. Where the general evolution of relations is positive (as is evident among the three countries), cooperation over increasingly valuable water resources could spur the peaceful resolution of disputes.

This cooperation has already been evident in the closer links between Sudan and Ethiopia as well as the ongoing Nile Basin Initiatives. The prospects for a wider settlement will require more serious treatment (such as equitable share) of water issues. Under these conditions, Ethiopian water resources will be a key asset for encouraging and consolidating peace in the wider region.

4.2.3. _Conclusion:_ the Growing Economic Dimensions of Peace and Security

From the perspectives of relations between regional states (mainly Sudan and Ethiopia), the economic dimension will be critical, and not simply because of energy and non energy trade. The proliferation of lines of communication for energy, port services and other trade will boost economic interdependence, and ultimately integration. The economic dimension of future regional peace and security order is likely to be more prominent rather than less.

Already the gab between Sudan and Ethiopia on the issue of the Nile is being narrowed; with Sudan increasingly coming closer to the Ethiopian position of equity. This is predicated on the possible revision of the 1959 agreement on the sharing of the Nile waters between Sudan and Egypt. This clearly shows the increasing closeness and understanding between the two countries.

Thus, the evolving *energy-led* economic integration encompasses several goals. Strengthening the political and economic sovereignty and independence of the countries of the region and encouraging political and economic reform, mitigating regional conflicts by building economic linkages between the states of the region; and maximizing the countries commercial opportunities. There will be greater emphasis on energy security and greater engagement among neighbors.

What is important, however, is that the "economic approach" appears to offer greater prospects for success in the search for paths towards peaceful solutions in the Horn of Africa. Two sectors in which the benefits are obvious to all sides appear to offer an appropriate way in to regional cooperation are energy and transport. Just as in other parts of the glob, the Horn of African economic community could grow out of initial cooperation in these two sectors.

There will be numerous points of interaction between Ethiopia and the Sudan with its potentially important role in security of the sub-region. Security cooperation has already been evident between the two countries, that dominate the region. No doubt, permanent and strong long-term economic interest is vital in the newly evolving security power order between Sudan and Ethiopia. Another strategic interest that links Khartoum and Addis Ababa is their shared and deep antipathy to the Eritrean regime of Isayas Afeworki.

Common security threat is often a basis for strong cooperation. The existence of a common external threat during the cold war was a powerful impulse towards regionalism in both Europe and East Asia. In Southern Africa, the common threat of Apartheid South Africa in the 1970's and 1980's pushed the independent countries of Southern Africa towards economic and political cooperation, notably in the creation of SADC.

Yemen has also lately joined the Ethio-Sudanese cooperation. This seem to have resulted in the so called the Sa'na Forum. This Forum marks the beginning of another regional grouping in the Horn and Southern Red Sea. Given that the progress in regional integration is dependent on building trust between the members, their size and significance in the region, the common security needs, their shared economic ideals, the members of the Forum seem to be serious to forge closer links in all conceivable dimensions.

Creating a workable security order is often the end result of regional organizations. But the Sa'na Forum have made it its organizing principle during its formative period. May be it already has gone a long-way to fulfill the basic preconditions for establishing a security community? It seem to have also created from the outset a strategic consensus (before establishing the structure) which is a basic prerequisite for establishing a workable peace and security order.

It is a necessary imperative that a regional integration process is infused at the beginning with strong political will and a committed leadership. This will enable the Forum to push the process forward. Institutional backing is important but not a substitute for member countries commitment to the overall process. In short, determining what constitutes a region is not a mere geographic exercise, but rather complementary

economic contexts, converging political values and policies, strategic consensus and common security agendas.

Regional cooperation is not a matter of numbers; it is a matter of sensible purposes. No doubt, *energy-led* integration and economic cooperation is becoming a mechanism of conflict resolution and peace building between the most important states of the Horn. Strengthening and expanding this zone of cooperation remains, however, a very challenging issue indeed. This needs careful consideration by all state and non-state actors, in the region and outside, who have a stake in the peaceful resolution of conflicts in the Horn of Africa.

In this regard three broad conclusions stand out:
- The Ethio-Sudan partnership may continue as the locomotive of community construction and remains the most plausible engine for regionalism in the Horn of Africa.
- The newly evolving economic cooperation is having clear foreign policy and security implications, with convergence on issues such as Somalia. It has also greatly eased the tension and contributes for the improvement of relations between the two countries.
- Egypt is feeling greater energy security and greater engagement on the issue of the Nile waters; which if resolved amicably, will in turn lead to consolidating peace and *energy-led* integration in the Horn of Africa.

This should, however, be punctuated by further democratizing the state and promoting the role of civil society organizations in the process; incorporating *human security* in to the parameters of the security equation, creating an *anti-destabilization regime*, and the adoption of a *collective security system*. This will go a long way in meeting the requirements in terms of internal peace within states and the

substantive requirements for a durable regional peace and security order

Regional integration schemes should also have to move beyond their inherent governmentalism. Bringing the citizen on board and democratizing the process from bottom up is particularly important as regional integration schemes progress towards economic interdependence. All countries that are part of the process should be equally ready to participate fully in the new economic course. The importance of self definition of a region should be seen more in terms of the grouping's economic objectives and security implications.

To prevent the entire integration (and its resultant peace building) process from being held up by lagging economics, member countries must decide to move ahead at different speeds. Hence, the progress being made by small grouping of countries on a similar economic and political trajectory deserves encouragement and support. After all the end result will be a regional security order and economic and political integration. It is a truism that, the future of the Horn of Africa, for better or worse, will be determined regionally.

REFERENCES

- Alex de Waal. "Class and Power In A Stateless Somalia" <u>A Discussion Paper</u>. Revised. October 2, 2002.
- Altaye Alaro. "The Government of Sudan: A Liability or An Asset to Regional Cooperation" No date.
- Aron T. Wolf. "Middle East Water Conflicts and Directions for Conflict Resolution". <u>In the Eye On Ethiopia and the Horn of Africa.</u> Vol. XIV N<u>o</u> 67.
- Caroline Thomas & Peter Wilkin (ed.) <u>Globalization, Human Security, and the African Experience.</u> London. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc. 1999.
- Clapham Christopher. "Notes on the Ethio-Eritrean Boundary Demarcation". Nov. 3, 2003.
- Collier, Paul. "Doing Well out of War". <u>Paper prepared for conference on Economic Agendas in Civil Wars</u>. London. April 26-27.1999.
- Country Analysis-On Oil and Electricity in Sudan, Ethiopia, Djibouti, Eritrea, Somalia and Egypt. March-April 2003 Issue.
- "Conflict Resolution-Peacekeeping: Contributions by The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung to Civil Conflict Transformation". <u>Division for International Cooperation and International Dialogue</u>. Berlin. 2003.
- Deng, Francies M., and Zartman, I. William. <u>Sovereignty as Responsibility: Conflict Management In Africa.</u> Washington, DC. Brooking Institution, 1996.
- Dougherty, James E. and Robert L. Pfaltzgraf Jr. <u>Contemporary Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey</u> (Third edition). New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1990.
- "Environmental Change and Security Project Report" <u>The Woodrow Wilson Center,,</u> September 1999.
- "Environmental Conflict Management And Sustainable Development". In <u>Environmental Change, Consensus Building and Resource Management (ECOMAN) project. Conference Papers,</u> Asmara rebruary, 1996.
- Ethiopian-Eritrean Border Commission /EEBC/ "Delimitation Decision", 13 April, 2002.
- "Ethiopian Foreign and Security Policy and Strategy". <u>A Government White Paper.</u> Released in mid- 2003.
- Ethiopian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. <u>Press Release</u>, 29 September, 2003.
- Fantu Cheru. "Renewing and Restoring Democracy In Africa. A Herculean Task". <u>Paper Prepared for the Conference on Development and Democracy In Sub-Saharan Africa,</u> IFAA, Johannesburg, 1992.

- Haggai Erlich. "the Saudis and Ethiopia-which Islam"? <u>A Paper Presented to the XVI International Conference of Ethiopian Studies.</u> Hamburg. July 2003.
- Hansen Stig Jarle. "Warlords, Patrimonialism and Ethnicism". University of Wales at Aberystwyth. No date.
- Horn of Africa- The Monthly Review. Compiled by the UNDP Emergency Unit for Ethiopia. May 27-June 28,1996. Vol.1. No. 3
- _____ Vol. / No. 7. November 1-31. 1996.
- _____ November –December 1998.
- Inter-Africa Group & Justice Africa. "The African Union and Peace and Security". <u>Issues Paper</u> for the African Union Symposium, Organized by the African Development Forum and the United Nations Economic commission for Africa, 2002, Addis Ababa.
- Ken Menkhaus. "Protracted Armed Conflict, Lawlessness, and State Collapse in Somalia". Davidson College 2002.
- Kent Hughes Butts Arthur L. Bradshaw, Jr. (ed.) <u>Caspian Sea: International Environmental Security.</u> By Center for Strategic Leadership. United States. 1998.
- Kumar Rupesinghe. "From Civil War to Civil Peace: Multi Track Solutions to Armed Conflict". Discussion Paper, July 1996, Addis Ababa.
- Letter from the President of Eritrea to the UN Secretary General. Dated 17 September, 2003.
- Letter from the Prime Minister of Ethiopia to the President of the Security Council. Dated 19 September 2003.
- Laure Nathan. <u>The Changing of the Guard: Armed Forces and Defence Policy In a Democratic South Africa.</u> Human Sciences Research Council. Pretoria. HSRC Publishers. 1994.
- Malewezi, Justin. "Regional Integration: the Path to Prosperity". In- <u>Regional Integration in Southern African.</u> SAIIA. 2001.

- Markakis, John. <u>Resource Conflict In the Horn of Africa.</u> London. SAGE Publishers, 1998.
- Martin G. Fischer. (ed.) "Conflict and Cooperation In the Horn of Africa". <u>Conference Papers Published by Frederich-Ebert Stiftung- Ethiopia Office.</u> November, 2002.
- Matt Bryden. "The IGAD Peace Process For Somalia: One Step Forward or Two Steps Back?" Paper presented at a lecture on Somalia, Addis Ababa. October 7, 2002.
- Medhane Tadess. <u>Al-ittihad: Political Islam and Black Economy In Somalia. Religion, Money, Clan and the Struggle for Supremacy Over Somalia.</u> Addis Ababa. Mega Printing Enterprise. 2002.
- Medhane Tadesse. "The Conflict Between the Borana Oromo and the Somali". <u>Paper Presented at ECOMAN Conference, London, 1998.</u>

- Medhane Tadesse. <u>The Eritrean-Ethiopian War: Retrospect and Prospects. Reflections on the Making of Conflicts in the Horn of Africa.</u> 1991-1998. Addis Ababa. Mega Printers, 1999.
- Medhane Tadesse. "Religion, Peace and The Future of Ethiopia". <u>A Paper Presented to the 1st National Conference on Federalism, Conflict and Peace Building In Ethiopia.</u> Addis Ababa. May 5-7, 2003.
- Mesfin Araya. "Issues of Hegemony In Post-independent Eritrea. "<u>In Ethiopia in Broader Perspective. The 13th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies.</u> Kyoto. Japan, 1997.
- Mohamed Suliman. (ed.) <u>Ecology, Politics and Violent conflict</u>. London: Zed Books, 1999.
- Mwagiru, Makumi. "Beyond the OAU: Prospects for Conflict Management in the Horn of Africa". <u>The Kent Journal of International Relations</u> 9,no. 2, 1995.
- Peter Adwak. <u>The Politics of Liberation In South Sudan: An Insider's View.</u> Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 2000.
- Report by Executive Secretary of IGAD. Tekeste Gebray. 14-15 March 1998.
- Rocky Williams. "From Collective Security to Peace Building" In – <u>Regional Integration in Southern Africa.</u> SAIIA. 2001.
- Schraeder, Peter. J. "Ethnic Politics In Djibouti: From 'Eye of the Hurricane' To 'Boiling Cauldron'." <u>African Affairs.</u> No. 367.1993.
- Steinberg B.James. "<u>An Ever Closer Union</u>": European Integration and Its <u>Implications for the Future of U.S- European Relations.</u> RAND. 1993.
- Sudan Update In Oil Energy in Sudan. (2003).
- Tesfatsion Medhane. <u>Eritrea and Neighbours In The New World Order: Geopolitics, Democracy and 'Islamic Fundamentalism'.</u> Hamburg. Lit verlag, 1994.
- "The Algiers Agreement." December 12, 2000. Algiers.
- The Pencil: "Defending Indefensible, Indulging Incompetence". By <u>Awate Team.</u> January 11, 2004.
- Track Two- "Constructive Approaches To Community and Political Conflict." Vol. 4 No. 3 September 1995.
- US Department of State "International Religious Freedom Report". December 23, 2003.
- Woodward, Peter & Murray Forsyth. <u>Horn of Africa: Federalism and its Alternatives.</u> Dartmouth, England, 1994.
- Young, John. "Along Ethiopia's Western Frontier: Gambella and Benishangul In Transition. "<u>JMAS</u>. Vol. 37. No.2. 1999
- Young, John. "Sudanese- Ethiopian Relations in the Post. Cold War Era." Unpublished Material. 2000.

" This sensible,concise volume on the road map to Horn of African peace and security order discusses the centrality of an economic framework to conflict resolution. The authors' general premise is that the nature of the state remains at the root of the regional conflict system and argues that the only way to transform conflicts to cooperation is through parallel democratisation and cooperation on selected economic sectors. The study identifies the strategic centrality of Sudanese oil and Ethiopia's water resources as new economic and security choke points,and concludes that the exploitation and transport of these resources over the next decade will be a dramatic new element in regional politics and integration.....This is a book that deserves to be read."

Hartmut Hess
Friedrich-Ebert -Stiftung ,Ethiopia Office

Medhane Tadesse –a specialist on the Horn of Africa-has written extensively on variouse historical and political issues of intra and inter state conflicts,and is uniquely qualified to write on the Horn's international relations. For information about securing Medhane for your next executive retreat, panel discussion, conference ,or executive briefing email at mt 3002 et@ yahoo.com or mt2002et@telecom.net.et. For his latest research on regional conflicts contact your local bookstore or call at 251-9-210149.

FRIEDRICH
EBERT
STIFTUNG