

HOW TO ADDRESS THE CONCEPT OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY
USING THE SOUTHERN AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT
COMMUNITY STANDBY BRIGADE

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE
General Studies

by

PAUL SAPEZO, MAJOR, ZAMBIA ARMY
Botswana Defence Command and Staff College and Dip DSS
University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana, 2016

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
2018

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. United States Fair Use determination or copyright permission has been obtained for the use of pictures, maps, graphics, and any other works incorporated into the manuscript. This author may be protected by more restrictions in their home countries, in which case further publication or sale of copyrighted images is not permissible.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved</i> <i>OMB No. 0704-0188</i>		
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 15-06-2018		2. REPORT TYPE Master's Thesis		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) AUG 2017 – JUN 2018	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE How to Address the Concept of Collective Security Using the Southern African Development Community Standby Brigade			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Major Paul Sapezo			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301			8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT Southern African Development Community Standby Brigade (SADCBRIG) is one of five brigades that constitute the African Standby Force (ASF). The SADCBRIG was formed in 2007; a decade down the line, it has only been in action on two occasions. The question this situation begs is how to make the SADCBRIG more responsive to handling contemporary security challenges that the sub-region may face. In doing so, this study used two case studies from Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) intervention in that sub-region. Using a qualitative methodology, this study analyzed ECOMOG interventions in Liberia in 1990 and Sierra Leone in 1999 to restore peace and security. A number of positive achievements were registered from the two interventions, as well as challenges. This research focused on what lessons did ECOMOG learn during these two deployments and what can the SADCBRIG embrace in order to improve its ability to address future contemporary security challenges in the sub-region.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Collective Security, SADC, SADCBRIG, ECOWAS, ECOMOG, ASF, APSA					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT (U)	b. ABSTRACT (U)	c. THIS PAGE (U)			(U)

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Name of Candidate: Major Paul Sapezo

Thesis Title: How to Address the Concept of Collective Security using the Southern African Development Community Standby Brigade

Approved by:

_____, Thesis Committee Chair
Michael J. Burke, M.Ed.

_____, Member
Dennis S. Burket, Ed.D.

_____, Member
Douglas E. Lathrop, M.A.

Accepted this 15th day of June 2018 by:

_____, Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Dr. Robert Baumann, Ph.D.

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

HOW TO ADDRESS THE CONCEPT OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY USING THE SOUTHERN AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY STANDBY BRIGADE, by Major Paul Sapezo, 107 pages.

Southern African Development Community Standby Brigade (SADCBRIG) is one of five brigades that constitute the African Standby Force (ASF). The SADCBRIG was formed in 2007; a decade down the line, it has only been in action on two occasions. The question this situation begs is how to make the SADCBRIG more responsive to handling contemporary security challenges that the sub-region may face.

In doing so, this study used two case studies from Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) intervention in that sub-region. Using a qualitative methodology, this study analyzed ECOMOG interventions in Liberia in 1990 and Sierra Leone in 1999 to restore peace and security. A number of positive achievements were registered from the two interventions, as well as challenges. This research focused on what lessons did ECOMOG learn during these two deployments and what can the SADCBRIG embrace in order to improve its ability to address future contemporary security challenges in the sub-region.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Jehovah Ebenezer, I am most grateful to God Almighty because His grace has brought me this far. I have enjoyed His divine health throughout my stay in the United States, thereby having the opportunity to study and work on this thesis. In my mind, I have no doubt that, without God's grace, I would have not had the opportunity to undertake this study. I am forever indebted to my committee chairman, Mr. Michael J. Burke, for his guidance throughout the period of my study, despite his plate being full as he chaired more than four research projects.

I want to acknowledge and thank the tireless effort from the other two committee members, Dr. Dennis S. Burket and Mr. Douglas E. Lathrop. They both brought an oasis of knowledge on African affairs especially on matters related to corrective security. Mr. Lathrop's immense knowledge in Research Methodology helped me in setting the foundation for the study. His painstaking accuracy in proofreading is highly appreciated too. I want to thank my Staff Group Adviser, Dr. Richard A. McConnell, for encouraging me to stay within the timeline for the MMAS program. Let me not forget to thank the faculty of the Graduate Degree Programs and the staff at the CARL Center for their selfless support to the study.

Let me finally thank my family back home in Zambia for enduring my absence and morally supporting me to be able to timely and successfully complete my study. Once more, let me thank everyone who made it possible for me to achieve this goal. May the Almighty God bless you all. Shalom, Shalom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE THESIS APPROVAL PAGE	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
ACRONYMS.....	viii
ILLUSTRATIONS	ix
TABLES	x
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background.....	1
Research Questions.....	5
Assumptions.....	6
Limitations	6
Delimitation	7
Significance	7
Arrangement of Chapters.....	8
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
The Theory of Collective Security.....	9
The African Union Security Architecture.....	14
Authority for Creation of Regional Security Mechanisms	19
Donor Countries' Involvement in Regional Peace Initiatives	20
The Creation of the SADC Brigade.....	21
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	25
Introduction.....	25
Methodology and Hypothesis	25
Step 1. Identification and Framing the Problem	28
Step 2. Review of Relevant Data	28
Step 3. Collection and Classification of Data	29
Step 4. Data Analysis	30
Variables	33

Step 5. Conclusions and Recommendations	33
Summary	34
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS	35
A Case Study of ECOMOG Intervention in Liberia 1990 -1997	35
Challenges Faced by Intervention Forces in Liberia (Assessing the Variables)	43
Collective Security Principles	44
Strong Military Coalition	44
Commitment to Intervention	46
Presence of a Hegemon	48
Responsiveness of Deployment	49
Clear and Feasible Mandate Supported by a UNSC Resolution	49
Troop Contributing Countries Support	53
Operational Status	55
Financial Support	55
Command and Control	57
Interoperability among Troop Contributing Countries	60
A Case Study of ECOMOG Intervention in Sierra Leone	63
Challenges Faced by ECOMOG Forces in Sierra Leone (Assessing the Variables)....	69
Collective Security Principles	69
Strong Military Coalition	69
Commitment to Intervention	71
Presence of a Hegemon	72
Responsiveness of Deployment	74
Clear and Feasible Mandate Supported by a UNSC Resolution	74
Troop Contributing Countries Support	75
Operational Status	77
Financial Support	77
Command and Control	78
Interoperability among Troop Contributing Countries	79
Summary Analysis of the Two Case Studies Results	80
Summary	81
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	84
Introduction	84
Requirements for Making a Sub-Regional Organization Formidable	85
Major Challenges to Establishing a Formidable Sub-Regional Force	86
Addressing Divergent Doctrines and Language to Achieve Interoperability	87
Mustering Political Will of Member States to Attain Their Commitment	87
Recommendations	87
Recommendations for Further Study	89
Conclusion	89
REFERENCE LIST	91

ACRONYMS

AFRC	Armed Forces Revolutionary Council
APSA	African Peace and Security Architecture
AU	African Union
CEWS	Continental Early Warning System
ECOWAS	Economic Community of the West African States
ECOMOG	Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group
FC	Force Commander
OAU	Organization of the African Unity
PSC	Peace and Security Council
RUF	Revolutionary United Front
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SADCBRIG	Southern Africa Development Community Standby Brigade
SMC	Standing Mediation Committee
TCC	Troop Contributing Country

ILLUSTRATIONS

	Page
Figure 1. Map of SADC Member States	4
Figure 2. Map of Liberia	35
Figure 3. Map of ECOWAS Member States	37
Figure 4. Map of Sierra Leone	63

TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Assessment of ECOMOG Conflict Interventions.....	33
Table 2. Summary Analysis of ECOMOG Conflict Interventions	81

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The SADC Brigade is to serve in peace-building efforts including post-conflict disarmament and demobilization and humanitarian assistance in conflict areas and areas impacted by major natural disasters. The Brigade operates as a tool of the SADC Organ on Politics, Defense and Security Cooperation (PDSC) and is guided by the SADC Committee of Chiefs of Defense Staff and the Committee of SADC Police Chiefs. Training of the Brigade at all levels is a key priority for SADC despite the financial challenges that may be encountered. The Regional Peacekeeping Training Centre located in Zimbabwe and other national peace support training institutions play a pivotal role in the training of military commanders, police officers and civilian officials at various levels of the Brigade.

—SADC Secretariat, “SADC Standby Brigade”

Background

The Organization of the African Unity (OAU), the predecessor of the African Union (AU), was formed more than half a century ago on 25 May 1963. The OAU’s premise stemmed from a Pan-African dream for unity with all countries on the continent becoming politically liberated and economically assertive. One of the pioneers of the OAU, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah advocated for establishment of a continental army under a central high command (Vines 2013, 89). Nkrumah’s vision was to have a continental army to deal with the security challenges that were embroiling the continent’s newly independent states. Most of Nkrumah’s compatriots did not support this vision; therefore, it never materialized. The OAU did not do much in terms of the peace and conflict resolutions as it focused more on the liberation of the rest of the continent.

The AU was born on 26 May 2001 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, taking over from the OAU. The AU inherited OAU’s challenges, increased in scope and intensity with world globalization. This organization had to revise its structure to meet contemporary

challenges. Therefore, along with the emphasis on economic growth, the AU had to look for ways of addressing contemporary security challenges. The AU organization included the Peace and Security Council (PSC) with its mandate to promote peace and security on the continent (Vines 2013, 96). Article 5(2) of the Constitutive Act of the AU defines other mechanisms to support the work of the PSC. As well as the Commission, these are comprised of the Panel of the Wise (POW), the Continental Early Warning System (CEWS), African Standby Force (ASF), Common African Defense and Security Policy (CADSP), and the Military Staff Committee (MSC) (Ramsbotham, Alhaji, and Fanny 2005, 331).

The ASF is meant to be the military instrument to intervene in peace and security threats when force intervention is needed (Fitz-Gerald 2017). The PSC provides for the peace and security architecture for the regional organization. The Standby Force is comprised of five standby brigades (Neethling and Litt 2005, 68). The five brigades are North African Regional (Arab Maghreb Union) Standby Force, Economic Community of the West African States (ECOWAS) Standby Force, Economic Community for Central African States (ECCAS) Standby Force, East African Community (EAC) Standby Force, and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Standby Brigade. The five sub-regional forces together form the African Union Standby Force. The African Union Standby Force is empowered under the United Nation Charter, Chapter VIII, in addressing matters of peace and security for the region (United Nations 1945).

SADC is an economic organization of the Southern African states made up of fifteen members: Angola, Botswana, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa,

Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe as highlighted in figure 1. The forerunner to SADC was the Southern African Development Cooperation Conference (SADCC), established in 1980, whose formation was for the purpose of reducing reliance on apartheid South Africa and supporting the liberation of Namibia. After accomplishing these two objectives, SADCC was reoriented to create a regional development community focused on trade, and was rebranded as the SADC in 1992 (Amdemichael 2006, 25). The reorientation did not end at trade, but went on to develop mechanisms within its structures to address security challenges, hence the formation of the SADC Interstate Defense and Security Committee (ISDSC). The ISDSC inputs formed the SADC Brigade.

SADC has remained relatively peaceful compared to other regions on the continent over the past two decades. However, that does not mean there has not been a need for force intervention to keep the peace. Within its structures, SADC has a Standby Brigade, which forms part of the African Union Standby Force (African Union 2005). The brigade formed on 17 August 2007 in Lusaka, Zambia, after the SADC Interstate Defense and Security Committee directed its Ministerial Defense sub-committee to create a working team to spearhead the formation of the SADC Brigade at its 2004 meeting in Lesotho (African Union 2005). The brigade is comprised of a military component along with police and civilian specialists from the fifteen member states of SADC. As the term indicates, the brigade is standby army not a standing army. Member states contribute personnel to the brigade when the need arises.



Figure 1. Map of SADC Member States

Source: South African History Online, “Southern African Development Community (SADC),” 2012, accessed 21 September 2017, <http://www.sahistory.org.za/organisations/southern-african-development-community-sadc>.

The brigade assembles for the purpose of training and intervention when needed. Drawing troops from various member states makes relief of the troops easier compared to drawing personnel from one country (Gamba 2008, 60).

From the time the SADC Brigade formed, it has met annually for training in different locations of the member states. It has intervened only twice in security situations. In Lesotho, it deployed troops from Botswana and South Africa to quell a would-be coup d’état in 2008. The brigade also deployed troops from Angola, Namibia,

and South Africa after the Lesotho Chief of Defense Force was assassinated by one of his generals in September 2017. The brigade deployed as a measure to prevent the situation from escalating into a situation that would endanger the peace and security of the country and the sub-region. However, the brigade could not intervene in Madagascar in 2009 when there was a security crisis as the regional leaders opted to pursue diplomatic means (Fabricius 2009, 16).

The brigade has been in existence for ten years, but faces a number of challenges that, unless resolved or mitigated, would make it less viable than it is. In its ten years of existence, the brigade embarked on building a logistics base in Rasesa located 40 km north of Botswana's capital Gaborone. But the construction of the base is not yet complete. This paper will investigate those challenges, and seek solutions to the challenges by comparing it to other regional organizations like the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in addressing some of the challenges that the brigade faces. The construction of the Rasesa Logistics Base is already one way of addressing some of the challenges that the brigade faces.

Research Questions

The SADC Brigade was formed in 2007. A decade later, it has only been in action on two occasions. The region has remained relatively calm, save for the enduring conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the political instability in Lesotho, where the brigade intervened twice, the political situation in Zimbabwe, and the political impasse that was in Madagascar, but was resolved by diplomatic means.

Given the scale of involvement in conflict intervention by the brigade thus far, this study focuses on the primary question: How can the brigade be made capable of

meeting the contemporary security challenges of the twenty-first century that may confront the region? From the primary research question, secondary questions must be addressed as well. Key among them are:

1. What is required to make the SADC Brigade a formidable force to address twenty-first-century security challenges in Southern Africa?
2. What have been the major challenges to establishing the SADC Brigade?
3. How do the issues of divergent doctrines and language differences among member states affect interoperability in the brigade?
4. What is required for SADC to muster the political will of member states to create a functional and versatile standby force?
5. Why do the same countries contribute troops for interventions conducted by the brigade?

Assumptions

This research is based on the assumption that South Africa will remain the hegemonic power when conducting future brigade interventions. It also assumes the capability of the majority of the member states is inadequate to contribute troops at short notice to effectively address security challenges since almost the same countries have responded during the few times the brigade has been called to action.

Limitations

The foremost limitation to this research work is the lack time and resources to interview chiefs of defense and other key personnel from the member states from the SADC Headquarters in Gaborone, Botswana. Such access would have allowed

interaction with key personnel and gather firsthand information. The thesis will therefore limit itself to literature already written on the SADC Brigade as its primary source of data and draw logical deductions based on those resources, and recommend the possible way forward.

Delimitation

This thesis is limited to the SADC Standby Brigade from the time it was formed in 2007 until 2017. The thesis will investigate the achievements and challenges that the brigade achieved during this period. The region has experienced a few security encounters; therefore, the thesis will look at how the brigade responded to those challenges by undertaking a case study of the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), and recommend ways of improving the performance of SADCBRIG.

Significance

This thesis will endeavor to show the SADC Brigade can be a viable tool in addressing the contemporary security challenges of the twenty-first-century confronting the region. This research will address the inadequacies of the brigade and suggest measures to make it a force to reckon with in addressing security challenges in the SADC region when called upon by the AU. It will also add to the body of knowledge that already exists on the subject matter, and recommend further research to continue addressing the gaps in terms of information on the matter. The significance of the study therefore lies in identifying the challenges the brigade faces and providing possible solutions to make the brigade more viable.

Arrangement of Chapters

This thesis comprises of five chapters. Chapter 1 sets the background of collective security mechanisms with a general broad overview of the African context then narrows down to SADC. Chapter 2 reviews the relevant literature on collective security and principles with a focus of the AU's PSC and the SADC collective security framework. Chapter 3 outlines the qualitative methodology used based on two case studies. Chapter 4 deals with the analysis of the ECOMOG intervention to the crises in Liberia and Sierra Leone by looking into the variables. Chapter 5 will conclude by making recommendations based on the analysis of the case studies, which will be the basis for making SADCBRIG a better-positioned collective security mechanism to address the contemporary challenges of the twenty-first-century in the sub-region and beyond when called upon.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this literature review is to evaluate existing literature relevant to the thesis, and identify any gaps this research may fill. The author will review theories of collective security from which regional security stems, addressing AU peace and security mechanisms, and how the SADC Brigade is imbedded within. The literature review will identify gaps in the brigade. The AU's comprehensive approach to addressing security challenges is through the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA). The APSA was established on 26 December 2003 to shape a comprehensive agenda for peace and security on the continent. It is comprised of the PSC, CEWS, Panel of the Wise, and the ASF (Fisher, Bah, Mniema, Okome, Tamba, Frederiksen, Abdelaziz, and Reeve 2011, 18-21).

The Theory of Collective Security

The Conflict Research Consortium at the University of Colorado defines Collective Security as “one type of alliance building strategy in which a group of nations agree not to attack each other and to defend each other against an attack from one of the others, if such an attack is made” (Conflict Research Consortium 2005). Collective security is premised on the principle that an attack on a member of the alliance is an attack upon all. The consortium further differentiates collective security from collective defense in that collective defense is an alliance of nations that agree to defend its own group against outside attacks (Conflict Research Consortium 2005). A vivid example of collective security architecture is the United Nations, under which regional organizations

like SADC are nested, while the Northern Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is an example of collective defense. The theory of collective security states there is normally a greater power at the core of the formation of an alliance that seeks to address collective security among the nation states. The greater power can choose to either form a bilateral or multilateral alliance (Nishida 2008, 9). In the case of SADC, the greater power (hegemon) is South Africa; SADC is a multilateral alliance.

The theory of collective security is premised on the fact that member states of the alliance must have common security threats. Nishida argues that greater powers might choose to form an alliance even when it has the capability of adequately confronting an aggressor alone, but forming an alliance could save its economic and military resources by cost sharing with the members of the alliance (Nishida 2008, 13). It can be argued from this background that collective security has advantages. According to Kupchan and Kupchan, there are two main advantages of collective security, in that it provides for a more effective balancing against aggressors, and promotes trust and cooperation (Kupchan and Kupchan 1995, 54-57).

Collective security provides more effective balancing against aggressors by embracing more effective mechanisms for confronting threats when they emerge, making aggression less likely by ameliorating the competitive nature of international relations. The contemporary environment, where the security threats are diverse, provides concerted efforts in addressing the threat of terrorism. This advantage, when it works, confronts aggressors with a preponderance of force as opposed to merely applying an equal force because the alliance provides more force to counter the threat as compared to one nation state (Kupchan and Kupchan 1995, 54).

The Kupchans indicate that collective security promotes trust and cooperation among members of an alliance. They argue that authors like Mearsheimer misrepresent collective security's reliance upon promotion of trust among states as one of its chief logical flaws. "Collective security is an incomplete theory" (Mearsheimer 1994-95, 35). Mearsheimer argues that great powers live in an essentially competitive environment where they consider others as potential adversaries and therefore look to maximize power at the expense of each other. He asserts that it is from the competitive nature that trust and cooperation can be elusive (Mearsheimer 2001, 55). However, the Kupchans argue that trust and cooperation among alliances is very possible, and is one of the two paramount advantages.

The Kupchans contend that collective security ameliorates the security dilemma, consequently increasing stability and minimizing the possibility of unintended spirals of hostility and enabling nation states to focus more on absolute rather than relative gains. Additionally, collective security assists nation states in articulating national interests in ways that ultimately contribute to international stability and global peace and security (Kupchan and Kupchan 1995, 58). They recount that collective security "rests on a more nuanced understanding of international politics than that offered by structural realism. The post-Cold War era offers an excellent laboratory in which to pit these competing theoretical perspectives against each other" (Kupchan and Kupchan 1995, 58).

It is paramount to note that unless collective security is given an opportunity to preserve peace and security in the world, peace will be elusive, as it requires concerted efforts, not individual nation states' approach, as the dimension of threats has become more complex in the twenty-first-century.

Negretto, in his essay, “Kant and the Illusion of Collective Security,” states that Thomas Hobbes concluded that man by himself is incapable of preserving peace and order after observing the destructive impact of the seventeenth-century European religious wars (Negretto 1993, 501). The same is true for nation states because nation states on their own cannot preserve peace and order, hence the need for alliances. Hobbes assumed that peace and order could only be established if a strong monopoly of violence was created in the hands of a single sovereign (nation state). This assumption has not been challenged over the years as monopoly on the use of violence has primarily remained under state control. According to Negretto, the Prussian philosopher Emmanuel Kant made a revolutionary argument that peace is possible in the absence of international authority. This assertion could have held before the twentieth-century, but in the modern era, peace initiatives require concerted efforts from nation states as threats transcend national boundaries. Equally, in the wake of the First World War, Kant’s idea was discredited that peace can be achieved by a mere balance of power (Negretto 1993, 502).

There is a profound similarity between Kant’s thoughts and the international collective security mechanisms formulated in the twentieth-century. The creation of both the League of Nations and the United Nations were premised on the assumption that some kind of international organization must be created if war was to be avoided or limited. Regional and sub-regional organizations, like the AU and SADC, are embedded in the UN because the authority for conflict intervention and resolution gets its authority from the UN Charter, Chapter VIII. It is from the idea of having an international organization in the quest of avoidance of another global war where the theory of collective security was born (Negretto 1993, 515).

Negretto suggests that the theory of collective security advocates for three essential conditions. The first is the need for member countries to renounce possibilities of resorting to use of coercive actions without authorization from the United Nations Security Council. The only exception to this condition is when acting in self-defense against aggression. Under this condition, states must resolve their disputes through peaceful settlements provided by the international organization, be it regional or the United Nations. The second condition looks at clear opposition to the balance of power. The theory of collective security implores states not to have alliances with or against other powers. It requires member states to be ready for defense of all against all. A common security agenda is one of the characteristics of collective security (Negretto 1993, 512).

Further, he indicates that the third condition is structural. He states that under collective security, it is important to clearly underscore the mechanisms by which a multinational alliance can mobilize against aggression. The alliance must serve as a deterrent to any aggression. It therefore requires an executive body within the alliance capable of commanding support from the member states to organize and direct the international force against such an aggression (Negretto 1993, 512). Negretto's assertion implies that the regional organization must be structured in order to organize and direct force against aggression.

According to Aleksovski, Bakreski, and Avramovska, collective security is the efforts by the international community in finding means and ways that lead to mutual trust among nation states in addressing the security dilemmas (Aleksovski, Bakreski, and Avramovska 2014, 274). They contend that the principles of collective security provide

rationality for a range of international organizations such as the UN, AU, and the SADC, which endeavor to promote and uphold international peace and security. They indicate that organizations like the UN stem from principle of “collective security.” Even Immanuel Kant presented this idea of collective security in his book towards the end of the eighteenth-century, *Perpetual Peace*, in which he states that the “the law of nations will be based on one federation of free states” (Kant 1991, 93). This thought by Kant implies that countries form a Federation of Free States, which implies that countries are willing to form alliances or organizations to focus on addressing peace and security. Aleksovski, Bakreski, and Avramovska state that collective security penetrates from the inside in order to achieve peace and security within sovereign nation states, and the level of collective security depends on the level of democracy to a larger extent (Aleksovski, Bakreski, and Avramovska 2014, 275).

The African Union Security Architecture

According to the African Union Commission’s website, the PSC was created in 2004 as the principal organ of the AU for the prevention, management, and resolution of conflicts. The PSC is the main decision-making body of the APSA. The APSA is the pinnacle of the overarching architecture for the main AU mechanisms for promoting peace, security, and stability in Africa (African Union Commission, Peace and Security Council 2015). The PSC’s authority is derived from Article 20 of the Constitutive Act as inserted by Article 9 of the Protocol on Amendments to the Constitutive Act 2003 together with Article 2 of the 2002 Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union (African Union Commission, Peace and Security Council 2015).

The PSC is comprised of fifteen members; five members are elected for three-year terms and ten members elected to serve for two years. Members usually take office on the first day of April following an endorsement by the Assembly. Retiring members are eligible for immediate re-election (African Union Commission, Peace and Security Council 2015; Williams 2016). The members of PSC are elected based on balanced regional representation and rotated according to the sub-regional quotas. The sub-regions are represented by Central Africa with three seats; East Africa, three seats; North Africa, two seats; Southern Africa, three seats; and West Africa, four seats.

According to Article 7 of the 2002 Protocol, the PSC is mandated to undertake the following tasks: foresee and prevent disputes and conflicts, to include bad policies which may lead to genocide and crimes against humanity; undertake peace-making, peace-building and peace-support missions; recommend intervention in a member state in respect of grave circumstances, namely war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity; institute sanctions; implement the AU's mutual defense policy; ensure carrying out of key conventions and instruments to fight international terrorism; promote synchronization between regional mechanisms and the AU on the subject of peace, security and stability in Africa; follow-up promotion of democratic practices; good governance; the rule of law; protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms; respect for the sanctity of human life and international humanitarian law; advocate and encourage the fulfilling of conventions and treaties on arms control and disarmament, examine and take action in situations where the national independence and sovereignty of a member state is threatened by acts of aggression; including by mercenaries, and support

and facilitate humanitarian action in situations of armed conflicts or major natural disasters (African Union Commission, 2017).

The CEWS was established within Article 12 of the PSC Protocol. It is made up of an observation and monitoring center, commonly known as “the Situation Room.” The CEWC is linked to the five regions of the continent through the Regional Early Warning Centers (REC). The Chairperson of the PSC uses the information gathered through the Early Warning System to advise the PSC on potential conflicts and threats to peace and security in Africa and recommend the best course of action (Fisher, et al. 2011, 32). The AU Commission indicates that the CEWS has achieved notable success to include:

1. Successful development of the CEWS methodology through a consultative process with all involved stakeholders.
2. Development of data collection and analysis tools and the elaboration of a software licensing agreement between CEWS and the early warning systems of the RECs.
3. Strengthened coordination and collaboration between CEWS and the early warning systems of the RECs.
4. Refurbishment of the Situation Room. Infrastructure upgrade and installment of the necessary equipment, including the live monitoring software (i.e., LIVEMON in the office of the AUC Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, Commissioner for Peace and Security and the Director for Peace and Security).
5. Increased expertise and analytical skills of the CEWS and the early warning systems of most RECs. This includes putting in place some Early Warning Officers, Analysts and Situation Room staff.

6. Information/intelligence collection and monitoring tools are operational and data can be accessed through a specifically developed CEWS information portal (Fisher, et al. 2011, 32).

The assessment conducted by the AU Commission believes that a fully operational and viable CEWS is an indispensable instrument that will assist in supporting conflict prevention, mediation, and preventive diplomacy. However, this can only be achieved if the RECs are fully operational and effective (Fisher, et al. 2011, 32-33).

The information collected by the CEWS might be valuable in the deployment of the ASF when the situation demands so. The ASF is one of the instruments in the APSA. The first Assembly of the African Union, which met in Durban, South Africa, 9-10 July 2002, adopted the Protocol relating to the Establishment of the PSC that included provisions on the establishment of the ASF and a Military Staff Committee as well as other instruments. Article 13 of the PSC Protocol provides that “an African Standby Force shall be established. Such force shall be composed of standby multidisciplinary components with civilian and military components in their countries of origin and ready for rapid deployment at an appropriate notice” (Fisher, et al. 2011, 37). The ASF is made up of five Regional Standby Forces that are the North African Regional Capability (NARC), also known as the Arab Maghreb Union (AMU), East African Standby Force (EASF), Multinational Force of Central Africa Standby Force (FOMAC), ECOWAS Standby Force (ESF), and the Southern Africa Development Community Standby Brigade (SADCBRIG), which the research focuses on.

The five sub-regions of Africa have different security challenges ranging from natural disasters to armed conflict. The UN African Review indicates the Arab Maghreb

Union faces the challenge of the unresolved dispute over the status of Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic (Western Sahara) is a complicated issue among member states of the Maghreb. Four out of the six member states do not recognize the Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic; this complicates how the member states relate with each other consequently hindering the optimum operationalization of North African Regional Capability. The other challenge the region faces is the reluctance by some member states to sign the founding documents. The region also faces the threat of terrorism in Libya, Tunisia, and parts of Egypt (Fisher, et al. 2011, 46-47).

According to the UN African Review, ECOWAS has some challenges despite demonstrating in the past that it is capable of conducting force intervention in addressing Peace and Security challenges. In the past, the sub-region body has intervened in Côte d'Ivoire (2002), Guinea Bissau (1999), Liberia (1990), and Sierra Leone (1999). There is strong resolve and solidarity among member states on issues concerning peace and security (Fisher, et al. 2011, 45). According to the UN, terrorism remains a major threat in West Africa. The UN indicates that despite a number of countries holding successful elections in West Africa, violent extremism poses security and humanitarian challenges. The terrorism from Boko Haram has not only affected Nigeria, but also Cameroon, Chad, and Niger. Mali faces an insurgency in the north by National Movement for the Liberation of Azawad (MNL) (United Nations African Review 2017).

The EASF, on the other hand, is confronted by the challenging of dealing with al Shabab in Somalia and piracy in the Red Sea, Gulf of Eden, and the Indian Ocean. Uganda has to battle with the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) under Joseph Koni. The Lord's Resistance Army extends its sphere of influence into parts of South Sudan and

Democratic Republic of Congo. Like the other four regional forces, the EASF has challenges in airlift and logistical capabilities. The Economic Community of Central African States Standby Force has the challenges of security in Central African Republic, which was embroiled in a war between government forces and the Seleka forces, and Cameroon has to fight the spillover of Boko Haram in the north. Like the rest of the sub-regional forces, they face the challenge of operational logistics to enable them confront the security challenges that the region faces (Varhola and Sheperd 2013, 325-332).

Authority for Creation of Regional Security Mechanisms

Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter in Article 52(1), (2), (3) states that:

Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. (United Nations Secretariat 1945)

United Nations member states are encouraged by Chapter VIII to pacify through regional and sub-regional bodies before calling on for help from the United Nations Security Council. It is important therefore that member states exhaust regional and sub-regional mechanisms before turning to the UN. In most cases where the regional or sub-regional initiatives seem to fail, the United Nations Security Council would normally step in to augment the efforts of the regional body's effort like United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID).

It is from Chapter VIII of the UN Charter that the AU and its sub-regional organizations are authorized to address regional and sub-regional security challenges through force intervention or peacekeeping, as the case in Somalia where AU forces are

deployed to fight Al Shabab. Prior to any peacekeeping mission or force intervention, the UN Security Council has to pass a resolution to allow such a force to deploy.

Donor Countries' Involvement in Regional Peace Initiatives

MAJ Jeffrey N. Krulick in his article, "Airlift in Africa: Building Operational Logistics Capability for the African Standby Force," states that the US policy makers during and post-Cold War had very limited strategic value in Africa. He says it was not until the attacks on American embassies on the Continent, the need for trade, access to energy resources, armed conflict, and the fight against terrorism that the US renewed its commitment to the Continent. He says that in renewing its interest in Africa, the United States established the African Command (AFRICOM) (Krulick 2013, 10). Through the Department of State, the US has assisted a number of African countries in training troops in readiness for deployment in peacekeeping operations. The African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA) is a program that the Department of State uses in achieving such assistance. The author was part of the first Zambian Battalion that benefited from the ACOTA program during its pre-deployment training before deploying to the Central Africa Republic (CAR) in 2015, although he never deployed with the battalion.

A BBC article alludes to the fact that Britain and France have had peacekeeping training assistance in a number of African countries. For instance, in 1998, France held a peacekeeping exercise in Senegal with the participation of three thousand West African troops that also included troops from the UK and the US. The article further indicates that the UK has three military assistance and training teams in Africa, referred to as BMATTS

(British Military Advisory and Training Teams), teaching peacekeeping operational experience in staff colleges, and training specialized units (BBC News 2000).

The Creation of the SADC Brigade

According to Gamba in chapter 4 of *South African Army Vision 2020 Volume 2*, “the South African Army is relevant and ready for future security challenges in Africa.” In chapter 4, she addresses the formation of the SADC Standby Brigade and its purposes and some challenges. The chapter indicates the ideal structure of the brigade as depicted in the African Union Monitor 2007:

1. A brigade (mission-level) headquarters and support unit of up to sixty-five personnel and sixteen vehicles.
2. A headquarters company and support unit of up to 120 personnel.
3. Four light infantry battalions, each composed of up to 750 personnel, and 70 vehicles.
4. An engineering unit of up to 505 personnel.
5. A light signals unit of up to 135 personnel.
6. A reconnaissance company (wheeled) of up to 150 personnel.
7. A helicopter unit of up to eighty personnel, ten vehicles, and four helicopters.
8. A military police unit of up to forty-eight personnel and seventeen vehicles.
9. A light multi-role logistical unit of up to 190 personnel and 40 vehicles.
10. A level II medical unit of up to thirty-five personnel and ten vehicles.
11. A military observer group of up to 120 officers.
12. A civilian support group consisting of logistical, administrative, and budget components (Gamba 2008, 64-65).

Gamba then addresses the aspect of the mandate for the brigade, then structure and administrative control. She looks at the measures put in place for attaining interoperability in the brigade to include training by the Regional Peace Training Centre based in Harare, Zimbabwe; however, the chapter does not look at how the challenges of interoperability will negatively hamper the operations of the brigade once deployed in the near future. Finally, the chapter looks at sustainability of the brigade by contributions from member states. This chapter does not address how the economies of the various member states will affect the sustainability of the brigade (Gamba 2008, 64-65). The author does not address the challenges facing the regional forces and how that affects the brigade. Gamba goes on to address lessons learned from the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). She indicates that for the SADC Brigade to be successful, the SADC must provide political guidance on common approach towards peacekeeping operations and conflict resolution, both regional and international, not failing to provide conceptual clarity on the boundaries of the operations so that member states can participate confidently and fully in peace and conflict resolution (Gamba 2008, 66).

The chapter further addresses the need for prior consultations with the AU and the UN well in advance before the mandate and deployment of the brigade on any mission so that pertinent matters are addressed. The chapter also looks at the need for a common standard operating procedure (SOP) that encompasses matters like cultural awareness training, as it affects peace operations, and Rules of Engagement (ROE). The aspect of logistical prepositioning is one important issue that the chapter indicates can be learned from the operations that ECOWAS has conducted in the past. Prepositioning and

standardization of logistics and equipment plays a crucial role in meeting interoperability goals of a force (Gamba 2008, 65). It is important that foresight in logistics planning is given the due considerations it deserves because history shows that operations and wars have failed to due lack of due considerations on the part of logistics.

The SADC Brigade has been in existence for ten years and a number of security scholars feel it is a right approach in the right direction as it can be one of the viable mechanisms in addressing conflict resolution in the region. At the time, Franke was writing his article in 2007, the brigade was in its formative stages when planning elements and doctrine were put in place. Matters affecting training and evaluation standards have been agreed upon, but the brigade meets only once a year for training. The author places emphasis on the importance of such security cooperation as it is a major achievement just as an attempt to finding measures of handling certain security challenges in the region (Franke 2007, 183-190).

Mandrup, in his article, "South Africa and the SADC Stand-By Force," argues that the continued instability in some SADC member states means that serious questions hang over their ability to provide the pledged units to towards the SADC Brigade. This implies that the burden of providing troops will rest with few countries that are economically and politically stable (Mandrup 2009, 15). He says much depends on the larger and stronger member states to take the lead and provide the capabilities that the other states cannot. This means that countries likes of South Africa, Angola Botswana, and Namibia, with the strongest economies in the region, will have to take a more active role in logistics support to the brigade. This may not give an equal voice to the other countries with less financial muscle. Over dependency on South Africa in the running of

the affairs of the brigade might pose challenges in the near future if negative forces in the economic world shake its economy.

The Pretoria Government's decision to cancel the acquisition of long-distance military transport planes is not good news. South Africa has the most adequate transport capability both land and air, therefore over dependency by other member states is likely. That brings in the major question whether a hegemon will be a necessary condition for making the SADC Brigade work effectively. "The lack of trust between members results in difficulties or long-term lapses to establish the SADC Brigade" (Mandrup 2009, 21). There is need for the member states to build trust amongst themselves for a better working culture that will enhance the operations of the brigade. Another problem the author identifies is that, it may be difficult for SADC Brigade members to agree on when, how and under which circumstances the brigade should be deployed, especially if the member states do not share common values or their national interests are compromised in the process (Mandrup 2009, 21). The issue of when and how to deploy the brigade could be harmonized adequately if the political will of member states is seen through promulgating an adequate mandate on the operations of the brigade.

A number of authors have written on the formation and operations of SADCBRIC, but there gaps that can still be addressed regarding the improvement in its efficiency and effectiveness. This study explores those gaps in addressing ways of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the brigade. In addressing those gaps, the author uses a methodological approach highlighted in chapter 3.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the research design methodology used to conduct this study. As quantitative measures do not ably fit to comprehend matters related to collective security mechanisms, this study will focus on the qualitative methodology based on two case studies: ECOWAS intervention in both Liberia and Sierra Leone. The research made an initial interrogation of literature available on the SADC Standby Brigade. This research focused on identifying gaps and trying to address them. It compared ECOWAS' security architecture to identify areas that can be of benefit to improvement of the brigade. Various theses on collective security from the United States Command and General Staff College, United States War College, and the Naval Post-Graduate School were also consulted. The findings focus on recommending means to improve the SADCBRIG to be a better-prepared force to address the contemporary security threats in the twenty-first-century.

Methodology and Hypothesis

Qualitative methods focus on how and why people, by extant organizations, behave, think, and make meaning, rather than focusing on what people do or believe in a large scale. Another benefit of such methodology is that it enables the researcher to analyze data from the macro to the micro level without risking analytical integrity by comparing the proverbial “apples to oranges” (Ambert, Adler, Adler, and Detzner 1995). Qualitative analysis is defined as a systematic interpretation into inquiry and then

meaning (Ospina 2004). Suffice to mention that, as a major research methodology in social sciences, qualitative research begins with assumptions most of the time, a world overview, the possible use of theoretical lenses and framing of the research questions.

The qualitative methodology used in this study is the most appropriate because it stands out as the best approach in undertaking studies in social sciences under which this research falls. The criteria helped in identify gaps relevant in making the SADC BRIG a force to be reckoned with in managing conflicts in Southern Africa and beyond. This study is based on two case studies of the ECOWAS Monitoring Group's (ECOMOG) intervention in Liberia in 1990 to 1997 and Sierra Leone in 1999.

The research relied on secondary data to undertake the case studies on ECOMOG interventions in Liberia and Sierra Leone. A case study approach helps to understand how other sub-regional bodies have addressed challenges of collective security by employing force intervention and other mechanisms. The focus of this study was to look at the successes and failures of two interventions. West Africa was picked for the case study because collective security has been a construct used to intervene in addressing security challenges the sub-region has gone through. Based on the purpose of the investigation of the study, different types of case studies exist. An instrumental case study is used to provide insight into an issue. An intrinsic case study is undertaken to gain a deeper understanding of the case and a collective case study is the study of a number of cases in order to inquire into a particular phenomenon (Stake 1995, 4). Therefore, the purposes of case study research methodology may be exploratory, descriptive, interpretive, and explanatory (Mariano 1993, 311).

The West African sub-region has had a number of military coups, civil strife, and civil wars. ECOWAS has a history of military interventions to restore peace prior to the deployment of a United Nations Peacekeeping Operations to consolidate the gains that could have been achieved by the intervention force like the case in Liberia and Sierra Leone. The successes and failures recorded must be interrogated so that the lessons learned can be applied to SADC BRIG through recommendations, thereby making it a formidable force that can address contemporary security challenges of the twenty-first-century that the sub-regions may face in future. ECOWAS was picked for the case study because of similarity in the political, social, and economic terrain.

ECOMOG intervention in Liberia, being the first sub-regional post-cold war military effort to address armed conflict, offers lessons in the field of collective security.

The efforts of ECOWAS and ECOMOG in Liberia offer lessons for both optimism and concern regarding the potential for regional coalitions to conduct effective complex operations. On one hand, ECOMOG proved that it could be done and bring in the meantime accomplished what no other organization whether global, regional or ad hoc has been able to achieve: it helped bring peace to a country devastated by internal crisis, culminating in free and fair elections. It did this despite problems of limited resources, lack of shared doctrine and training questions about its legitimacy, loss of neutrality, and some serious transgressions. (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 70-71)

The research explored and analyzed the lessons learned from both Liberia and Sierra Leone to make recommendations that would better make SADC BRIG a formidable force better poised to handle contemporary security challenges facing the sub-region in this dispensation.

The study follows William Wiersma's five steps for conducting research. First, identification and framing of the problem; second, reviewing literature relevant to the study, as identified in chapter 2 in order to determine relevant factors in collective

security; third, the collection and classification of data concerning the case studies; fourth, to analyze the data to determine what needs to be used in improving the SADCBRIG; and fifth, to draw conclusions and make recommendations (Wiersma 1991, 8).

Step 1. Identification and Framing the Problem

During the review of chapters 1 and 2, it is evident that SADCBRIG does not have much experience and expertise in conflict resolution through force intervention. Since its formation in 2007, the brigade has not been employed, except for the Force Intervention Brigade that deployed under the UN in the Democratic Republic of Congo and the limited intervention in 2017 in Lesotho after the assassination of the Chief of Defense Force. With the lack of experience in the field of conflict resolution, it is doubtful whether the brigade has the capacity to confront contemporary security challenges that the sub-region faces in the future. The brigade has been meeting for training once a year amidst numerous logistical, interoperability, and political challenges.

Step 2. Review of Relevant Data

In reviewing the relevant information in chapter 2, it is apparent that SADCBRIG is part of the African Union Peace and Security Architecture mechanism in trying to operationalize the ASF. The ASF stands as a means of addressing the collective security challenges on the continent. The integration of the SADCBRIG in the ASF within the APSA should normally facilitate its action. Moreover, the international community and the involvement other stakeholders is significant to the operations of the brigade. SADC should therefore embrace factors like political will and military readiness and

responsiveness. Political will is the commitment by SADC member states having common decisions regarding crises as and when they arise. It also includes financial commitment because lack of it impairs any intervention. Likewise, it includes their willingness to contribute troops whenever required to do so. In the past, the same few countries contributed troops to this noble cause. South Africa, as a sub-regional hegemon, has been forthcoming leading such interventions. Military readiness and responsiveness concerns the operational status of the troops, and how quickly they can deploy. It is the capacity and capability for their rapid deployment when required to intervene that will make a difference when called upon. This implies that they must have the necessary logistics readily available and adequately train to be able cope with the contemporary security challenges.

Step 3. Collection and Classification of Data

This thesis used two steps to collect data in order to answer research questions. It reviewed relevant literature on collective security generally, the Africa and the SADC. It also reviewed what the AU provides for the security architecture before cascading down to the sub-region body. The second step is based on gathering and analyzing data from the case studies of ECOWAS interventions and draw lessons on the challenges faced. The challenges and lessons learned from the case studies will help in framing the recommendations to help the SADC BRIG be better prepared for the challenges in addressing collective security in the sub-region and beyond when necessary.

Step 4. Data Analysis

The analysis will focus on ECOWAS intervention in Liberia and Sierra Leone, and how the sub-regional body handled the crises. It will allow the detection of the successes scored and the challenges encountered and why those challenges were encountered. In the Liberian intervention, ECOMOG troops deployed in 1990 without a UN Security Council Resolution. It was not until October 1992 when the UN Security Council did retrospectively authorize ECOMOG's intervention under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The intervention was without the consent of the belligerents as such, there was a lot of resistance. Insurgents targeted the intervention force, which was a major challenge. Implementation of a collective security mechanism was on the verge of failure due to such attacks and noncompliance to cease-fire agreements. The intervention in Liberia was the first of its kind undertaken by a sub-regional body intervention force, therefore its analysis brings lessons on the challenges of feasible mandates, challenges of interoperability, logistics support, and the political will of TCCs. ECOMOG managed to restore order in the capital Monrovia amidst these challenges.

The second case study of Sierra Leone provides analysis of the role of the hegemon and implications national TCC caveats have on operationalizing collective security mechanisms in crises. The results of the analysis will be displayed in tabular form that addresses the adequacy of the response to intervene with collective security principles, responsiveness of deployment, and the operational status. The study assesses these key variables by evaluating their related sub-variables with a "PRESENT" or NOT "PRESENT" according to their presence or absence (see table 1).

The variables are divided in three categories: collective security principles, responsiveness to deployment and operational status. Under collective security, the author uses only three of the principles: strong military coalition, commitment to intervention, and presence of a hegemon as variables because they have the most impact. On the part of the category for responsiveness of deployment, this study used a clear and feasible mandate supported by UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) and that of Troop Contributing Country (TCC) support because these play pivotal roles in the ability for a force to react in a more robust way. The last category is that of operational status; it encompasses financial support, command and control, and interoperability among the TCC. These variables in this category are important because they provide the lubrication for the force to be able to operate efficiently and effectively.

In assessing the variables based on collective security principles, the study starts with the presence of a strong military coalition, which will be based on the number of member states that contribute troops or support the intervention. Out of the fifteen member states of ECOWAS, at least one third must either contribute troops or support the cause. If the contribution of troops or support does not reach one third, then this variable is not present. Commitment to intervention shall be assessed to be present if one third of the political leadership of ECOWAS show political will in addressing the conflict. If less than one third of the member states do not commit to the intervention, this variable is not present. Presence of a hegemon will be assessed based on a dominant member state that steps in to take charge due to its economic, military, and demographic influence. If there is no such a member state, then this variable of hegemon will be considered “NOT PRESENT.”

In assessing the variables based on responsiveness of deployment, the study looked at a clear and feasible mandate supported by a UN Security Council Resolution. Such a mandate clears ambiguity in the minds of the troops, as they know clearly in their minds what is required of them at any given time in the course of their duty. It also implies clearly defined rules of engagement. The presence of this variable is the absence of confusion and not knowing what is required of troops to do at any given time. Troops in the field should be able to be supported by the TCC during their tour of duty. Therefore, if the troops receive the support and the operation goes on without major shortcomings then this variable is “PRESENT” but if the support is not forthcoming thereby affecting the running of the operations, then the variable is “NOT PRESENT.”

The last category of variables is operational status; the first variable in this category is financial support. Financial support is very important as it provides the money that the operations needs for both the maintenance of equipment and personnel thereby enhancing the endurance of the combat power. Every military operation to succeed needs established authority and communication means to be able control the operation. So the variable of command and control will be assessed base on the presence of discipline and order in the intervention but when such is absent, then the variable will score not present. Finally, interoperability among TCC variable will be assessed on the ability of troops from different nations to be able to operate with various equipment as one force without major problems hindering them, then the variable scores “PRESENT” but in case there are major operational problems due to this diversity then, the variable scores “NOT PRESENT.”

Table 1. Assessment of ECOMOG Conflict Interventions			
Variables		Liberia 1990	Sierra Leone 1999
Collective Security Principles	Strong Military Coalition		
	Commitment to intervention		
	Presence of a hegemon		
Responsiveness of deployment	Clear and feasible mandate (supported by UNSC Resolution)		
	Troop Contributing Countries support		
Operational Status	Financial support		
	Command and Control		
	Interoperability among Troop Contributing Countries		

Source: Abdoul Aziz Fall. “Turning the ECOWAS Standby Force in a More Proactive Force: An Analysis of Past Interventions to Assess Key Deployment Hindrances,” Master’s thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 2015. (Variables: Financial support and Interoperability among Troop Contributing Countries formulated by the author).

Step 5. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions found after assessing ECOMOG’s intervention will indicate which sub-variables ECOMOG did not meet in each crisis. This lead to recommendations on how to better make SADCBRIG more responsive in developing an optimal collective security approach mechanism. These discussions are contained in chapter 5.

Summary

The qualitative methodology used in this study is based on two case studies. It aims at assessing SADCBRIG's capacity to meet collective security principles. It will examine the interventions based on three categories of eight variables relating to military and political domains. The next chapter will analyze each case study and interpret the results. After evaluating the case studies, analysis will help to identify variables in which ECOMOG encountered some challenges. The results of this analysis will help the researcher propose recommendations to make SADCBRIG more responsive and better prepared as an instrument to address collective security in the sub-region and beyond.

CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS

A Case Study of ECOMOG Intervention in Liberia 1990 -1997



Figure 2. Map of Liberia

Source: University of Texas at Austin, “Country Maps Sierra Leone-Political,” 2004, accessed 23 March 2018, https://legacy.lib.utexas.edu/maps/africa/liberia_pol_2004.jpg.

ECOMOG Intervention in Liberia stands as a valuable case study for a number of reasons. It was the first almost entirely African effort, with some limited financial and diplomatic support from the UN and the United States. This serves as a yardstick to what extent a regional body, especially in the Third World, can pacify an internal conflict in a member state. It provides vital information on the advantages of an intervention operation conducted by a preexisting regional organization (such as the ECOWAS), but also offers important insights into an ad hoc military coalition. It gives an opportunity to examine the role of a local hegemon, like Nigeria, in fostering interoperability and synchronization of the unity of effort towards the attainment of peace and stability in a given sub-region (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 55).

ECOWAS was established on 28 May in 1975; it is comprised of fifteen member states made up of former French, British, and Portuguese colonies with different languages, culture, and traditions. At its inception, the focus was on economic integration of the sub-region; but in order to do this it had to clear the obstacles along the way. Some of the obstacles to sub-regional economic integration have been peace and security challenges the sub-region has experienced. It is paramount to note that economic development and integration cannot take place in the absence of peace and security. Therefore, the organization realized the importance of addressing security challenges in order to have an environment conducive for economic development and integration in the sub-region. Before looking at how it handled the peace and security challenges that have been an impediment to the economic integration, let us look at the structures within the ECOWAS that address such challenges.



Figure 3. Map of ECOWAS Member States

Source: Johan Sävström, “Morocco goes West African.” The Nordic Africa Institute, 29 June 2017, accessed 31 October 2018, <http://nai.uu.se/news/articles/2017/06/29/092656/index.xml>.

In order to address the challenges facing the sub-region body had to be structured poised to meet those challenges.

ECOWAS’s structure is made up of Institutions and Specialized Agencies. The Institutions comprise: The Authority of Heads of States and Government, The Commission, The Community Parliament, The Community Court of Justice, Council of Ministers, Specialized Technical Committees as well as the ECOWAS Bank for Investment and Development (EBID) (ECOWAS 2016).

The ECOWAS Standing Mediation Committee, one of its specialized organs, established a Military Observer Group (ECOMOG) on 7 August 1990 to help resolve the Liberian armed internal conflict that had broken out in 1989 (The Journal of Humanitarian Assistance 1995). The proliferation of conflict and its impact on economic development on the region prompted ECOWAS to realign its focus to include security challenges after the end of the Cold War. Thus, ECOMOG is the force intervention mechanism of ECOWAS (De Wet 2014).

ECOMOG was born from the Protocols on Non-Aggression signed in 1978 at the Third Conference of Head of States and Government of ECOWAS in Dakar, Senegal, and the Protocol on Mutual Assistance on Defense, adopted in May 1981 in Freetown, Sierra Leone. The Protocol on Mutual Non-Aggression is premised on the fact that ECOWAS cannot attain its objectives, except in an atmosphere of peace and harmonious understanding among member states (Journal of Humanitarian Assistance 1995, 66). This is in line with the theory of collective security. In Article 2 (4) of the United Nations Charter, the respect and non-use of force is advocated among member states to which the 1978 Protocol affirms. However, the Protocol indicates,

Each member state shall refrain from committing, encouraging or condoning acts of subversion, hostility or aggression against the territorial integrity or political independence of the other member state. At the same time member states were ‘to prevent non-resident foreigners from using its territory as a base for committing (these) acts. (ECOWAS 1978, 4)

Article 3 of the Protocol on Mutual Defense Assistance states that “Member States resolve to give mutual aid and assistance for defense against any armed threat or aggression” (ECOWAS 1978, 3). This protocol in essence supports national sovereignty, a core principle of international politics, international relations and international law

since the signing of the Westphalia Treaty of 1648 (Osiander 2001, 261). So the sub-regional organization is committed to protecting the sovereignty of its member states by military intervention if necessary.

Liberia was established as a country and declared a republic in 1847 by freed black slaves from America (Americo-Liberians). The Americo-Liberians were less than five percent of the entire country's population. Americo-Liberians practiced the politics of exclusion because they never included indigenous people in the government of Liberia and dominated all key political, economic, and social positions (Mgbeoji 2003, 7). From the establishment of the country until immediately before the Doe regime, 1980 to 1990, politics was centered on the Americo-Liberians-led True Whig Party (TWP), founded in 1869 (Ellis 1999, 45). The TWP turned out to be the means by which political achievement was realized through the Americo-Liberians' cultural and religious establishments, as well as the Christian churches, which became tools for attaining social expansion and dominance. These maneuvers led to the marginalization of indigenous population by the Americo-Liberians, and their second-class status resulted in resentment, subsequently leading to the bloody military coup by Samuel Doe in 1980. The advent of Doe's military government marked a turning point in Liberia's political landscape, because it set a stage for tyrannical rule, which was a catalyst for state failure (Mgbeoji 2003, 6-7).

With the end of the Cold War, there was a security paradigm shift from the threat of limited warfare to asymmetrical warfare, and this did not spare the continent of Africa. In Africa, especially in West Africa, there was struggle for power that was characterized by military coups that were ethnically oriented. As the sub-regional organization,

ECOWAS had to rise to the challenge. ECOWAS created ECOMOG, and deployed it for the first time in Liberia in 1990. The Liberian conflict was sparked by the Charles Taylor-led National Patriotic Front for Liberia (NPFL), which revolted against the military regime led by Samuel Doe. Doe's army was mainly from the Mandingo and Krahn tribes, while Taylor's followers were drawn the Gio and Mano tribes. To some extent, the civil war was ethnically propelled. The struggle for power became even more compounded with the Independent National Patriotic Front of Liberia (INPFL), led by Prince Johnson, joining the conflict and began fighting both Taylor and Doe's camps (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 56-57).

After Prince Johnson joined the conflict, other belligerent groups based on ethnic orientation emerged. These were, the Mandingo-based United Liberation Movement for Democracy in Liberia (ULIMO/K); ULIMO/J, a Krahn-dominated splinter group; and the Liberian Peace Council (LPC), another Krahn-dominated group. Not long after, massacres and random killings triggered an exodus of five hundred thousand refugees, later to increase to almost one million; hundreds of thousands of Liberians would face starvation. The number of refugees increased putting an enormous burden on the surrounding countries (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 56). The conflict was intensifying with no help in sight. The United Nations and United States were not forthcoming to rescue the situation that had become desperate despite calls for help by Liberia.

The lack of intervention by either the UNSC or the US left the Organization of African Unity (OAU) with no option, but to find an African solution to an African problem. Despite this, the OAU did not want to have close involvement in conflict intervention in Liberia. This meant that the responsibility to intervene was delegated or

rather left to the sub-regional body, ECOWAS. The Nigerian President Ibrahim Babangida urged the Standing Mediation Committee of ECOWAS (comprising of The Gambia, Ghana, Mali, Nigeria, and Togo) to establish the monitoring group in order to intervene in the Liberian security situation pending a more lasting solution by either the OAU or the UNSC. Even though a cease-fire was not yet in place, a peacekeeping force of about four thousand ECOMOG troops was deployed to Monrovia by the end of August 1990 (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 57).

When ECOWAS intervened in Liberia, the justification was premised on the Protocol Relating to Mutual Assistance of Defense (PMAD) (ECOWAS Secretariat 1981) encompassing the provision for AAFC (Tuck 2000, 4). This intervention was without a UNSCR mandating them to do so. According to Article 16, the head of state of any member under attack may request action or assistance from the community. Article 4 of the protocol empowers ECOWAS to initiate collective security measures in any internal armed conflict, within any state, planned, and supported actively from outside likely to jeopardize the security and peace of the entire sub-region. Article 6 (3) and Article 17 empower the authority to decide on the expediency of military action, to impose a peacekeeping force between the warring factions, or to engage in political mediation. Article 13 (1, 2) provides for creation of the AAFC from earmarked units (ECOWAS Secretariat 1981).

The delay in the intervention was because Samuel Doe asked for military intervention from Nigeria as a country, not as a representative of ECOWAS. Nigeria then took the matter before ECOWAS for possible consideration. Initially, not only did humanitarian considerations not have backing from a legal perspective for intervention,

but also ECOWAS had no international legitimacy, because the UN did not authorize ECOMOG until October 1992, when it retrospectively authorized ECOMOG's intervention under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter. Chapter VIII of the UN Charter provides for the employment of regional initiatives in addressing peace and security challenges. The UNSC is the only institution that has the power to authorize any intervention by use of force as the institution mandated for the maintenance of world peace. So prior to the Security Council resolution in October 1992, ECOMOG had no international legitimacy in Liberia (ECOWAS Secretariat 1981).

It is important to mention that the ECOMOG intervention in Liberia, after President Doe's murder, was without the consent of the belligerents and a cease-fire was not in place. In the absence of the consent of the belligerents and a cease-fire, the intervention force found itself targeted by the NPFL and INPFL. The NPFL's refusal to recognize the peacekeepers' intervention made the mission much more difficult. It is not surprising that the NPFL not only attacked ECOMOG forces, but also ignored the cease-fire agreements that they had signed (Adebajo 2002, 50). This situation led to casualties of ECOMOG troops. Confronted with this dilemma, ECOWAS authorized the troops to escalate the peacekeeping operation to peace enforcement. ECOMOG managed to re-established order in the capital, Monrovia, and extended its area of influence beyond the city borders by November 1990 establishing a cease-fire that would last almost two years (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 57).

It would appear that the progress made by ECOMOG in attaining the cease-fire was not lasting as the belligerents constantly broke the cease-fires. This meant that the intervening force had to move to and from peacekeeping to peace enforcement due to the

cease-fire violations by the belligerents as the war dragged on to seven years by April 1996. The violence increased and reached the streets of the capital city Monrovia. The Abuja Peace Accord, amended and signed in August 1996, stipulated provisions for a cease-fire at the end of August, which was followed by disarmament and demobilization over the next five months. Four months after the disarmament and demobilization, general elections were held with international observers assessing the elections being free and fair. Charles Taylor emerged victorious in the presidential election (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 57).

Challenges Faced by Intervention Forces in Liberia (Assessing the Variables)

The fact that the intervention at the onset had no legal backing from the Security Council posed a challenge compounded by other challenges from within ECOWAS itself. The coalition forming the ECOMOG intervention in Liberia was a departure from the organization's core business, which is the primary economic and social well-being of the sub-regional member states. It meant treading in a new domain not ventured before. This was a challenging experience since it was first time that the sub-region was involved in force intervention, meaning that the aspect of political will for TCCs committing troops and logistics would be a challenge, too. Sun Tzu once said, "The line between disorder and order lies in logistics" (Tzu 1910). This assertion has proven consistent throughout history, and a commander who can ensure secure, consistent sustainment for troops has a distinct advantage in a military operation. The art of logistics is difficult in any operational environment, and working with armies from different countries increases that difficulty (Christie 2015, 12). This is at a point where the involvement of a hegemon may

be required because there will always be logistical constraints in a multinational environment, more so amongst developing countries' coalitions.

Collective Security Principles

Strong Military Coalition

Some of the intervening forces had national caveats that interfered with the operations. It is difficult to conduct an operation according to plan when intervening forces have national interest at stake in the conflict. To a greater extent, Nigeria had national interests in the Liberian conflict by taking a position against one of the faction leaders, Charles Taylor, instead of remaining neutral as part of the intervention force (Arthur 2010, 17). There was a rift between English-speaking (Anglophone) and French-speaking (Francophone) members because of failing to remain impartial during in the conduct of the operation. Some Francophone states, like Côte d'Ivoire and Burkina Faso, constantly rejected the idea of contributing troops for the intervention operation, criticizing the intervention, and consequently supplied the NPFL with military hardware, material, and financial support in conflict with ECOMOG (Arthur 2010, 16).

Prominent among the reasons for the politics and intra sub-regional rivalries between the two language blocs in the ECOWAS, the seven Francophone states, with the exception of Guinea, signed their own separate nonaggression defense pact (ANAD) in 1977, which equally addressed the need for a sub-regional standby force. A number of separate developments among the West African Francophone states brought divisions, which ultimately weakened the sub-region. These divisions would later take a toll on the leadership of Nigeria during the ECOMOG intervention in Liberia (Obi 2009, 121).

The taking of sides by some ECOWAS leaders with one faction or the other needlessly accelerated the conflict and protracted the ECOMOG intervention assignment, thus, ruining the credibility of the ECOMOG peacekeeping endeavor (Adebayo 2002, 48-53). Nigeria as the hegemon provided both the political will and the financial support to the intervention without which the mission would have crumbled. Despite the political will and financial muscle Nigeria provided, they needed to provide leadership for the strength of the coalition but was found at variance with Ghana, more so that Ghana was interested in a more traditional way of peacekeeping while its close ally, Nigeria, wanted a more robust way of intervention. Despite the success scored on the ground, the coalition was not that strong as there were different national interests by the nations fielding the troops.

Due to the rift between the Francophone and Anglophone states, the coalition was not strong, as there were divisions within the intervention force. The divisions within the intervention force had negative effects on the strength of the military coalition despite the pivotal role played by Nigeria. There were intense differences within ECOWAS on how to best handle the civil war in Liberia. A number of countries in the sub-region had vested political, economic, social interests, and in some instances personal interests for supporting or opposing the ECOWAS military intervention. The Burkinabe leader was reported by Radio Burkina (Burkina Faso National Radio Station) to have sent a strong message to the ECOWAS Chairman, the President of the Gambia. He declared his country's total disagreement with the intervention, adding that ECOMOG had no legal obligation to interfere in member states' internal conflicts, but only in conflicts breaking out between member countries (limited war).

Côte d'Ivoire was also believed to be opposed to the initiative, which they saw as being largely advanced by Nigeria (BBC Monitoring Report 1990, 85). Both countries were suspicious of Nigeria's intentions, citing that they had vested interests beyond the conflict resolution. Thus, in an attempt to reduce the tension, Nigeria initially conceded the leadership of the force to Lieutenant General A. Quainoo of Ghana in order to avoid giving any impression that they wanted to dominate ECOMOG's operation (Alao 1993, 342). The position held by the Francophone countries was that of Nigeria wanted to dominate at all costs. In this regard, there was a lack of cohesion in the intervention force in the Liberian crisis thereby weakening the coalition. This may have been a reason why the crisis was protracted. The variable of strong coalition is not present as can be evidenced from the rift between the Anglophone and the Francophone states. The only member states that stood strong with Nigeria in the coalition, was Ghana and to some extent Guinea. The coalition was not strong because some members of ECOWAS were indirectly assisting, financially and materially, the belligerent parties. Based upon this analysis, a value of "NOT PRESENT" is assigned to the value of "strong military coalition."

Commitment to Intervention

A number of the ECOWAS members were committed to the intervention despite a few Francophone states that were opposed to the idea of force intervention citing legalities. The fact that countries like Côte d'Ivoire and Burkina Faso consistently refused to contribute troops to ECOMOG shows that not all the member states were committed to the intervention. The level of commitment by those contributing troops needs examining too. When ECOWAS established the Standing Mediation Committee (SMC) in May

1990 at a summit in Banjul, the mandate was to intervene wherever and whenever conflict might threaten sub-regional peace and security. The Gambia, Ghana, Nigeria, Mali, and Togo formed the SMC. In July 1990, the SMC held an emergency meeting in Sierra Leone's capital of Freetown, at which the Liberian peace plan was crafted. With the deterioration of the situation in Liberia, the SMC met the following month in Banjul. Soon after the meeting, the Gambia's President, Dawda Jawara, acting in his capacity as the ECOWAS chairperson, announced the decision to deploy an intervention force to Liberia (Mortimer 1996, 295).

Out of the five members of the SMC, the Gambia, Ghana, and Nigeria pledged troops. It can be noted that the three countries that pledged troops were all Anglophone. None of the Francophone members showed a commitment to the intervention, save for a small contingent from Guinea. Côte d'Ivoire and Burkina Faso were reported to have supported Charles Taylor's insurgent movement. That could answer the question why they were not committed to providing troops for the intervention force while Senegal expressed hesitations due to what it claimed as lack of consultation in the decision-making process (Mortimer 1996, 295). It is apparent that from the onset, there was little or no commitment by Francophone ECOWAS member states to the intervention. Burkina Faso declared openly its support for the NPFL of Charles Taylor owing to the fact that the Burkinabe President had family connections with Charles Taylor.

It would appear that the low level of commitment from the Francophone countries, in particular, was as a result of various national interests and not necessarily pursuing the agenda of ECOWAS. On the other hand, scholars claim that Ghana and Nigeria were committed because they had a substantial population of their nationals in

Liberia. Senegal, with financial assistance from the United States, transported in about five hundred troops from October 1991 to 15 January 1993, but had to withdraw those troops due to the political climate both at home and in the operational area. Senegal committed its troops after President Diouf was persuaded when he went to Washington on a state visit in September 1991. He was urged by both President George Bush and Secretary of State James Baker to commit troops. The Bush Administration promised to pay a significant portion of the materiel costs of the operation in what was viewed as a move to reduce Nigeria's dominance (Mortimer 1996, 297-299).

Commitment to the intervention in Liberia was from the Anglophone states and not from the Francophone due to various interests among the ECOWAS members. Concisely, commitment was there for the countries that contributed troops and for the member states that did not contribute troops, there was no commitment. From a background of more than fifteen member states with only three committing troops, sums up as lack of commitment from the overall sub-regional organization. Based upon this analysis, a value of "NOT PRESENT" is assigned to the value of "commitment to the intervention."

Presence of a Hegemon

In ECOWAS, Nigeria stands out as the hegemon. During the period of intervention, 1990 to 1997, Nigeria remained the dominant force in ECOMOG and in its intervention in Liberia. The term "hegemony" is often used to describe the dominant state in a particular region in terms of political and economic power and extending to military power. However, it is important to note that despite Nigeria's commitments in the West African sub-region, some countries still do not see Nigeria as a hegemon in the region

because they believe they can also be in that position. Many of these countries are the Francophone West African countries such as Cote d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (Habeb 2014, 2-4). This could be one reason why the Francophone countries were never committed to the intervention, because Nigeria took the center stage.

With its abundant human and material resources, Nigeria has a privileged position in the West African sub-region. Nigeria has played vital roles in West Africa due to its economic and political power. Nigeria has always played a leading role in providing aid projects to other West African states. Nigeria, as a nation, has done a number of developmental aid projects to help other West African States, usually in collaboration with ECOWAS. The Nigerian economy standing in the first place in Africa, inevitably puts Nigeria in a hegemonic position in West Africa, and its population of more than 180 million dwarfs all other African nations. Therefore, the presence of Nigeria in the intervention force meets the variable of "PRESENT" for a hegemon in a coalition.

Responsiveness of Deployment

Clear and Feasible Mandate Supported by a UNSC Resolution

From the onset of the intervention in Liberia, ECOMOG had no blessings from the UNSC until two years later when a UNSCR was passed to give legal obligation to the operation. Closely associated with the challenges, caused by strategic level political differences and matters concerning mandates, were the difficulties linked to ECOMOG's military strategy, which vacillated between peacekeeping and peace enforcement without significant breakthroughs in either. "Peacekeeping in Liberia was always likely to be difficult; the examples of Bosnia and Somalia illustrate the problems associated with

trying to apply the Cold War concept of peacekeeping in post-Cold War conflict environments” (Tuck 2000, 7).

There were challenges on which path to take, whether to go the peacekeeping route or the peace enforcement route, considering that the intervention force was subject to attacks from the belligerents. Based on the value and nature of the differences and the intricacies of the politics, it led to circumstances in which risks increased, consent was contested, violence was vicious and endemic, and where impartiality was very difficult to maintain. The Liberian conflict did not have the traditional essentials for a peacekeeping operation, such as the consent of the warring factions and a working ceasefire. For example, upon deployment the ECOMOG intervention force was attacked by the NPFL (Tuck 2000, 7).

ECOMOG was not only attacked upon deployment, but was expected to stop the belligerent parties from fighting each other and prevent further resumption of hostilities by them. Despite the challenges of manpower, ECOMOG troops were expected to protect and provide humanitarian assistance to the community Liberia. The ECOMOG mandate suffered the blunt of indecision from the policy makers at ECOWAS secretariat. This saw ECOMOG operations in Liberia moving to and fro between peacekeeping and peace enforcement activities (Mohammed 2005, 7).

The ECOMOG intervention in Liberia was marred by several setbacks; first, the intervention force was hastily constituted with a mandate, which did not mirror what was obtaining in the operation environment. Secondly, the intervention force deployed laid no necessary groundwork. Thirdly, it was only when the force was confronted by the belligerent parties that the impending complexities of the conflict became reality. The

conflict protracted eventually taking a toll on the troops. The rules of engagement kept on being modified as the conflict raged on to be able to respond to the operational environment as it evolved (Mohammed 2005, 7).

Sustaining the operation became economically and politically demanding for the TCCs, eventually contributing to divisions within the force. As the operation protracted, it became more dangerous, and costly. The readiness of ECOWAS states to support the supposedly dangerous options often dwindled substantially. The Senegalese contingent, for example, was withdrawn because of initial casualties were sustained after being involved for less than two years in the operation (Alao 1994, 430). Divisions at the political strategic level interfered with the decision-making capability of ECOWAS and led to indecision regarding which operational objectives to pursue at any given time. Moreover, as expected, the national governments intervened in ECOMOG operations by directly ordering their own contingents, negatively affecting the cohesion of the force and more often than not, creating potentially disastrous situations. Instead of the operation being wholly controlled by ECOWAS, TCCs interfered with running of the mission when ECOMOG had an appointed force commander who was in charge of the operation (Howe 1996, 162).

The intervention force had another challenge on the unclear mandates given to the force. At the inception of the operation, it was required to monitor the cease-fire, but later had to conduct operations to restore law and order. Because the force deployed without consent of some of the belligerent forces, they ended up being targets. For example, it had major NPLF offensive operations directed at it. ECOMOG ended up finding itself operating from Chapter VI to Chapter VII (BBC Monitoring Report 1990, 100). The

force had no option but to switch from Chapter VI to Chapter VII and mounted limited offensive operations in order to protect its positions and enforce the cease-fire since they had operated without a UN Security Council Resolution until after October 1992.

However, when the UN Security Council passed Resolution 788 of 1992 the intervention was authorized to operate under Chapter VII.

The Bamako Agreement of November 1990 and the Lomé Agreement of February 1991 for example, tasked ECOMOG to monitor cease-fires and manning buffer zones. It established movement control measures, like roadblocks and checkpoints, in order to disarm factions without explicit guidelines on how these tasks were to be achieved in a non-permissive and volatile environment (United Nations Security Council 1991, 1-43). The mandate did give clear guidance on how these tasks were to be performed given the paucity in the number of troops and in the event that the troops faced resistance in the conduct of the operations. There was yet another challenge surrounding mandates when a later decision relating to implementation of the Yamoussoukro IV agreement was made. More often than not, ECOMOG was required, to use all measures necessary to enforce the cease-fires and sanctions, while at the same time a strong assumption that the intervention force will maintain its status as peacekeepers was expected (Tuck 2000, 4).

The mandate given to the ECOMOG intervention force kept shifting the focus and there bringing ambiguity to the troops on the ground. It was not to clear what was expected of the troops to do, from cease-fire monitoring to firefights with the belligerents; but UNSCR 788 of 1992 authorized the intervention force to operate under

Chapter VII. Based upon this analysis, a value of “NOT PRESENT” is assigned to the value, “Clear and Feasible Mandate Supported by a UNSC Resolution.”

Troop Contributing Countries Support

The troop contributing countries supported their troops in the operation in Liberia. However, the capture and killing of President Samuel Doe in unexplained circumstances negatively affected the military credibility of ECOMOG. In September 1990, Nigerian President, General (GEN) Babangida, and Ghanaian President Flight Lieutenant Jerry Rawlings agreed to strengthen ECOMOG’s land component part of the force to the level of an effective and cohesive fighting force. The objective was not only to deter the belligerents from launching further attacks on the ECOMOG intervention force but also to prepare ECOMOG for peace-enforcement actions aimed at restoring its image as a credible military force. In support of this cause, the intervention force strength was doubled from 3500 in August to 7000 soldiers by the end of September 1990. This indicates a measure of support by Nigeria and Ghana as part of the TCC. Additionally, ECOMOG was completely restructured to comprise all the three components of a contemporary fighting force: army, navy, and air force (Adibe 1997, 476).

The United States had interest in seeing that the conflict in Liberia was resolved. The US was therefore keen in supporting the peace process in that country. It contributed a total of more than 8.6 million US dollars to ECOWAS for peacekeeping. When President, Diouf of Senegal officially visited Washington in September 1991 President George Bush and Secretary of State James Baker urged him to contribute troops to the ECOMOG intervention in Liberia. The Bush administration contributed approximately

2.8 million US dollars towards the intervention by September 1991, but pledged to contribute more towards the effort (Mortimer 1996, 297).

The United States Department of State announced in September 1991 that it would provide an additional 3.75 million US dollars in foreign military financing funds to support the Yamoussoukro Peace Process, allocated as follows: Cote d'Ivoire and Senegal, one million US dollars; Ghana, Guinea, and Sierra Leone, five hundred thousand US dollars each; and The Gambia, two hundred and fifty thousand US dollars. The statement further said, "We are urgently considering what additional resources can be made available to support the reinforcement of ECOMOG with Senegalese troops and urge the international community to join us in assisting the Liberia peace process" (Mortimer 1991, 28).

The United States found additional money under the provisions of Section 506b of the Foreign Assistance Act, which authorizes the Pentagon to provide supplies from its stockpiles to assist other governments in peacekeeping activities. The fact that the United States provided some fifteen million US dollars' worth of military equipment to Senegal helps to explain Senegalese President Diouf's decision to commit forces to the politically treacherous Liberian arena (Mortimer 1996, 297). Though the US did not intervene in the Liberia crisis despite having played a vital role in the creation of the country, they did support the intervention initiative financially as evidenced by the financial and logistical support rendered to the TCCs. There was TCC support from the TCCs themselves and the international community especially the US as evidenced by the financial and logistical support rendered to the troops in the field. Based upon this analysis, a value of "PRESENT" is assigned to the value of "Troop Contributing Country Support."

Operational Status

Financial Support

Despite facilitating the peace intervention by giving the consent to the ECOWAS to intervene in the Liberian conflict, the OAU did not support the intervention logistically. One of the major reasons why the OAU could not render support to the intervention was the fact that most of the member states were economically or/and politically not viable (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 56). This meant that ECOWAS had to look for support within ECOWAS and other international partners as the mother body the OAU was not in position to support the mission. It equally gave the opportunity to the sub-region's hegemon, Nigeria to step in and do much in support of the intervention. Nigeria having the strongest economy in the ECOWAS, was seen to take the center stage in both troop contribution and the support rendered to the intervention mission. The actual financial cost for the Nigerian part in the intervention in Liberia remains a state secret to date, but sources claim it could have been in excess of US \$4 billion. In 2001, the President of Nigeria, by then Olusegun Obasanjo, indicated that in the 1990s alone, Nigeria spent US \$13 billion over a period of twelve years on peace support operations (Afaha 2016, 13).

It is evident that Nigeria as the sub-region hegemon takes center stage among the member states in the ECOWAS to support of peace support operations financially. Ghana also has been very instrumental in both troop contribution and financial support to peace support operations. During the intervention in Liberia, Ghana was the closest ally to Nigeria so was the troop and financial contribution. The study is limited in time and

space and therefore just looks at the two member states as an examination on the commitment to financially support.

The Financial Times was quoted to have reported that Nigeria spent between US \$ 250-500 million to finance the ECOMOG intervention in Liberia from its Gulf war windfall. This was just within a time frame of two to three years. Due to the lack of resources, it became difficult for Ghana to sustain operations. It has been argued that Ghana, after Nigeria, took care of a significant portion of the outstanding 20 to 30 percent recurrent expenditures left for supporting ECOMOG peace support operations in Liberia. Based on the aforementioned figures, Ghana's contribution to ECOMOG would then be approximately US \$8 million annually (Kwesi 1996, 285).

In the first officially published report, former Minister of Finance, Kwesi Botchway indicated that Ghana had disbursed financial resources in excess of US \$10 million on its contribution to ECOMOG from 1990 to 1995, primarily for salary and logistics (Kwesi 1996, 285). On the other hand, it has been argued that Ghana's total expenditure on its ECOMOG involvement in Liberia until late 1995 amounted to US \$15 million (Ephson 1996, 33). Ghana stood second in terms of ECOWAS member states financial contribution to the intervention effort in Liberia though both countries are on record for having problems of paying operational allowances to their troops. Guinea is the third country that participated throughout the ECOMOG intervention in Liberia though the actual figures that the country contributed are not readily available.

On the part of international partner financial assistance, the United States stands on top of the list. United States provided funds for operationalizing some of the shortfalls; for example, the inclusion of Senegalese, Tanzanian, and Ugandan troops at

different points in the operation. The United States helped finance individual ECOWAS member states that contributed troops to the intervention, and gave direct financial assistance to ECOMOG. Though there was no financial support that was forthcoming from the OAU, the intervention force received financial support from TCCs and international partners like the United States. Suffice to mention that the financial resources were not always sufficient, as there were reports of troops going without their allowances for months (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 72). Since the operation endured from 1990 to 1997 without coming do halt due to financial constraints, the financial support variable scores “PRESENT.”

Command and Control

Command and control of the intervention force proved to be a tug of war because Ghana initially provided the force commander, Lieutenant General Arnold Quainoo. However, a change of command occurred after the capture and assassination of President Samuel Doe and seventy of his bodyguards from the ECOMOG Force Headquarters by Prince Johnson’s INPFL. The capture of Samuel Doe from the ECOMOG Force Headquarters dented the credibility of the ECOMOG command as the international community felt that GEN Quainoo blundered by disarming Samuel Doe and his men when they went to the ECOMOG Headquarters, but failed to disarm Prince Johnson and his men (The Ghanaian Times 2014).

The Sierra Leonean contingent commander, Lieutenant Colonel Modu Hanciles, had to be withdrawn for cowardice and dereliction of duty within three months of deployment. Looting became a common trend among the ECOMOG troops with stolen cars and other valuable household goods regularly shipped to Nigeria and elsewhere

where the intervention troops came from. Due to this unprofessional behavior, the Liberian population corrupted the acronym, ECOMOG, to stand for “Every Car or Moving Object Gone.” Adherence to the common code of military discipline was questionable from time to time leading to many questions begging as to whether command and control was effective. The force was also hindered by what was called “an incoherent logistical tail” (Howe 1998). Air assets, for instance, were so inadequate that by 1995, the force commander used the only available and serviceable helicopter as his personal taxi instead of using it to enhance command and control.

Lack of adequate air transport and communication resources also affected command and control. The Liberian campaign is reported to have cost Nigeria alone a staggering US \$3 billion, and over 500 soldiers killed in action. The loss in terms of the troops has been attributed to problems of command and control, especially in the early stages of the Liberian campaign and compromised discipline (Gberie 2003, 149).

The other aspect that posed a challenge to command and control of the ECOMOG force in Liberia was that governments of TCCs maintained significant political control over their battalions, which led to negative operational consequences. This implied that the Force Commander (FC) did not have effective operational control of the troops under his command and could not always deploy them according to his plan stemming from the visualization of the operational environment. Governments for TCC normally determined where their troops were to be deployed and not the Force Commander. This put the contingent/battalion commander in a predicament, as they had to answer both to their governments through their Chief of Defense Staff and the Force Commander (Mohammed 2005, 12).

Multinational operations, be it offensive or peace support operations, have challenges of command and control. The ECOMOG intervention force in Liberia was a multinational force and could only achieve “unity of effort.” Compounded by mistrust among the members, troops deployed in the operations area with different instructions from those issued by the ECOMOG Headquarters. This implied that the Contingent Commanders enjoyed considerable autonomy from the control by the FC. Such a situation compromised command and control in the operation area. Even more seriously, it is on record that governments of TCCs would withdraw their troops deployed on a flank without the consent of the FC thereby exposing the other troops and jeopardizing their lives. The FC lacked a well-founded political direction for his area of operation. The ECOWAS secretariat on the other end, which was supposed to direct the conduct of operations by the ECOMOG intervention force, did not have well-established channels of communication with the troops in the operational area. (Mohammed 2005, 12).

When Major General Joshua Nimyel Dogonyaro was appointed FC, the office of Field Commander in charge of field operations in Liberia was created in Monrovia instead of Banjul where the previous FC operated. The appointment of General Dogonyaro, was a process of weaning General Arnold Quainoo from Ghana as FC. The subsequent appointment of two Deputy Field Commanders from Ghana and Guinea respectively as the other TCCs was intended to help foster unity of effort in the force. Henceforth, Nigeria assumed the command responsibility of ECOMOG Forces in Liberia, and occupied most of the dominant positions in the Force Headquarters. With Nigeria taking over command of the ECOMOG intervention force, restructuring had to be done in order to achieve operational efficiency and effectiveness by forming two

ECOMOG Brigades, and a Ground Task Force consisting of armor, infantry units, and an artillery brigade. The restructuring was meant to provide more tactical balance and operational grouping versatile enough to deal with specific operational situations with adequate combat power (Mohammed 2005, 12). Based upon this analysis, a value of “NOT PRESENT” is assigned to the variable of Command and Control.

Interoperability among Troop Contributing Countries

Interoperability among a multinational force can be a big challenge if not addressed during joint training. Interoperability in multinational forces joint operations generally refers to compatibility of hardware and software. Connectivity alone, however, does not confer capability and should be accompanied by interoperability of personnel, processes, and organizations. Studies have been conducted aiming to identify and understand non-technical factors that have the potential to impinge on optimal inter-working in multinational forces joint operations (Stewart, Cremin, Mills, and Phipp 2004, 3). In assessing interoperability among the TCCs during the ECOMOG intervention in Liberia, this study will restrict itself to aspects of doctrine, communication, and equipment (language).

There were doctrinal obstacles; Anglophone TCCs’ doctrines were pro-British while the Francophone TCCs were pro-French. This difference in doctrinal orientation resulted in different approaches adopted by the TCCs. For example, the Francophone TCCs preferred moderate measures and limited objectives, while Nigeria advocated for high tempo and aggressive tactics in dealing with the belligerents (Wippman 1993, 169). The Nigerian Defense Force were more aggressive unlike the Francophone TCCs. Ghana on the other hand was moderate due to its massive experience in peacekeeping

operations. These differences were as a result of the absence of a common doctrine among ECOMOG's TCCs to intervention force. The difference was particularly evident between the Ghanaian troops' and Nigerians' approaches to peace support operations. The Ghanaians were seen to emphasize diplomacy over enforcement due to their immense training in peacekeeping backed by experience. Ghana has participated in peace support operations since 1960. Nigerians on the other hand, preferred a more activist and combat approach to the Liberian intervention operation (Olonisakin 1993, 363). These differences in the operational approach by the ECOMOG TCCs in the Liberian conflict were the result of not having an ECOMOG peace support operations doctrine.

Just like doctrine, communication is important. It enables the passage of information from one end to another. The importance of communication in any military undertaking cannot be overemphasized. However, communication can be a nightmare in a multinational environment due to different languages and incompatible communication equipment. The intervention force was divided into two camps in terms of language, the French speaking West African states, and the English speaking. The countries operated according to their language affiliation.

In order to avoid misunderstandings due to language differences, ECOMOG divided Liberia into sectors. Each contingent worked autonomously in the assigned national sector, thereby circumventing problems that could arise from differences in contingents' capabilities or languages. ECOMOG had allowed only English and French to be spoken at the headquarters level, this again was done to avoid the language challenges that could have arisen had more than two languages and dialects been used. Too many languages in the same work environment may lead to distortion of information

and eventually lead to miscommunication, and can compromise operational security. (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 65).

After the Liberian intervention, Nigeria embarked on formulating a peace support operations doctrine and intended to disseminate it to interested countries in the sub-region. It would be assumed that such a doctrine will include lessons learned challenges faced in terms of interoperability in Liberia. For example, Nigeria learned that it was paramount to have liaison officers in each participating contingent. The value of liaison officers in a multinational operational environment cannot be overemphasized as it helps in fostering interoperability, command and control, and communication. (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 65). Since the contingents operated in different sectors allocated to the participating countries, the aspect of difference in equipment did not have much impact to the operations. This was because the TCCs' militaries operated almost independently; therefore, the challenge of equipment compatibility was not much of an issue. The variable of interoperability was "NOT PRESENT" in the Liberia intervention.



Figure 4. Map of Sierra Leone

Source: The University of Texas at Austin, “Country Maps Sierra Leone-Political,” 2018, accessed 23 March 2018, https://legacy.lib.utexas.edu/maps/africa/sierra_leone_pol_2005.jpg.

A Case Study of ECOMOG Intervention in Sierra Leone

Sierra Leone, a member of the ECOWAS, got its independence from Britain in 1961. After independence, the country was ruled by the Margai brothers—Sir Milton Margai and Sir Albert Margai—under the Sierra Leone People’s Party (SLPP). Elections were held in 1967, which saw the All Peoples Congress (APC) winning. Immediately

after APC won the elections and begun to govern, a coup was staged toppling the legitimate government. Ultimately, in 1968, the military leaders handed over power to Siaka Stevens, leader of the APC. Over time, political power became monopolized under Stevens, resulting in the creation of a one-party system in 1978 (Zack-Williams 1999, 143-162).

The Siaka Stevens' government was spending more than it was collecting in revenue thereby reducing the government's capacity to run the state. With lack of revenue to run the state, Siaka Stevens had no option but to turn to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to borrow money to enable the state to function. However, borrowing money from the International Monitoring Fund and World Bank did not make the economic situation any better in Sierra Leone, given the conditionality attached to borrowing from international lending institutions, which also was exacerbated by the corruption that was ongoing in the government. Instead of addressing the economic situation, most of the borrowed money was embezzled by the ruling bureaucrats. Embezzlement by top government officials sowed a seed of discontent in other sectors of the society and would later be a trigger for civil strife plunging the country into an armed conflict (Kandeh 2003, 192).

With the continuing decline of the economy and no hope of recovery, President Siaka Stevens decided to hand over power to his army commander, GEN Joseph Momoh. GEN Momoh thought he would turn the economy around by continuing with the reforms that Stevens had initiated but these reforms did not yield any positive results as the public sector was still infested with corruption, which posed a big challenge (Adebajo 2002, 81). The lack of political accountability, rampant corruption and inequitable exploitation and

distribution of the country's resources set the stage for an armed rebellion by the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), led by a former army signals corporal Foday Sankoh, and composed mainly of disaffected and unemployed youths and soldiers who defected from the army (McGregor 1999, 483). With the ongoing economic hardships in the country, it was very easy for the RUF to recruit members among the unemployed youths and dissatisfied workers into its rebellion endeavor.

With support in the form of logistics, military training, and financial support from countries like Libya and Burkina Faso, as well as Liberia now under Charles Taylor who was controlling Liberia by then, the RUF launched its offensive and invaded the diamond-rich southeast region of Sierra Leone from Liberia, on 23 March 1991 (Adebajo 2002, 82). The very fact that the invasion was launched from Liberia, suggests the support received from Charles Taylor. Foday Sankoh's RUF begun its rebellion during Momoh's reign, but the civil war continued to rage on between successive civilian and military governments. Therefore, at the time, Army Captain Valentine Esegragbo Melvine Strasser and the National Provisional Ruling Council (NPRC) overthrew Momoh's government and took over power in April 1992, causing the armed conflict to rage on. Captain Strasser made efforts to negotiate with Sankoh's RUF, but the negotiations were futile leading to Captain Strasser's government hiring a private South African security firm, Executive Outcomes. Executive Outcome was hired to assist in the training and provision of logistical support to the Sierra Leonean Army, and recapture the diamond rich areas (eastern part of Sierra Leone), which was under RUF control. They were also seen providing security for key infrastructure like the Kambui Hills Hydro Power Station. (Adebajo 2002, 84).

Executive Outcomes managed to recapture some parts of the diamond rich areas in the east of the country, which were under control of the RUF. But Executive Outcomes remained a huge drain on the Sierra Leone exchequer, consuming US \$1.7 million per month (Zack Williams 1999, 143-162). In January 1996, Brigadier General Julius Bio overthrew Captain Strasser's government, but due to concerted domestic and international pressure, Bio had to hand over power to a civilian a civilian government. Elections were held in February 1996 and Ahmed Tejan Kabbah of the Sierra Leone People's Party, which had led the country to independence, emerged as a winner with a decisive victory (Arthur 2010, 9).

After what ended up being protracted chain of political violence and coups and countercoups during Kabbah's tenure of office, Côte d'Ivoire negotiated the Abidjan Agreement, which the Sierra Leonean factions signed in November 1996. The agreement centered on a cease-fire, equitable social and economic development and democratization (McGregor 1999, 485), it also included the withdrawal of all foreign troops, like Executive Outcomes, and the transformation of the RUF from an armed belligerent force to a political party (Adebajo 2002, 86). The country was optimistic that with the signing of the Abidjan agreement and the coming to power of Kabbah, Sierra Leone would return to peace and security, but this did not happen as Ahmed Tejan Kabbah's government was overthrown by a military junta led by MAJ Johnny Paul Koroma on 25 May 1997. MAJ Koroma's military junta formed the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC), and entered into an alliance with the RUF. At the time this alliance was formed, the RUF had been fighting the Freetown government from March 1991 (Arthur 2010, 9).

Prior to leading the military junta that overthrew President Ahmad Tejan Kabbah's one-year old government of national unity, the thirty-three-year-old, MAJ Koroma had been held at the Pademba Road Penitentiary awaiting trial for his alleged involvement in the September 1996 attempted coup d'état against the government. Soon after his release from the penitentiary, Major Koroma, whose trial was scheduled to commence the following day, formed the AFRC, and asked Nigeria to release RUF's Foday Sankoh from detention and invited him to join the military junta as his vice president. Kabbah requested GEN Sani Abacha of Nigeria for military help since he was the ECOWAS chairperson. The request was made after two days of fighting. He needed the military intervention from ECOWAS to help restore his ousted government. During this period, Nigeria had some troops in Sierra Leone who had been there to help train the national defense forces in its fight against the RUF (Dumbuya 2008, 83).

Nigerian President GEN Abacha, a close personal friend of Ahmed Tejan Kabbah, saw the coup by the military junta as a personal humiliation, and vowed to overturn it by all means possible (Gberie 2003, 150). He ordered the Nigerian training team to help Tejan Kabbah's ousted government but they failed to dislodge Koroma's junta. After the Nigerian training team failed to dislodge MAJ Koroma's junta, General Abacha decided to deploy an ECOMOG Nigerian led intervention force to reverse the coup in Freetown. The intervention force fought and recaptured Freetown in February 1998 forcing Koroma and Sankoh's rogues to flee into the provinces, the majority of them into the diamond rich areas in the eastern part of the country. After President Kabbah returned to Freetown on 10 March 1998, he appointed Nigerian GEN Maxwell Khobe to lead the intervention force that pushed the rebels from Freetown to head the Sierra Leonean Army

(Dumbuya 2008, 83). The dislodging of the rebels from Freetown did not end the civil war that had by then raged on for seven years leaving thousands of innocent civilians dead and many more displaced with scores seeking refuge in neighboring countries.

It can be concluded that a combination of factors and theories ranging from economic and political marginalization, centralization of power, corruption, and attempts to control resources were behind the conflict in Sierra Leone. When the rebels were dislodged from Freetown, the war raged on. It led to the exploitation of children and physical mutilation of the bodies of innocent people. Rebel groups raped girls and committed various crimes against humanity leaving thousands of citizens traumatized (Zack-Williams 1999, 143-162). No sooner had the rebels been dislodged from Freetown than the country was rocked by more violence. The violence culminated in an alliance of RUF and the military junta, and invaded the capital of Freetown on 6 January 1999. The invasion of Freetown left massive destruction of life and property. Thousands of people, including children and women, were either killed or displaced. Others had their limbs cut off. In May 1999 when the Lomé Peace agreement was signed, it granted a blanket amnesty to all combatants and the government was required to share power with rebel leaders despite the atrocities they had committed against the people of Sierra Leone (Kandeh 2003, 192-193). Soon after the signing of the Lomé Agreement, Nigerian troops began to gradually withdraw troops from Sierra Leone in August 1999. At the same time, the UN started deploying its peacekeepers; first Military Observers deployed, and then armed contingents and civilian police.

Challenges Faced by ECOMOG Forces in Sierra Leone (Assessing the Variables)

Sandline International, a British-based private military and security company had a contract with the Kabbah government. It supplied President Ahmed Kabbah's government with weapons to help deal with the insurrection in the country. In the meantime, the ECOMOG intervention forces deployed in March 1998 to reinstate the legitimate and democratically elected Ahmed Tejan Kabbah. Kabbah had been overthrown in a military coup led by MAJ Koroma. The efforts from Sandline International were not good enough, even when combined with the efforts from Executive Outcomes, another private military and security company (Arthur 2010, 13). Contracting these private armies was meant to augment the Sierra Leonean Army in bringing peace and security to the country after a period of civil war but took a toll on the already failing economy.

Collective Security Principles

Strong Military Coalition

The conflict in Sierra Leone did not only have negative consequences, but left untold human carnage. The junta and the RUF rebels committed many crimes against humanity; a number of people had their limbs cut off. When ECOMOG intervened, they had to fight both the junta (AFRC) and RUF to bring the human carnage to an end and restore the legitimate government of Ahmed Kabbah. Nigeria, Guinea, and the Gambia were the member states that contributed troops for the intervention force in Sierra Leone. Nigerian and Guinean forces had been stationed in Sierra Leone since 1995, training the Sierra Leonean defense force and helping the government to fight the RUF rebels. The

ECOMOG troops were led by General Maxwell Khobe from Nigeria. The ECOMOG troops had the pro-government Civil Defense Forces, locally known as Kamajos, numbering 25,000 on their side fighting elsewhere in the country (Dumbuya 2008, 97). Nigeria's hegemonic role provided more than 75 percent of ECOMOG troops (twelve thousand out of sixteen thousand in Liberia, and twelve thousand out of thirteen thousand in Sierra Leone) and 90 percent of the funding during the military interventions in both Liberia and Sierra Leone (Adebajo 2005, 293).

ECOMOG's important source of the political cohesion was in the bond that nearly all the TCCs had with Nigeria. For example, Nigerian former President General Babangida was a classmate at the Nigerian Military and Defense Academy to one of the former Sierra Leonean presidents. Nigerians have served in some high government portfolios to include as attorneys general and chief of staff for the armed forces in the Gambia. This shows how close the Nigerians and the Gambians are. Prior to the death of Guinea's Sékou Touré in 1984, the relationship between Nigeria and Guinea was not sound. But after his death, the impediment to the relationship was removed. Since then, the two countries enjoyed warm and cordial relations. Nigeria has been supportive in meeting Guinean, Gambian, and Sierra Leonean financial and logistical requirements for participation in ECOMOG operations, hence the willingness to follow Nigeria's lead (Taw and Grant-Thomas 1999, 60-61). However, the lack of meeting the threshold to qualify the strong military coalition requirement of at least five member states contributing troops, nullifies this cohesion.

Besides the political cohesion, Nigeria and Guinea had troops that were already in Sierra Leone helping the country's defense forces train. The two countries were already

cooperating, and therefore when it came to the intervention piece, it was not a challenge for them to work together. The Gambia, being Anglophone, had no problems in working with Nigeria nor had they had any challenges with working with Guinea. The cordial relationships that existed among the TCCs allowed for a strong military coalition among the three TCCs. The fact that the three countries were the only ones that offered to contribute troops to the intervention effort, out of the sub-region of fifteen member states, made them have a unity of effort. However, considering that the ECOWAS is a fifteen-member state sub-region organization with only three countries that contributed troops, makes the military coalition not a strong one despite the cooperation that existed in the operational environment. More so that Nigeria contributed more than 75 percent of the intervention force. Therefore, this variable of strong military coalition is rated as “NOT PRESENT.”

Commitment to Intervention

Just like the intervention operation in Liberia, Nigeria still played the pivotal role in the intervention in Sierra Leone. Nigeria justified its interventionist approach in the wake of the coup by the AFRC that deposed of President Ahmed Tejan Kabbah of Sierra Leone by citing the 1981 ECOWAS Protocol Relating to Mutual Assistance. The sections of the protocol cited are Article 2, which states, “Member States declare and accept that any armed threat or aggression directed against any member state will constitute a threat or aggression against the entire Community.” Article 16 states, “When an external armed threat or aggression is directed against a member state of the Community, the Head of State of that country shall send a written request for assistance

to the current Chairman of the Authority of ECOWAS” (Economic Community of the West African States 1981).

When Sierra Leonean President Kabbah requested for intervention from Abidjan, the Nigerian government was pleased that the required conditions for military intervention had been met. The security piece of ECOWAS was an added responsibility because the original purpose of ECOWAS was to promote economic integration amongst the disparate Anglophone, Francophone, and Lusophone nations of the sub-region. During the period that ECOMOG was intervening in Sierra Leone, only Nigeria, Benin, and Cote d’Ivoire were fully paid up members. This posed a number of challenges. Just like there were few paid up members of the sub-region, so was the commitment to the intervention to reverse the coup in Sierra Leone. The lack of commitment was largely attributed to the failed efforts at economic and monetary union, distrust between Anglophone and Francophone members and organizations, like the European Union that once took a great interest in ECOWAS’s success, begun to divert their financial assistance and energies to the more promising Southern Africa Development Community (McGregor 1999, 482-501).

The variable of Commitment to the Intervention is found “NOT PRESENT” in the Sierra Leonean intervention because only three out of the fifteen member states were committed to the cause. It required at least five of the member states to be committed for it to be present.

Presence of a Hegemon

Nigeria stands out as the hegemon in the ECOWAS. During the period of intervention in Sierra Leone, Nigeria was in the forefront in reversing the AFRC junta

coup and fighting the RUF. Their role and presence in the intervention clearly qualifies them as a hegemon not only in the sub-region, but in the entire process of intervention. Nigeria contributed more than 75 percent of the intervention troops, and also helped Guinea and the Gambia logistically during the intervention.

It is widely recognized that Nigeria is acknowledged as the hegemon in the sub-region. It played a vital and indispensable role in the Sierra Leonean conflict, and continues to do so in most, if not all, sub-regional peace and security initiatives, both politically and financially. One wonders what would have been of President Kabbah's government without the hegemonic role played by Nigeria in reversing the AFRC junta. Probably the violence and atrocities committed by both the AFRC and the RUF, and later with the Westside Boys, would have escalated to levels that the UN would have had no peace to keep. United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) would have not had any peace to keep had the Nigerian led ECOMOG not done the groundwork, which included the restoration of the Kabbah-led government.

When compared to what ECOWAS has done in the realm of peace and security in relation to other sub-regional organizations on the continent, then one begins to appreciate the vital and indispensable role Nigeria has played and continues to play in ECOMOG. However, it cannot still be ignored that in any peace support operation, or indeed any multinational military operation, measures should be put in place to ensure that presumed regional hegemons do not dominate to an extent of disadvantaging the operation (Adibe 1997, 483). From the analysis, one can see the "PRESENT" variable of a hegemon in the Sierra Leone ECOMOG intervention.

Responsiveness of Deployment

Clear and Feasible Mandate Supported by a UNSC Resolution

The intervention by the Nigerian led ECOMOG in Sierra Leone was premised on the ECOWAS Protocol Relating to Mutual Assistance on Defence of 1981. Chapter VIII of the UN Charter allows regional and sub-regional organizations to undertake peace support operations. However, any military intervention, or rather use of force, requires authorization by the UNSC through the promulgation of a resolution to address that specific mission or operation.

Notable among resolutions that the UNSC adopted that supported the ECOMOG intervention was Resolution 1132 of 8 October 1997. It was adopted after the UNSC expressed concern on the deteriorating situation in Sierra Leone (United Nations Security Council 1997). Acting under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council banned the sale or supply to Sierra Leone of petroleum and petroleum products and arms and related materiel of all types through Resolution 1132, which included weapons and munition, military vehicles and equipment, paramilitary equipment and spare parts for those items. The UNSC unanimously approved a resolution to establish the United Nations Observer Mission to Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL) in July 1998, increasing the UN's military observer presence already in the country from approximately ten to seventy officers, along with civilian support and medical staff. UNOMSIL was mandated to monitor and help ECOMOG with the implementation of a program for the disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of combatants (the DDR program); reporting on the security situation; and monitoring respect for international

humanitarian law, including at disarmament and demobilization sites (United Nations Security Council 1998).

ECOMOG felt justified and adequately covered by the United Nations Charter Chapter VIII, which allows regional or sub-regional conflict resolution which in this case was equally reinforced by Resolution 1132/1997. In its press release, the Security Council indicated its support for the efforts by the ECOMOG in trying to address the deteriorating situation in Sierra Leone. The UNSC “expresses its strong support for the efforts of the ECOWAS Committee to resolve the crisis in Sierra Leone and encourages it to continue to work for the peaceful restoration of the constitutional order, including through the resumption of negotiations.” One may argue that the UNSC did not give blessings to the use of force by the ECOMOG in confronting the security situation in the country. However, Chapter VIII of the UN Charter authorizes sub-regional organizations to intervene and in doing so they may use force under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. In achieving the ECOWAS mandate of reinstating the democratically elected government of Ahmed Tejan Kabbah, it was inevitable for ECOMOG troops to use force. Clear and Feasible Mandate Supported by a UNSC Resolution variable is therefore “PRESENT” based on this analysis.

Troop Contributing Countries Support

Besides the support that came from the TCCs themselves, the ECOMOG intervention received support from international partners. The United Kingdom provided the highest financial and logistical support to ECOMOG and Sierra Leonean government forces than any other international partner, and was equally the largest national donor to Sierra Leone’s reconstruction effort and humanitarian assistance. The United Kingdom

provided a total sum of more than 30 million US dollars from the time President Kabbah was reinstated in March 1998. The assistance provided included financial and logistical assistance to ECOMOG, as well as training and equipment for a new Sierra Leonean army (Foreign and Commonwealth Office 1999).

The United States' foreign policy on Sierra Leone during the conflict was tailored to achieve four objectives that was to: increase international support for ECOMOG; help ECOWAS leaders coordinate a negotiated settlement; curtail external support for the military junta and RUF rebels; and provide humanitarian relief. Stemming from these objectives, the U.S. provided 3.9 million U.S. dollars in equipment and logistical support to ECOMOG, and contributed over fifty-five million U.S. dollars in humanitarian assistance in 1998. In 1999, it committed five million for logistical support and medical supplies and planned to seek approval for a further 5.8 million U.S. dollars from Congress (Rice 1999). In May 1999, the U.S. government promised to double its commitments to assist ECOMOG and the Sierra Leonean Government (Pickering 1999).

Nigeria provided not less than 80 percent of ECOMOG troops (12,000 out of 16,000 in Liberia, and 12,000 out of 13,000 in Sierra Leone) and 90 percent of its funding during the military interventions in both Liberia and Sierra Leone (Adebajo 2005, 293). So the support by the other TCCs (the Gambia and Guinea) was very marginal considering that international partners contributed 10 to 20 percent of the remaining financial costs. Since the operation was not impeded by financial and logistical constraints, the variable of Troop Contributing Countries Support is hereby awarded the score "PRESENT."

Operational Status

Financial Support

Nigeria met 80 percent of the financial obligation for the intervention operation in Sierra Leone with the remainder coming from international partners like the United Kingdom and the United States. Guinea and the Gambia contributed very marginal amounts as they relied heavily on Nigeria for financial support to support their troops in the field. It is reported that Nigeria alone spent about 1 million U.S. dollars every day in operational cost during its involvement with ECOMOG in Sierra Leone (Human Rights Watch 1999). The U.S. provided 3.9 million U.S. dollars in equipment and logistical support to ECOMOG. In 1999, it committed 5 million for logistical support and medical supplies and planned to seek approval for a further 5.8 million U.S. dollars from Congress (Rice 1999). In May 1999, the U.S. government promised to double its commitments to assist ECOMOG and the Sierra Leonean Government (Pickering 1999).

The United Kingdom is said to have been the largest international partner financial sponsor to the efforts of ECOMOG in Sierra Leone. The United Kingdom provided a total sum of more than 30 million U.S. dollars from the time President Kabbah was reinstated in March 1998. The assistance provided included financial and logistical assistance to ECOMOG, training and equipment for a new Sierra Leonean army (Foreign and Commonwealth Office 1999). The ECOMOG operations are reported to have benefited a substantial amount of that financial contribution by the UK. The European Union is reported to have assisted financially but the actual figures are not known. The operations of ECOMOG in Sierra Leone had some financial challenges, but those challenges did not impede intervention as the basic requirements were made available. It

is concluded therefore that since no serious impediments resulted from the lack of financial support, the variable of “Financial Support” scores “PRESENT” in the ECOMOG intervention in Sierra Leone.

Command and Control

Nigeria provided more than 75 percent of the intervention troops in Sierra Leone and had close ties with the other TCCs. The numbers of troops contributed by the Gambia and Guinea were not that many to pose challenges of command and control. Nigeria being the largest troop contributor, took charge of the overall command of the mission. Guinea, despite being Francophone, had strong ties with Nigeria and sound relations with the Gambia. Guinea and Nigeria had troops already stationed in Sierra Leone with the tasks of training the Sierra Leonean Army and help fighting the RUF rebels. So over time they developed a shared understanding of the operational environment which helped in command and control. Despite this, there were a number of command and control issues in the ECOMOG intervention in Sierra Leone.

First and foremost, the challenges of command and control became evident when it failed to halt the AFRC and RUF alliance advance on Freetown in January 1999. It is a failure on the part of the leadership on account that they had intelligence reports two months earlier that AFRC and RUF were planning an attack on Freetown. However, ECOMOG command did nothing and left the civilian population at the mercy of the rebels who committed atrocities on the population in the city. This was a dismal failure on the part of the part of Major General Timothy Mai Shelpidi’s command. Command and Control was equally adversely affected by poor discipline and morale due to over deployment, in part because most of the soldiers deployed in Sierra Leone just

transitioned from the operation in Liberia. The discipline for rank and file soldiers became compromised they watched their officers go on leave while they had no such opportunities. This affected the operation a great deal as the soldiers felt not properly looked after. Lack of consistency in paying of allowances to the soldiers also negatively affected the morale of the soldiers who became unwilling to undertake risky tasks and resorted to diamond smuggling (Woods and Reese 2008, 47).

The ECOMOG intervention force was a multinational force dominated by Nigeria. The other TCCs included Guinea, the Gambia and, at a later stage, Ghana and Mali. Guinea and the Gambia had no issues in submitting to the leadership of Nigeria but it is reported that Ghana and Mali caused a number of challenges in command and control since they would conduct their own operations under their TCC command (Woods and Reese 2008, 49). One of the major contributing problems was the suspicion that the ECOMOG commander by then, Major General Maxwell Khobe was collaborating with the RUF and had received diamonds from them worth 10 million US dollars in exchange for weapons. So, some contingents thought it was not ethically justified to submit to such a commander. These challenges had a definite negative impact on command and control and therefore the variable of command and control does not qualify for the score of “PRESENT.”

Interoperability among Troop Contributing Countries

The majority of the TCCs forming up ECOMOG in Sierra Leone had operated together before in other peace support operations. Limited liaison officers hampered the communication process and interoperability between the units consequently affecting the smooth interaction, especially between the two blocs. This added up to ECOMOG’s

somewhat anarchical and decentralized organization both in its lateral (within national contingents) and horizontal (between contingents) capabilities (Howe 1997, 168). There were doctrinal obstacles. The Anglophone TCCs' doctrines for those that had were pro-British whilst the Francophone TCCs were pro-French. This difference in doctrinal orientation resulted in different approaches adopted by the TCCs just as it was in the ECOMOG intervention in Liberia. One would have expected that the ECOWAS was Secretariat would have learned lessons from the Liberian intervention and made the ECOMOG intervention have minimal challenges regarding interoperability (Wippman 1993, 169).

The challenges of command and control did not make things better for interoperability within the intervention force. Units from Nigeria had challenges in dealing with other units from other countries as they considered the command at the ECOMOG headquarters corrupt and the Nigerian soldiers not disciplined. Differences in communication equipment were another challenge, although not as serious as that of the language, doctrinal differences and challenges of command and control. The variable of interoperability is therefore awarded "NOT PRESENT" during the intervention in Sierra Leone.

Summary Analysis of the Two Case Studies Results

The following table summarizes the results the case study of ECOMOG intervention in Liberia and ECOMOG intervention in Sierra Leone under the purview of the key variables identified.

Table 2. Summary Analysis of ECOMOG Conflict Interventions			
Variables		Liberia 1990	Sierra Leone 1999
Collective Security Principles	Strong Military Coalition	NOT PRESENT	NOT PRESENT
	Commitment to intervention	NOT PRESENT	NOT PRESENT
	Presence of a hegemon	PRESENT	PRESENT
Responsiveness of deployment	Clear and feasible mandate (supported by UNSC Resolution)	NOT PRESENT	PRESENT
	Troop Contributing Countries support	PRESENT	PRESENT
Operational Status	Financial support	PRESENT	PRESENT
	Command and Control	NOT PRESENT	NOT PRESENT
	Interoperability among Troop Contributing Countries	NOT PRESENT	NOT PRESENT

Source: Abdoul Aziz Fall, “Turning the ECOWAS Standby Force in a More Proactive Force: An Analysis of Past Interventions to Assess Key Deployment Hindrances,” Master’s thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 2015. (Variables: Financial support and Interoperability among Troop Contributing Countries formulated by the author).

Summary

Table 2 shows the scores obtained on the variables from the two case studies. In the first case study, ECOMOG lacked a strong military coalition and the commitment from a majority of the member states was not there, this is one reason why the intervention took close to ten years. Nigeria played the role of a hegemon in the Liberian intervention, and still is a hegemon in West Africa. Most of the financial expenses on the

part of ECOWAS/ECOMOG in the Liberian intervention were met by Nigeria. Without Nigeria's funding to the intervention effort, it probably would not have succeeded. ECOMOG troops in Liberia deployed without a mandate from the United Nations Security Council until October 1992. On the part of ECOWAS, the mandate kept on bouncing back and forth between Chapters VI and VII. Troops were not sure of what was required of them, more often than not, due to unclear instructions coming from the ECOWAS Secretariat. Troop Country Contribution scored present in the case study on Liberia because operations were not adversely affected as the TCCs and international partners met most of the operational support requirements.

ECOMOG had a number of issues that negatively affected the command and control of the Liberian operation. The rivalry between Anglophone and Francophone states contributed greatly to the lack of cohesive command and control; as did the infighting command appointments between Nigeria and Ghana. Discipline was another issue; the same issues that affected command and control had negative impacts on the interoperability of units on top of challenges of compatibility to communication equipment and the diversity of languages.

The Sierra Leonean intervention, like the Liberian intervention, had challenges regarding Strong Military Coalition and Commitment to the Intervention. Both are scored "NOT PRESENT" due to similar reasons: rivalry, lack of discipline, allegations of corruption by commanders, delayed payment of soldiers' allowance, and lack of leave because most of the soldiers had just transitioned from the intervention operation in Liberia into Sierra Leone. The West African hegemon Nigeria was present in the Sierra Leone intervention, and contributed more than 75 percent of the troops and financed up

to 80 percent of the operation. From the onset, the intervention in Sierra Leone enjoyed the backing of the UN Security Council in the form of embargoes and there was more clarity in the mandate given by ECOWAS, as compared to the Liberian intervention, thereby scoring present on the “Clear and Feasible Mandate” variable supported by UNSC Resolution. The Financial Support variable scored “PRESENT” as already alluded to above. Command and Control and Interoperability among Troop Contributing Countries both scored “NOT PRESENT” due to similar reasons to the intervention in Liberia though there were allegations of illegal trading in diamonds in exchange for arms and ammunition among the elements of command leadership. Many of the issues experienced in these two West African interventions also confront SADC and the next chapter contains recommendations which, if addressed now, may help SADC prepare its brigade for future employment.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

ECOWAS was the first sub-regional organization to conduct force intervention in the post-Cold War era. It has conducted a number of force interventions and other related peace support operations. Despite the number of challenges it faced, ECOWAS has scored numerous successes. From both these challenges and successes, the SADC sub-region has a lot to learn in order to position itself ready to confront contemporary security challenges that the sub-region may face or when called upon by the African Union or the United Nations.

The best way to handle security challenges is by collective security mechanisms as there is strength in the unity of effort as compared to individual countries trying to confront such security challenges alone. This was demonstrated by ECOWAS's efforts through the employment of ECOMOG in addressing security challenges in West Africa. Adequately addressing the principles of collective security and learning from ECOWAS' experience will assist in making SADCBRIG more responsive. This chapter looks at the purpose of the research, summarizes chapter 4, makes recommendations for SADC consideration and suggests further study.

This research found a number of challenges in the ECOMOG intervention force due to abrogating most of the principles of collective security, lack of commitment, and political will from member states. The intervention in Liberia lacked a clear and feasible mandate (supported by UNSC Resolution), and troop-contributing countries' (TCC) support was not an issue as the TCCs made strides in supporting their troops, while

financial support was made available by the hegemon to a large extent, and international partners made substantial contributions. Command and control suffered a great deal due to rivalry among the TCCs, allegations of corruption, and delayed payment of soldiers' allowance affected their morale and discipline. The study equally found challenges of interoperability among troop-contributing countries.

Requirements for Making a Sub-Regional Organization Formidable

From the literature review and analysis, one realizes for a region or sub-region to develop a good security mechanism capable of confronting security challenges through use of force, principles of collective security provide a valuable and indispensable guide. The need for a strong military coalition in a military intervention to address conflict cannot be overemphasized. Without a strong military coalition, the likelihood of mission failure is high, and risks increase consequences of the loss of human life and property. In any multinational operation, commitment by member states is very important. That being the case, commitment by member states of a region or sub-region is equally important to any force seeking to meet its intervention objectives. Commitment means supporting the operation from its inception through completion. There comes a time when unplanned expenses arise along with many other challenges, but the TCCs must sustain the operation through to its completion.

As evidenced in the Liberian case study, some countries that were TCCs at the inception of the operation were not part of the TCCs that completed the operation. Perseverance and consistence is an attribute that is required of all TCCs. However, this would mean member states of the intervening region or sub-region must have a viable

economy to support such an effort. It is when TCCs cannot support their troops for the duration of an operation that the help of a hegemon or cooperating international partners is needed to complete the mission. It is therefore important that regions and sub-regions work toward growing their economies and maintain sound international relations so that if a need arises, international partners can assist in the peace making process.

Major Challenges to Establishing a Formidable Sub-Regional Force

Member states of a region or sub-regional organization may have different agendas that may contradict the values and goals of the organization. As evidenced in the case study of the Liberian ECOMOG intervention, some member states supported the belligerent parties instead of joining the coalition to establish security. They, instead, were part of the problem instead of the solution. Lack of commitment from member states can be another hurdle that may be a major challenge in establishing a formidable force or a strong military coalition. Sub-regional organizations must muster the commitment of all member states, as there is strength in unity of purpose. Financial challenges, due to poorly performing economies of member states, are another major challenge to forming a formidable force. Defense spending on tangible equipment requires a sizeable financial investment. Therefore, good member state economies are a prerequisite to the formation of a strong and formidable sub-regional force. As seen during the interventions by ECOMOG in Liberia and Sierra Leone, financial challenges can have second and third order effects during operations, and mitigation measures must be in place to counter them.

Addressing Divergent Doctrines and Language to Achieve Interoperability

Diversity of languages poses a number of challenges in a multinational environment. Multinational operations are not an exception to these challenges posed by language diversity in a coalition. Approaches to how militaries conduct their operations is mostly influenced by the doctrine they have embraced. The study found that French doctrine influences Francophone state militaries, while most of the Anglophones are influenced by British military doctrine. These doctrines, if not harmonized before meeting on the field of operations, may become a big distraction. Due to the diversity of language and the limited number of translators, communication between the Anglophones and the Francophones proved a challenge.

Mustering Political Will of Member States to Attain Their Commitment

National political leadership's will over member states is a requirement for the success of any multinational commitment. It is the political will that is key to unlocking resources to commitments, like participation in multinational coalition interventions. Without political will, there usually can never be sustained commitment of troops and resources to the effort of bringing peace to a member state that has undergone turmoil.

Recommendations

From the study, there are a number of challenges and achievements that ECOMOG had in the field during its interventions. SADCBRIG can learn lessons from these challenges and achievements to prepare for future employment. If enacted, the following recommendations would make the brigade more effective and relevant in

addressing contemporary security challenges in both the sub-region and beyond when fulfilling these requirements:

1. SADC Secretariat must advocate for more commitment of member states to the SADCBRIG.
2. SADC member states must be more committed to funding the SADCBRIG's budget requirements.
3. SADC must hasten and complete the construction of the Rasesa Logistic Base near Gaborone in Botswana, and stock it with the requisite logistics for the brigade.
4. SADC Secretariat must promulgate a common doctrine for the SADCBRIG to avoid doctrinal challenges when the brigade is deployed.
5. SADC Secretariat must promulgate and publish standard operating procedures and a code of conduct for SADCBRIG troops when they are deployed, if not yet already in place. When deployed, troops must be given clear rules of engagement.
6. SADC must advocate for its member states to refrain from supporting belligerents fighting a legitimate government.
7. The current training conducted once annually by SADCBRIG is not adequate; there is need to increase the number of times the brigade is assembled for training during a year in order to enhance interoperability.
8. Member states must be encouraged to train language translators in English, French, and Portuguese to be deployed with the brigade when required to facilitate communication.
9. Whenever SADC deploys the SADCBRIG, it must ensure the brigade is given a

- clear and feasible mandate, and ensure the chain of command is well-articulated.
10. SADC must replicate the UN model, which has a civilian as head of a mission during peace support operations.

Recommendations for Further Study

During of this research, three prominent issues emerged: lack of commitment by the majority of member states, command and control problems of the intervention force and issuance of mandates that were not clear and feasible thereby leaving field commanders with a sense of uncertainty on how to execute operations. This research therefore recommends further studies in these areas with a view to developing measures to avoid these potential pitfalls.

Conclusion

SADCBRIG was created in 2007, but has not been actively involved in force intervention to confront security challenges in the sub-region. It is therefore, imperative that the brigade is adequately trained and equipped. Once that is implemented, SADCBRIG can be a formidable force in addressing contemporary security challenges in the sub-region, and beyond, when called to action. However, this cannot happen in a vacuum. Certain prerequisites must be in place for such intervention to have the desired outcomes. SADC must learn from ECOWAS's experiences as it has been involved in a number of interventions and peace support operations. What is paramount is to have the political will and sound economies of member states to help drive this whole process. Without the political will of the member states, even with the best economies, nothing

will happen, as the political will of the leadership of member states is key to unlocking these resources for the brigade's benefit.

REFERENCE LIST

- Adebajo, Adekeye. 2002. *Building Peace in West Africa: Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea-Bissau*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- _____. 2005. "Pax West African? Regional Security Mechanisms." In *West Africa's Security Challenges: Building Peace in a Troubled Region*, edited by Adekeye Adebajo and Ismail Rashid, 293. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers. Quoted in Cyril I. Obi. "Economic Community of West African States on the Ground: Comparing Peacekeeping in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau, and Côte D'Ivoire." *African Security* 2, no. 2 (15 December 2009): 119-35.
- Adibe, Clement E. 1997. "The Liberian Conflict and the ECOWAS and UN Partnership." *Third World Quarterly* 18, no. 3: 471-488. Accessed 20 January 2018. <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.lumen.cgscarl.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=6&sid=10d6c528-19f1-4572-acfd-52a7c21f520c%40sessionmgr4009>.
- Afaha, Philip. 2016. "Nigeria: Counting the Cost of the ECOMOG Operations." *Conflict Studies Quarterly* no. 16 (July): 3-16.
- African Union. 2005. *Roadmap for the Operationalization of the African Standby Force*. Addis Ababa: African Union. Accessed 14 September 2017. <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/C4BC0E63EEA32DBDC1256FE1004D4476-au-gen-23mar.pdf>.
- _____. 2010. "The African Union Peace and Security Architecture, 2010 Assessment Study." Accessed 3 October 2017. <http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/RO%20African%20Peace%20and%20Security%20Architecture.pdf>.
- _____. 2017. "Peace and Security Council (PSC)." Accessed 2 October 2017. <http://www.au.int/en/organs/psc>.
- Alao, Charles Abiodun. 1993. "Peacekeeping in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Liberian Civil War." In *Brassey's Defence Yearbook, 1993*, 342. London: Brassey.
- _____. 1994. "ECOMOG in Liberia: The Anaemic Existence of a Mission." *Jane's Intelligence Review* 5, no. 4: 430.
- Aleksovski, Stefan, Oliver Bakreski, and Biljana Avramovska. 2014. "Collective Security – The Role of International Organizations – Implications in International Security Order." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5, no. 27 (December): 274-82.

- Ambert, Anne-Marie, Patricia A. Adler, Peter Adler, and Daniel F. Detzner. 1995. "Understanding and Evaluating Qualitative Research." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57, no. 4 (November): 879-893. Accessed 30 December 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/353409>.
- Amdemichael, Haile Araya. 2006. "East African Crisis Response: Shaping Ethiopian Peace Force for Better Participation in Future Peace Operations." MA diss., Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA.
- Arthur, Peter. 2010. "ECOWAS and Regional Peacekeeping Integration in West Africa: Lessons for the Future." *Africa Today* 52, no. 2: 2.
- Christie, Theresa D. 2015. "Multinational Logistics Interoperability." *Army Sustainment* 47, no. 5 (September-October): 12-14.
- Conflict Research Consortium. 2005. "Collective Security." University of Colorado. Accessed 13 October 2017. <https://www.colorado.edu/conflict/peace/treatment/collsec.htm>.
- Dumbuya, Peter A. 2008. "ECOWAS Military Intervention in Sierra Leone: Anglophone-Francophone Bipolarity or Multipolarity?" *Journal of Third World Studies* 25, no. 2 (Fall): 83-98.
- Economic Community of the West African States. 1981. "Protocol Relating to Mutual Assistance on Defence." Accessed 24 October 2017. http://documentation.ecowas.int/download/en/legal_documents/protocols/Protocol%20Relating%20to%20Mutual%20Assistance%20on%20Defence.pdf.
- Ellis, Stephen. 1999. *The Mask of Anarchy: The Destruction of Liberia and the Religious Dimension of an African Civil War*. New York: New York University Press.
- Ephson, Ben. 1996. "Ghana: Today and Tomorrow – A Report on the Economic and Political Problems to be solved by Ghana." *Udvikling (Development)* 1 no. 2 (February-March): 33.
- Eyal, Jonathan. 2000. "Africa's Peacekeeping Problem." *BBC News*. May 10. Accessed 8 October 2017. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/743249.stm>.
- Fabricius, Peter. 2009. "SADC Rejects Military Option for Madagascar." *Sunday Tribune*. 21 June. Accessed 16 September 2017. <https://search-proquest-com.lumen.cgsccarl.com/docview/431118119?accountid=28992>.

- Fisher, Louis Matshenyego, Alhaji Sarjoh Bah, Abeer Mniema, Hortense Nguema Okome, Meïssa Tamba, Jonas Frederiksen, Alaa Abdelaziz, and Richard Reeve. 2011. *African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) 2010: Assessment Study*. Addis Ababa: African Union's Peace and Security Department. Accessed 2 October 2017. <http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/RO%20African%20Peace%20and%20Security%20Architecture.pdf>.
- Fitz-Gerald, Ann. 2017. "Towards a Common Doctrine for African Standby Force-led Peace Operations." *International Peacekeeping* 24, no. 4 (April): 616-38. Accessed 23 September 2017. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Fitz-Gerald%2C+Ann+%E2%80%9CTowards+a+common+doctrine+for+African+Standby+Force-led+peace+operations%E2%80%9D+International+Peacekeeping+Vol.+24%2C+Iss.+4%2C2017.&btnG=.
- Franke, Benedikt. 2007. "Military Integration in Southern Africa: The Example of SADC's Standby Brigade." In *South African Yearbook of International Affairs*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs, 183-190. Accessed 23 September 2017. Political Science Complete, EBSCOhost.
- Gamba, Virginia. 2007. "SADC Security Cooperation and Progress with SADC Brigade." In *South African Army Vision 2020: Security Challenges Shaping the Future South African Army*, 57-72. Pretoria/Tshwane, South Africa: Institute for Security Studies.
- Gberie, Lansana. 2003. "Review of ECOMOG: The Story of a Heroic Failure." *African Affairs* 102, no. 406 (January): 147-54.
- The Ghanaian Times*. 2014. "General Quainoo speaks out! West African state plotted Sgt. Doe's death." Ghana Web. Accessed 8 February 2018. <https://www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/NewsArchive/General-Quainoo-speaks-out-West-African-state-plotted-Sgt-Doe-s-death-340439>.
- Habeeb, Muhammed Olabisi. 2014. "The Hegemonic Position of Nigeria in West Africa: A Study of Nigeria's Leadership Roles in West African Politics and Economic Relations." Master's thesis, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
- Howe, Herbert. 1996/97. "Lessons of Liberia: ECOMOG and Regional Peacekeeping." *International Security* 21, no. 3 (Winter): 145-176.
- _____. 1998. "Self-help, African style: Nigerian intervention in Sierra Leone highlights new trends in African security." *Armed Forces Journal International* 135 no. 11: 64.
- Human Rights Watch. 1999. "International Response. ECOWAS, ECOMOG, and the Organization of African Unity (OAU)." Accessed 10 January 2018. <https://www.hrw.org/reports/1999/sierra/SIERLE99-06.htm>.

- The Journal of Humanitarian Assistance*. 1995. "ECOWAS and the Subregional Peacekeeping in Liberia." Tufts University. Accessed 24 October 2017. <https://sites.tufts.edu/jha/archives/66#comments>.
- Kandeh, Jimmy. 2003. "Sierra Leone's Post-Conflict Elections of 2002." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 41, no. 2: 189-216.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1991. *Perpetual Peace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krulick, Jeffrey N. 2013. "Airlift in Africa: Building Operational Logistics Capability for the African Standby Force." *Army Sustainment* (January-February). Accessed 8 October 2017. http://www.alu.army.mil/alog/issues/JanFeb13/Airlift_in_Africa.html#.WfCC4rpFxPY.
- Kupchan, Charles A., and Clifford A. Kupchan. 1995. "The Promise of Collective Security." *International Security* 20, no. 1 (Summer): 52-61.
- Kwesi, Emmanuel Aning. 1996. "Ghana, ECOWAS and The Liberian Crisis: An Analysis of Ghana's Role in Liberia." *Liberian Studies Journal* 21 no. 2: 259-299. Accessed 8 October 2017. <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/lstj/article/download/4146/3773>.
- Mandrup, Thomas. 2009. "South Africa and the SADC Stand-By Force." *Scientia Militaria - South African Journal of Military Studies* 37, no. 2 (September): 1-24.
- Mariano, Carla. 1993. "Qualitative Approaches in Nursing Research. Case Study: The Method." *NLN Publications* 19-2535: 311. Accessed 10 September 2017. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C47&q=Qualitative+Approaches+in+Nursing+Research.+Case+Study%3A+The+Method.&btnG=.
- McGregor, Andrew. 1999. "Quagmire in West Africa: Nigerian Peacekeeping in Sierra Leone (1997-98)." *International Journal* 44, no. 3: 482-501.
- Mearsheimer, John. 2017. "Anarchy and the Struggle for Power." In *Essential Readings in World Politics*, edited by Karen A. Mingst and Jack L. Snyder. The Norton Series in World Politics, 54-69. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- Mgbeoji, Ikechi. 2003. *Collective Insecurity: The Liberian Crisis, Unilateralism, and Global Order*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Mohammed, M. 2018. "Sub-Regional Pre-Emptive Mechanism for Conflict Resolution: Lessons from Liberia (1990 – 2000)." Lecture, 10th International Command and Control Research and Technology Symposium. Armed Forces Command and Staff College Nigeria Department of Land Warfare, Jaji-Kaduna.

- Mortimer, Robert A. 1991. "Assistance to Peacekeeping Efforts in Liberia." *Foreign Policy Bulletin: the Documentary Record of United States Foreign Policy* (November-December): 28. Quoted in Robert A. Mortimer, 2008. "Senegal's Role in ECOMOG: The Francophone Dimension in the Liberian Crisis." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 34, no. 2 (11 November): 293-306. Accessed 16 September 2017. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-modern-african-studies/article/senegals-role-in-ecomog-the-francophone-dimension-in-the-liberian-crisis/28881EA2FBA7390D1A84A037F8361E8C>.
- _____. 1996. "Senegal's Role in ECOMOG: The Francophone Dimension in the Liberian Crisis." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 34, no. 2 (June): 293-306.
- Neethling, Theo. 2005. "Shaping the African Standby Force: Developments, Challenges, and Prospects." *Military Review* 85, no. 3 (May-June): 68-71. Accessed 14 September 2017. Military and Government Collection, EBSCOhost.
- Negretto, Gabriel L. 1993. "Kant and the Illusion of Collective Security." *Journal of International Affairs* 46, no. 2 (Winter): 501-23.
- Nishida, Tatsuya. 2008. "A Theory of Collective Security Alliances: A Case of Incomplete Pacific Pacts." Paper presented at the International Studies Association (ISA)'s 49th Annual Convention, San Francisco, CA, 26-29 March.
- Obi, Cyril I. 2009. "Economic Community of West African States on the Ground: Comparing Peacekeeping in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau, and Côte D'Ivoire." *African Security*, 2: 2-3, 119-135. Accessed 14 September 2017. DOI: 10.1080/19362200903361945.
- Olonisakin, Funmi. 1993. "African 'Homemade' Peacekeeping Initiatives." *Armed Forces and Society* 23, no. 3 (Spring 1997): 363.
- Osiander, Andreas. 2001. "Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth." *International Organization* 55, no. 2: 251-287.
- Ospina, Sonia. 2004. "Qualitative Research." In *Encyclopedia of Leadership*. Vol. 3, edited by George R. Goethals, Georgia Jones Sorenson, and James MacGregor Burns, 1279-84. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pickering, Thomas. 1999. "The U.S. Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, made this pledge to the Nigerian President on May 5, 1999." Accessed 18 October 2017. <https://www.hrw.org/reports/1999/sierra/SIERLE99-06.htm>.
- Ramsbotham, Alex, Alhaji Bah, and Fanny Calder. 2005. "Enhancing African Peace and Security capacity: A useful role for the UK and the G8." *International Affairs* 81, no. 2 (March): 325-39. Accessed 14 September 2017. Military & Government Collection, EBSCOhost, International Affairs.

- Rice, Susan E. 1999. "U.S. Assistant Secretary for African Affairs Speech to the Committee on International Relations of the U.S. House of Representatives, 23 March 1999." As quoted by Human Rights Watch. Accessed 14 September 2017. <https://www.hrw.org/reports/1999/sierra/SIERLE99-06.htm>.
- SADC Secretariat. 2012. "Standby Force & SADC Brigade." Accessed 24 October 2017. <http://www.sadc.int/themes/politics-defence-security/regional-peacekeeping/standby-force/>.
- Stake, Robert E. 1995. *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stewart, Keith, Dennis Cremin, M. Mills, and D. Phipp. 2005. "Non-Technical Interoperability: The Challenge of Command Leadership in Multinational Operations." Paper submitted to the 10th International Command and Control Research and Technology Symposium: The Future of C2, McLean, VA, June.
- Taw, Jennifer Morrison, and Andrew Grant-Thomas. 1999. "U.S. Support for Regional Complex Contingency Operations: Lessons from ECOMOG." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 22, no. 1 (February): 53-77.
- Tuck, Christopher. 2000. "Every Car or Moving Object Gone: the ECOMOG Intervention in Liberia." *African Studies Quarterly* 4, no. 1. Accessed 14 November 2017. <http://web.africa.ufl.edu/asq/v4/v4i1a1.htm> 2000.
- United Kingdom Parliament. 1999. "Answers to Questions from Debate on Sierra Leone." British House of Commons, 8 March 1999. Accessed 14 September 2018. <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/199899/cmhansrd/vo990308/text/90308w01.htm>.
- UN News Centre. 2016. "Terrorism Remains Major Threat in West Africa Despite Electoral Progress – Senior UN Official." Africa Renewal. January 14. Accessed 5 October 2017. <http://www.un.org/africarenewal/news/terrorism-remains-major-threat-west-africa-despite-electoral-progress-%E2%80%93-senior-un-official>.
- United Nations. 1945. *United Nations Charter*. New York: United Nations. Accessed 21 September 2017. <http://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/>.
- United Nations Security Council. 1991. *Peace Agreement between the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF*. Accessed 8 October 2017. https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/SL_990707_LomePeaceAgreement.pdf.
- _____. 1997. "Security Council Unanimously Approves Sanctions Regime against Sierra Leone: Press Release SC/6425." Accessed 8 October 2017. <https://www.un.org/press/en/1997/19971008.SC6425.html>.
- _____. 1998. *The Situation in Sierra Leone*. Resolution 1181. New York: United Nations.

- Varhola, Laura R., and Thomas E. Shepherd. 2013. "Africa and the United States-A Military Perspective." *American Foreign Policy Interests* 35, no. 5 (December): 325-32. Accessed 8 October 2017. <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.lumen.cgscarl.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=8&sid=987cdd05-6dad-44c8-98f1-46c86436c1bb%40sessionmgr4006>.
- Vines, Alex. 2013. "A Decade of African Peace and Security Architecture." *International Affairs* 89, no. 1 (January): 89-109. Accessed 14 September 2017. Military and Government Collection, EBSCOhost.
- Weller, Marc, ed. 1994. *Regional Peace-Keeping and International Enforcement: The Liberian Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Quoted in BBC Monitoring Report. *Document 59*. 15 August 1990.
- _____. 1990. "Call for ECOWAS Summit: ECOMOG Given 'Fresh mandate.'" Quoted in BBC Monitoring Report.
- Wiersma, W. 1999. *Research Methods in Education*. 5th ed. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Willetts, Peter. 2017. *The Charter of the United Nations*. City University London. Accessed 3 October 2017. <http://www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/UN/CHARTER.HTM>.
- Williams, Paul D. 2016. "A New African Model of Coercion? Assessing the ECOWAS Mission in the Gambia." *IPI Global Observatory*. Accessed 25 October 2017. <https://theglobalobservatory.org/2017/03/ecowas-gambia-barrow-jammeh-african-union/>.
- Wippman, David. 1993. "Enforcing the Peace: ECOWAS and the Liberian Civil War." In *Enforcing Restraint: Collective Intervention in Internal Conflicts*, edited by Lori F. Damrosch, 169. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.
- Woods, Larry J., and Timothy R. Reese. 2008. *Long War Series Occasional Paper*. Vol. 28, *Military Interventions in Sierra Leone: Lessons from a Failed State*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, US Army Combined Arms Center.
- Zack-Williams, Alfred. 1999. "Sierra Leone: The Political Economy of Civil War, 1991-98." *Third World Quarterly* 20, no. 1: 143-162.