



The
Letort
Papers

FROM CHAOS TO COHESION:
A REGIONAL APPROACH TO SECURITY,
STABILITY, AND DEVELOPMENT
IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Diane E. Chido

Visit our website for other free publication
downloads

<http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/>

[To rate this publication click here.](#)

Strategic Studies Institute
U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, PA



The Letort Papers



In the early 18th century, James Letort, an explorer and fur trader, was instrumental in opening up the Cumberland Valley to settlement. By 1752, there was a garrison on Letort Creek at what is today Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania. In those days, Carlisle Barracks lay at the western edge of the American colonies. It was a bastion for the protection of settlers and a departure point for further exploration. Today, as was the case over 2 centuries ago, Carlisle Barracks, as the home of the U.S. Army War College, is a place of transition and transformation.

In the same spirit of bold curiosity that compelled the men and women who, like Letort, settled the American west, the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) and U.S. Army War College (USAWC) Press presents The Letort Papers. This series allows SSI and USAWC Press to publish papers, retrospectives, speeches, or essays of interest to the defense academic community which may not correspond with our mainstream policy-oriented publications.

If you think you may have a subject amenable to publication in our Letort Paper series, or if you wish to comment on a particular paper, please contact Dr. Steven K. Metz, Director of Research, Strategic Studies Institute and USAWC Press, U.S. Army War College, 47 Ashburn Drive, Carlisle, PA 17013-5010. His phone number is (717) 245-3822; e-mail address is steven.k.metz.civ@mail.mil. We look forward to hearing from you.

**Strategic Studies Institute
and
U.S. Army War College Press**

**FROM CHAOS TO COHESION:
A REGIONAL APPROACH TO SECURITY,
STABILITY, AND DEVELOPMENT
IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA**

Diane E. Chido

April 2013

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. Authors of Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) and U.S. Army War College (USAWC) Press publications enjoy full academic freedom, provided they do not disclose classified information, jeopardize operations security, or misrepresent official U.S. policy. Such academic freedom empowers them to offer new and sometimes controversial perspectives in the interest of furthering debate on key issues. This report is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

This publication is subject to Title 17, United States Code, Sections 101 and 105. It is in the public domain and may not be copyrighted.

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute and U.S. Army War College Press, U.S. Army War College, 47 Ashburn Drive, Carlisle, PA 17013.

This manuscript was funded by the U.S. Army War College External Research Associates Program. Information on this program is available on our website, *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil*, at the Opportunities tab.

All Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) and U.S. Army War College (USAWC) Press publications may be downloaded free of charge from the SSI website. Hard copies of this report may also be obtained free of charge while supplies last by placing an order on the SSI website. SSI publications may be quoted or reprinted in part or in full with permission and appropriate credit given to the U.S. Army Strategic Studies Institute and USAWC Press, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA. Contact SSI by visiting our website at the following address: *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil*.

The Strategic Studies Institute and USAWC Press publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please subscribe on the SSI website at *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/newsletter/*.

ISBN 1-58487-563-1

FOREWORD

In December 2012, General Carter Ham, commander of U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM), told students at Brown University that recent successes in reducing the influence of al-Shabaab and presidential elections in Somalia:

happened because the nations of East Africa collectively, and under the auspices of the African Union, decided that they would take action. . . . It was the regional states making that decision, crafting a plan and then coming, frankly, to the international community and ask[ing] for some support, which the United States and many others were able to provide. But it was an African-led and-designed effort.

U.S. policy has long voiced support for the concept of “African solutions for African problems” but has implemented plans that proved policymakers believed they knew better how to “fix” Africa. Now the United States is beginning to support African solutions by increasing partnerships with African Regional Economic Communities (RECs) for coordinated security, stability, and development efforts across sub-regions.

In this monograph, Diane Chido explores the evolution of the Organization for African Unity (OAU) into the present-day African Union (AU) and considers optimal directions for this organization to achieve both African and U.S. objectives for the continent in the context of past, current, and future AFRICOM engagement. Ms. Chido accedes that AFRICOM has begun to engage with the RECs for more effective and cost-efficient regional security and stability efforts, but recommends that this joint command place greater coordinated emphasis on this approach as a

series of smaller-scale “pilots” in order to form a long-term pan-continental strategy for U.S. engagement in Africa.

Positive engagement in this often misunderstood region requires a clear understanding of local decisionmaking environments and the stresses and influences under which such leaders or leaders-to-be may be operating. The U.S. Army War College can provide strategic research opportunities to identify up-and-coming individuals and groups in countries and counterpart organizations, such as RECs, especially suited as partners for enhancing security and stability in the region.

In this continuing age of austerity, discussions in the defense arena focus on cost-effective solutions to large problems. Regional and ultimately, continental, approaches to Africa’s myriad security challenges that directly affect U.S. national interests will increasingly have a greater impact than single-country, piecemeal military-to-military efforts. For this reason, the Strategic Studies Institute offers this monograph as a contribution to the debate on the future of U.S. Army engagement in Africa and how it can best enhance U.S. competitiveness abroad and security at home.



DOUGLAS C. LOVELACE, JR.
Director
Strategic Studies Institute and
U.S. Army War College Press

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

DIANE E. CHIDO is the President of DC Analytics, a research and analysis firm formed in October 2008. She has served as a cultural awareness subject matter expert on the Horn of Africa, assisting in creating training materials for the U.S. Army and course curricula in cultural intelligence analysis for academic and intelligence community agencies. She has also performed extensive research on Sub-Saharan African civil-military relations, socio-cultural cleavages, and regional security threats and opportunities. In December 2008, she completed the U.S. Army Culture Center's train-the-trainer course on Cultural Awareness in the Horn of Africa. Ms. Chido is an adjunct professor of intelligence studies with the Institute for Intelligence Studies (IIS) at Mercyhurst University as well as a graduate of that program. She teaches Intelligence Communication, Advanced Intelligence Analysis, and Advanced Analytic Techniques, in the classroom and online, to graduate students who are practicing analysts in the Intelligence Community. She also serves as a faculty advisor for student researchers on numerous Department of Defense (DoD) contracts with the Center for Intelligence Research, Analysis, and Training (CIRAT). Ms. Chido has 20 years of experience in research including with the International Monetary Fund and with the Brookings Institution Foreign Policy Program. She publishes widely on intelligence analysis, ethnic conflict, and international security topics. Ms. Chido holds an M.S. in Applied Intelligence Analysis, an M.A. in Russian Language, and a Graduate Certificate in Russian/East European Studies.

SUMMARY

Conflicts and extremism are almost certain to continue to rise in Africa, especially with instability resulting from the cascade of unrest across North Africa and the Middle East, the burgeoning youth bulge in Sub-Saharan Africa, African mercenaries, rising Islamic extremism, myriad wild, ungoverned spaces, and increasing resource shortages resulting from human activities and climate change across the Continent. In order to protect our troops while ensuring stability in the region, we must develop the capacity of a Pan-African force to deal effectively with these and other likely problems as they arise.

Prevention is the key to effective policies in Africa, whether the issue is equitable resource exploitation, ethnic conflict, infectious diseases, or famine. Beginning now to develop well-trained, disciplined, and well-equipped military and police forces that can ensure stability in place of our own troops in future conflicts and emergencies is a long-range stabilizing method certain to pay for itself in the long-term. This monograph provides a path toward developing a viable African Union capable of serving as a supranational governing body to drive stability, security, and economic development by strengthening the capability of Regional Economic Communities (RECs) as the first step in a longer-term integration process.

Carefully implementing such a pan-continental strategy is highly likely to have the net effect over the next 20 years of attaining a considerable competitive advantage for the U.S. economically, militarily, and politically, with a corresponding increase in stability, security, and economic opportunity in that region.

FROM CHAOS TO COHESION: A REGIONAL APPROACH TO SECURITY, STABILITY, AND DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

INTRODUCTION

It takes many raindrops to form the pool from which we all drink.

Nigerian Proverb

Conflicts and extremism are nearly certain to continue to rise in Africa especially with instability resulting from the cascade of unrest across North Africa and the Middle East, the burgeoning youth bulge in Sub-Saharan Africa, African mercenaries, rising Islamic extremism, myriad wild, ungoverned spaces, and increasing resource shortages resulting from human activities and climate change across the Continent. In order to protect our troops while ensuring stability in the region, we must develop the capacity of a Pan-African force to deal effectively with these and other likely problems as they arise.

This monograph recommends a more comprehensive and strategic approach to developing Pan-African plans for security, governance, and resource exploitation, to reduce the need for U.S. and international physical intervention or post-conflict clean-up. Beyond current engagement efforts by U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) a long-term prevention and management strategy is likely to reduce the need for expensive piecemeal efforts with uncertain outcomes and enhance the overall security and capacity of the region to develop its own security, stability, gover-

nance, and development plans that still ensure a competitive advantage for U.S. interests.

In March 2011, a glaring case developed which illustrated the need for such a comprehensive Pan-African strategy. An increasingly unstable Libya caused Western leaders to discuss action, but *who* should lead eclipsed public talk of *what* measures to take. A robust, U.S.-friendly African Union (AU) would likely have been the most advantageous organization to lead the Libyan intervention. However, many African government leaders, tribal chiefs and kings, and average people had a positive view of Libyan Colonel Muammar Gaddafi, due to his infrastructure investments in their countries. In fact, the AU itself exists largely due to Gaddafi's contributions, which included paying the dues of a number of other member countries. This resulted in a hamstrung AU, which was unable to act on behalf of its stated constituents, the African people, for fear of taking the wrong side against an autocrat who had plundered his country's wealth for over 40 years and served as a clear model of the worst kind of African leader. Therefore, without an effective African consultative body or force, the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) led the airstrikes on Libya with the consequences, good or bad, laid squarely on their shoulders.

The post-Gaddafi era provides an opportunity for the United States to carefully guide the process of filling the power vacuum with a sensible pan-continental approach to Africa's problems of resource exploitation, governance, and delivering real political power to the African people. However, before any of this can take place, the key issues of security and stability must be addressed. The April 2011 *National Strategic Narrative* states that the primary U.S. goal in the 21st

century is to “become the strongest competitor and most influential player in a deeply interconnected global system, which requires that we invest less in defense and more in sustainable prosperity and the tools of effective global engagement.”¹ Through the unique structure of AFRICOM, the U.S. Departments of Defense (DoD) and State (DoS) can lead a cooperative initiative to pursue such an engagement strategy.

DISMAL INHERITANCE

Nigerian nationalism was, for me and many of my generation, an acquired taste; like cheese or ballroom dancing. . . .

Famed Nigerian novelist,
Chinua Achebe, 1998

Africa blames colonialism for its ills. Most countries only achieved independence in the 1960s, which often led to civil wars and further dissolution of states throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Even in Kenya, once a model of multiculturalism, the violence that occurred after the 2008 election sharply illustrates that tribal and ethnic cultures—stretching back millennia—are driving the demand for scarce resources and demonstrates that these cultural differences are still more deeply valued than the national borders, which have only been in place for a few short decades. The arbitrary dividing of African geography has separated historical lands, tribes, and even families into forced concepts of “nations” that have not entirely taken hold in the post-colonial period.

Although the AU has been in existence in name for over 10 years, it remains a quasi-body, adept at pronouncing initiatives to which it agrees but never

ratifies or moves to implement. Even when it decides to act, it is often ineffectual. In March 2012, the AU announced a 5,000-strong force that would hunt down renegade warlord Joseph Kony and his 300 followers, who were menacing the borderlands of Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), South Sudan, and Uganda. As of August 2012, this force had not even been assembled, with 100 U.S. Special Forces Soldiers working with mainly Ugandan troops on this effort. In the case of Libya, an AU delegation attempted to broker a settlement . . . the day *after* the NATO bombing campaign began.

Ten years later, the question of whether the AU is to be a union of equal sovereign states or a union of “the African people,” is still unanswered. Today the AU’s Pan-African Parliament (PAP), its primary governing authority, is still evolving in its role and composition. The PAP was established in 2002, with only “advisory and consultative powers,” but is intended to evolve into a “fully functioning legislative body elected via full universal adult suffrage.”² Will it be a system in which each state gets the same number of delegates or in which seats are assigned to various ethnic groups on the basis of population? The PAP structure and election process are critical decisions still under advisement, which must be resolved before any Pan-African governing can occur. Once the structure is finally determined, the next issues concern how the representatives will be selected within these sovereign states: through direct elections, appointment by heads of state or from among sitting parliamentarians?

The fact is, the optimal AU structure, including the PAP makeup and deputy selection process, is inconsequential as long as it is transparent and agreed upon within the states. As past efforts suggest, the current

AU is highly unlikely to become a functioning body able to implement Africa-wide decisions or policies with any transformative effect in the near term. The best approach is to start with regional blocs as models for AU development—the AU can dither for the next 10 years while the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) lead the way to integration and experimentation with models that can be applied continent-wide.

The late Nigerian economist Claude Ake's 1997 statement, "Because of the historical legacy and objective conditions of contemporary Africa, a national development project in most African countries is not a rational undertaking,"³ lends credence to the need for integrated markets and transnational policies and projects. Although their names imply a focus on economic development, the first priority for these regional economic communities (RECs) is to develop a sound regional security structure.

U.S. Department of Defense/Department of State (DoD/DoS) joint efforts should be focused on building the RECs' capacity to ensure security and stability as the precondition for sustainable economic development. This regional approach gives the U.S. a broader and more comprehensive target for furthering AFRICOM's stated aims than current piecemeal efforts in individual countries. While AFRICOM has a relationship with ECOWAS and SADC, as well as the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), and has begun some initiatives, such as the 2009 ECOWAS conference on security sector reform, AFRICOM should focus more directly on this regional approach to enable it to streamline its efforts and resources to build capacity in these larger blocs.

While it is true that the same elites will likely attempt to co-opt any new system and that any new approach is likely to engender new problems, a larger, continental context can make it more difficult for regional or national elites to gain as much power as they have in their current fiefdoms. This approach will support the eventual development of an AU structure enabling the United States to support, engage with, and realize competitive advantage across the entire continent into the 22nd century.

REGIONAL COMMUNITIES' FIRST STEP TOWARD A VIABLE AFRICAN UNION

African Sovereign State Instability.

When we look at the surplus of unstable and corrupt states in Sub-Saharan Africa, we often shake our heads and wonder, "Why can't they all just get along?" The long-standing competitive and complementary relationships that developed over millennia across Sub-Saharan Africa to survive climate changes and other adversity have evolved into myriad specializations and identities that we call ethnic divides today. Throughout the colonial period, Europeans saw Africans as a single, monolithic, sub-human group ripe for exploitation and controllable across wide swathes of territory, with no concern for existing ties. Richard Dowden reminds us that even through the 1960s, as the independence movement swept southern Africa:

In rural areas the kings and chiefs might still hold sway but in the swelling towns young nationalist leaders were creating political awareness and building a power base. They knew they had to break old loyalties to chiefs and kings and replace it with loyalty to themselves and their parties.⁴

In 2008, the African Program and Leadership Project at the Woodrow Wilson Center found the “uncertain sense of national identity and community in multiethnic states that can divide societies” when constituent ethnic groups “do not see each other as interdependent parts of a single national entity, [but] often perceive members of other communities as ‘outsiders’, or, in the extreme, as dehumanized and threatening hostile adversaries.”⁵

These developing nations have managed to “leap-frog” technological stages, avoiding massive landline infrastructure and more effectively implementing cellular or other wireless communication strategies. Why then can they not “leap over” the statist phase of political development? As Francis Fukuyama has suggested, our traditional view of sovereign states operating under their own individual self-interest is evolving, noting that since the early 1980s:

the trend in world politics has been to weaken states . . . the growth of the global economy has tended to erode the autonomy of sovereign nation-states by increasing the mobility of information, capital, and, to a lesser extent, labor. . . .⁶

Like the looting of valuable but obsolete copper wiring, Sub-Saharan Africa can take some examples of effective state-building to create a Pan-African decisionmaking structure without the messy nationalistic wrangling that led to the destructive outcomes of two world wars in Europe. Africa could also avoid some of the violent destruction that the United States underwent during its civil war, and achieve a resulting political federation of independently operating but mutually dependent states with diverse cultures intact.

Harvard's Steven Pinker provides some evidence that such integration reduces competition and violence, whether the associations are Neighborhood Watch groups or international governmental organizations (IGOs) as the third side of what he describes as a Kantian "triangle of pacifying forces" in which democratization, trade, and membership in cooperative organizations significantly reduce the likelihood that countries will go to war with each other. Pinker notes:

Nations become stable democracies only when their political factions tire of murder as the means of assigning power. They engage in commerce only when they put a greater value on mutual prosperity than on unilateral glory. And they join intergovernmental organizations only when they are willing to cede a bit of sovereignty for a bit of mutual benefit.⁷

African countries, by and large, have been only too willing to cede, if not sovereignty, responsibility for good governance in exchange for the largesse of many of the organizations they have joined in the last 60 years. From the International Monetary Fund (the Fund), the World Bank (the Bank), and the United Nations (UN), many of these countries treated such memberships as proof that they were fully functioning independent states or as signs that they were equals on the world stage. However, many of these organizations had simply become another avenue of dependence and their mandated expenditures or policy requirements in exchange for funds did not engender the good governance and opportunities for economic development promised. This can be attributed both to the IGOs' lack of enforcement and to the national governments' lack of will to follow prescribed implementation plans and the funds essentially evaporated without the anticipated returns appearing.

However, real participation in an IGO that has direct relevance to Sub-Saharan African countries' interests and needs will depend as much on each member taking part in developing the policies for the region as a whole, rather than having them imposed from without. This would be a new kind of cooperative model into which the AU could eventually evolve with the RECs beginning to provide a sort of pilot integration.

EU/NATO Model for Integration?

As the European Union (EU), or at the very least the Eurozone, deals with the messy political, economic, and social ramifications of the current financial crisis, "continental" consolidation does not seem to be a positive development model for the 21st century. However, we must look to Europe not as a model made of plaster, but as one made of soft clay, still malleable and which cannot be identically grafted onto Africa. We must look for positive lessons for continental integration and clearly understand the very different motivations and processes that created the current EU/NATO structure.

First of all, the victorious Allies established NATO after World War II as a defensive alliance against the perceived international agenda of Communist expansion emanating from the Soviet Union. It was also seen as a way to join together the European countries that had engaged in brutal conflict twice in one half-century with such devastating consequences. Seeing the Soviet Union as a shared threat provided simple demarcation of who was "in" and who was "out."

Similarly, since the 16th century, the greatest threats to Africa had also come from external influences in the form of colonial and post-colonial re-

source exploitation through the Cold War proxy conflicts that resulted in destructive civil wars. Africa's greatest threats today, however, tend to come from within. The continent's lack of economic development relative to the rest of the world has led to a lack of education, healthcare, infrastructure, and good governance that hamper future development. Therefore, a cooperative transcontinental structure should provide stability and cohesion to overcome the lack of governance most of its individual states have shown to date, and provide a continent-wide basis for development of institutions to more transparently, effectively, and equitably resolve critical problems, such as land use and distribution, resource exploitation, and trade.

While some suggest applying a type of Marshall Plan to Africa, the differences between the two cases are stark. In her 2009 book, *Dead Aid*, Zambian economist Dambisa Moyo points out that Marshall Plan funds were intended to be provided to Europe after World War II for a specific period of time (5 years) without renewal, at which time, recipients were to begin paying them back, as they were loans, not grants. Most importantly, they were targeted at rebuilding infrastructure, not for any other purpose. The fact that the structures and the institutions to effectively manage the funds and the projects were already in place in the European beneficiaries, differentiates any potential use of this framework as a model for Africa. However, simply waiting until the institutional governance structure in African countries match those which developed in Western Europe over centuries is also not a tenable prospect.

Using the Marshall Plan as a model of cross-continental infrastructure building as opposed to past piecemeal efforts in preferred countries does have po-

tential viability. However, the funds should not be in the form of undetermined payback loans nor certainly given freely as grants, but should flow as foreign direct investment (FDI). This way, as investors are taking the risk, the RECs, not individual governments, would be the recipients. These entities are better suited to manage interstate activities, such as building robust transportation and power generation structures that can serve more than a single country or constituency with realistic risk calculations and clear incentives for private investment, than any single constituent country.

United States of Africa? Was Gaddafi Right?

Africa, as a continent, resembles America in the fact that it is made up of 54 states, much like the United States. When it comes to dealing with culture, education, healthcare, law enforcement, and even violence, American states' approaches and outcomes vary widely. However, we do not despair that there is no hope for the states in which education achievement lags or violence is highest, we simply continue to try strategies that have worked to bring other states along the development continuum.

The optimal economic, political, and social development model for Africa, rather than the EU, therefore, could be the United States. Individual U.S. states are responsible for education, healthcare, and providing social services and police to varying degrees as mandated by each state's electorate. American states, for instance, are free to engage in their own international trading regimes and support the trading businesses in their jurisdictions, but they can also rely on the Federal Government to provide assistance and create the environment in which smaller entities can

more effectively operate. The Federal Government is primarily responsible for continental defense and emergency and natural disaster prevention, planning, and response, as well as consistency in administration of public land and its use, international trade, and energy policy.

Security First.

The initial phase of an integration process in Africa, however, just as NATO presaged the EU, should be focused on developing the security structure and apparatus that can be rapidly deployed to prepare for and respond to natural and man-made disasters, prevent conflict and violence, and provide stability in fragile post-conflict states. The RECs of Africa can look to the EU for a general security-development model, which grew out of post-war European efforts to limit Germany's ability to make weapons of war and to consolidate trade in the commodities of growth in the period. It essentially began in 1951 with the six nations of the European Coal and Steel Community (ESCS) before spreading across the continent by the end of the century. While common security and economic consolidation were the primary aims of Western European integration, the current crisis illustrates that perhaps common political structures ought to be in place before integrating currency regimes, for instance. In the case of Africa, a shared currency is a very long way off with the disparity in purchasing power of its states. However, shared policymaking on the big issues and shared security structures can be the early steps to continental integration.

Initial steps toward a Pan-African approach to continental security are already being taken. As the

RECs have consolidated their efforts in this area, they also increasingly work consultatively to address other continent-wide issues. Existing and emerging cooperative structures within the RECs, and even the AU, can provide a viable platform upon which to provide assistance with needed reforms within and eventually across regions with positive effects on individual countries. In this way, leaders from various factions within member states can support security and stability efforts without the stigma of propping up the national leadership in highly corrupt or failing states. Leaders of ethnic groups straddling borders can also give their entire population a voice without alienating or alarming national governments in a single state.

The AU was created in 2002 as a successor to the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), which had become all but irrelevant by the time of South African liberation. From its inception, the new organization was torn between its two largest contributors and their two larger-than-life leaders: Libya's Muammar Gaddafi and South Africa's Thabo Mbeki:

Gaddafi's dream was to see a continental government, one African military force, uniform trade and foreign policies and one leader representing all the African states in dealing with the rest of the world. . . . On the other hand, Mbeki's mission was to create a continent ruled by like-minded African democrats who shared his goals of competitive markets, technological advancement, progressing economies, and industrious populations.⁸

Neither achieved their goals and, with Gaddafi out of the way, now is the time for the United States to step in and subtly enable both visions by first developing an African military force that can provide

security and stability and smoothing national trade restrictions to develop a continental trade regime, and second by identifying and encouraging democratic leaders who will entice foreign investors by developing the governance structures to enable prosperity and advancement across the region. Such a Pan-African goal is strategic, but in the nearer-term, such goals are more attainable at the REC level. This gradual approach will allow a smoother transition to continental-wide policies because they will need only input from two or three regional bodies, rather than from 54 individual states.

The political process has been stalled since 2002 by wrangling over the form a functioning AU will take. The question of whether the AU is to be a union of equal sovereign states or a union of “the African people,” is still unanswered. Will it become a system in which each state gets the same number of delegates or in which seats are assigned to various ethnic groups on the basis of population? The first system will give utterly disparate states, such as South Africa and Lesotho, the same weight in the legislature and likely undermine the entire effort, due to a resulting lack of participation by regional anchors, whose influence is not fully represented. The second method will continue to marginalize minority ethnic or other groups. A possible resolution is a bicameral legislature with upper and lower chambers to balance representational issues. Another method would assign seats on the basis of regional blocs, which could increase regionalism and ultimately lead to transcontinental cohesion.

Once the structure is finally determined, the next issues concern how the deputies will be selected within these sovereign states: through direct elections or appointment by heads of state or from among sitting

parliamentarians. Experts have noted that ensuring the democratic credentials of the PAP are among the key indicators of a functioning and internationally recognized AU. African commentators anticipate a “democratic dividend,” with regional integration ensuring more democratic processes than are currently in place. This is more likely if the RECs are able to serve as models and then as the entities that integrate to form the full AU.

In 2004, Dr. Steven Metz of the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College emphasized significantly that because of “the great value that African culture places on collective action, the most tangible gains have come from building on existing structures.”⁹ A great shortcoming of Western policy in Africa, and elsewhere throughout modern history, is an assumption that we are working with a blank slate upon which we can impose our own plans and methods, and a failure to recognize the importance of existing cultural values. Regional approaches enable cultural values to coexist with national interest in multiethnic areas where broader consensus and more collegial decisionmaking are possible than in single states where one ethnic group dominates or groups are divided by national borders. As Richard Dowden pointed out in 2004, “In the end, power in Africa derives not from outside support but from within, from old networks and pre-colonial power systems that lie beneath.” The regional approach also permits these networks to maintain some influence, while avoiding the monolithic decisionmaking processes that occur in many single-party states.

The AU’s own 2009-12 *Strategic Plan* articulated the publicly espoused shared interests within African states toward greater common governance.¹⁰ The

stated mission of the AU's Commission is to become an efficient and value-adding institution driving the African integration and development process in collaboration with African Union member states, the Regional Economic Communities [RECs] and African citizens."¹¹

Today's African Union Security Structure.

Many African states structured their military forces as if the most significant threats were likely to come from over the new border, although the truly significant challenges to stability tend to be internal. African governments also often identified threats as requiring military intervention, even in cases of dealing with legitimate (from a Western viewpoint) political opposition, thus, "even ordinary governance issues were militarized."¹² Any legitimate AU needs a standing, unified, well trained and equipped, multinational force to prevent genocide, intervene in civil wars and interstate conflicts, prepare for and respond to natural and other disasters, as well as oversee and provide security for large-scale, interstate infrastructure projects.

The AU's Peace and Security Council (PSC) is comprised of 15 member states which are responsible for "deployment of peace keeping and quick intervention Missions to assist in cases of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity."¹³ In order to enact such deployments, the PSC "could consult a Panel of the Wise comprising [sic] of five African personalities so as to take action on the distribution of the military on the field."¹⁴ Its functions are listed as (a) . . . the promotion of peace, security and stability in Africa; (b) preventative diplomacy and the maintenance of peace; and

(c) management of catastrophes and humanitarian actions.¹⁵ Therefore, it is entirely within the purview of the PSC to ensure that an entity exists to be deployed to assist in the cases described, and suggests that such an entity should take the form of a military, or at least a military-style organization.

The African Stand-by Force (ASF) was established under Article 13 of the PSC protocol to enable PSC engagement in “Peace support missions and intervention pursuant to the Constitutive Act Article 4(h),” which permits action under “grave circumstances, namely: war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity” and 4(j), which grants member states the right to “request intervention from the Union in order to restore peace and security.”¹⁶

Regional Approach to African Security.

In 2004, the AU decided to create five regional brigades as “first responders to emergencies both man-made and natural” that occur on the continent. However, delays have kept the force in the planning stages since its public announcement in 2005. The latest mandate for a “validated and exercised” 7,000-strong brigade-sized force by January 2010 was not met. Initially, member states were to be responsible for training their personnel along regional stand-by standards to ensure interoperability with each other and with the UN. While the AU currently endorses and works in concert with eight regional economic councils, ECOWAS and SADC are currently the most effective, ubiquitous, and focused on security.

Of the RECs initially mandated to develop a stand-by force, ECOWAS has made the most progress. In June 2004, the ECOWAS Defence and Security Com-

mittee approved the formation of the ECOWAS Stand-by Force (ESF) envisioning a Task Force (TF) of 2,773 military, police, and civilian personnel able to deploy within 30 days and fully self-sustaining for 90 days, and an ESF Main Force (MF) of 3,893 military, police, and civilian personnel able to deploy within 90 days and be fully self-sustaining for 90 days.

The ESF held its first significant exercises in June 2009 to evaluate its logistical capability, with 10 ECOWAS member states to contribute 1,270 military personnel for week-long field training in Burkina Faso.¹⁷ In November 2011, the ESF held a training exercise, dubbed Jigui III, at the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Center in Accra, Ghana. The goal was to test the MF capabilities in strategic and operational planning and preparation for multi-dimensional operations and to exercise command and control training.

The SADC Brigade was launched at the 2007 SADC Summit held in Lusaka, Zambia, through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by southern African leaders to “guarantee peace, security and political stability, which are prerequisites for development.” The Brigade is to be comprised of civilian, military, and police components and supported through pledged resources from member states.

The Brigade was envisioned as one of five regional brigades comprising the ASF with troops or personnel based in their own countries, deployed as needed on an “on call” basis. The Regional Peace Training Centre located in Zimbabwe and other national peace support training institutions were to play pivotal roles in training military commanders, police officers, and civilian officials at various levels, while at the same time acting as the “clearinghouse” for all peace support operations and training activities in the region.

However, Zimbabwe has since become something of a regional embarrassment, and many of its SADC rights and responsibilities have been suspended.

The Brigade's only permanent force structure has a Planning Element at the SADC Secretariat in Botswana, consisting of regional military, police, and civilian staff on rotation from member states. The Planning Element operates daily as part of the SADC Organ on Politics, Defence, and Security Cooperation commanded by the SADC Committee of Chiefs of Defence Staff and the Committee of SADC Police Chiefs.

SADC member states have also agreed to establish the Main Logistics Depot in Botswana to support the operations of the force from a central point. Discussions between the SADC Secretariat and the government of Botswana are said to be "at an advanced stage" to enter into an MOU establishing the depot. By 2009, the Brigade was renamed the SADC Stand-by Force (SADC SF) to indicate that it had its civilian and police, and not just military components, in place. The SADC SF has also held a variety of training exercises in various member countries to meet its obligations.¹⁸

AFRICOM in concert with the Canadian government, also developed the Partnership for Integrated Logistics Operations and Tactics (PILOT) in 2009 for enhancing the ASF capacity for operational logistics planning to promote interoperability between the U.S. military and the ASF.¹⁹ While there were 14 exercises scheduled with the U.S. Army across Africa in 2012 alone, identifying additional opportunities to build African capacity and enhance the ubiquity of U.S. tactics and methods through regional blocs, rather than simply with individual states, should be a priority of AFRICOM's leadership and planning staff in order to ensure the broadest possible U.S. engagement.

APPLYING REGIONAL APPROACHES TO KEY SECURITY THREATS

Sub-Saharan Africa is the least secure, stable, and economically developed geographic region in the world, with its long-standing problems exacerbated by recent unrest in Northern Africa, the prevalence of well-armed African mercenaries, ungoverned spaces that are a natural draw for terrorist groups and insurgencies, frequent conflicts over resources, and the region's own demographic disadvantages. Both increasing Islamic extremism and disparities in income and opportunity are also found in the governable and least governed areas alike. However, today's threats, or perceived threats, may not be eternal but should be considered within the historical and political context of the region and as outliers in the world's overall trajectory toward violence reduction.

While individual countries make varying degrees of effort to reduce the impact of these threats within their own borders, a regional approach is likely to be more effective in most cases. When ethnic groups or wild spaces cross borders, more than one government is involved. With U.S. support, SADC and ECOWAS are striving in various ways, but the emphasis on ensuring the security and stability of Sub-Saharan Africa should be in supporting the development of increasingly robust mechanisms for these regional efforts with an eye to full regional integration of all of southern Africa within a viable AU future framework.

North African Unrest and Islamic Extremism.

While this monograph is focused on Sub-Saharan Africa, the effects of recent unrest in northern Africa cannot be ignored. Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia, and most significantly Libya, have undergone dramatic change since the start of 2011. While these “revolutions” have brought varying degrees of change, outcomes remain far from certain. Indeed, they all had “organic” origins, but saw differing levels of international assistance (or meddling, depending upon your perspective), with Libya the extreme case of Western involvement.

A robust and independent AU would have been the most appropriate organization to lead an intervention in Libya. However, the AU was one of the last organizations willing to act in this case as it was fully under the sway of the funding and influence of Libya’s Gaddafi. It also focused on the consequences of supporting the wrong side in the conflict, rather than focusing on the best outcome from Africa’s perspective. Of course, many African government leaders, tribal chiefs and kings, as well as average people, had a positive view of Gaddafi due to his infrastructure investments across Africa. In fact, the AU in its current form exists largely because of Gaddafi’s contributions, which amounted to nearly 15 percent of African countries’ share of the total budget. Gaddafi even paid the dues of several other member countries.²⁰ Therefore, without an effective African consultative body or force, the United States and NATO led the airstrikes on Libya with ultimate consequences, good or bad, laid squarely on their shoulders.

To avoid the need for UN, U.S., or European intervention in all future conflicts and insurgencies, AFRICOM should continue to engage with the RECs to enhance security sector reform and civil society development programs to enable REC leadership to more effectively manage conflicts in their respective regions.

African Mercenaries and Insurgencies.

Gaddafi was also responsible for much of the development of African mercenary groups later contracted as “third party nationals” to provide security in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. Deploying and paying members of potentially restive tribal groups to work outside the country was an effective method for keeping them from forming an opposition to his autocratic rule. Now with the United States out of Iraq and its role in Afghanistan winding down, those guns for hire will be looking for new hotspots. Many will return home to Africa with, as an Eritrean economist recently commented, “no skills other than raping and killing.”²¹

Even as Libyan government forces continued to fight, observers voiced concern over the need to secure the massive weapons caches known to be located around the country. Despite early efforts, this arsenal is making its way around already over-armed Sub-Saharan Africa, even as the coalition and Libya’s own National Transitional Council (NTC) take steps to safeguard what was left. In addition to small arms, tens of thousands of landmines and even more sophisticated surface-to-air missiles (SAM) have disappeared from poorly guarded storage facilities.²²

Numerous African governments are currently in power as a direct result of coups and guerilla wars. The “demobilization” phase of post-conflict stability development causes many of these former fighters to be offered minimal training or payments in transitioning to civilian life. When the Ugandan war ended in 1986, current President Yoweri Museveni boasted that at one time he could call up one million trained fighters, but has an official army of only 65,000 today. If true, where have all those combatants gone?

A February 2011 *Foreign Policy* article noted, “Recent conflicts in [West Africa] have generated a steady supply of unemployed ex-fighters willing to move from conflict to conflict for the right price.”²³ One estimate places the number of Ugandans working for private U.S. contractors as security guards in Iraq at 15,000,²⁴ with returning U.S. service personnel suggesting the number was likely twice that. Even with the Ugandan Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) reporting a very low 2010 unemployment rate of 4.2 percent,²⁵ the question for these mercenaries must be, “where to next?”

As Ugandan journalist Charles Onyango-Obbo commented in November 2011:

When Africans go into the hired gun business, it increases the potential for intra-continental conflicts as is happening in Libya. But it is also as good an indicator of the effect of the hyper-militarization and militarization that happened in Africa in the 1990s. Because African mercenaries probably charge less than former British SASs or American Marines, the number of African mercenaries and guards will only grow, not decline, over the coming years.²⁶

The recent coup in Mali is the result of the return from Libya of Tuareg mercenaries, with equipment and experience enabling them to outperform the poorly equipped Malian military units that were deployed to suppress the Tuareg uprisings. In late 2011, hundreds of such militants returned from Libya armed and ready to form the Azawad National Liberation Movement (MNLA), which took control of several northern towns in 2 months. In March 2012, frustrated Malian Army soldiers under Captain Amadou Sanogo staged a coup, which led to looting and violent street protests in one of Africa's poorer countries.²⁷ Worse still is the imposition of sharia law in this region of Mali and the continuing destruction of ancient artifacts considered "un-Islamic."

Hand-in-hand with the experience armed men for hire gain in international security contracting is their access to small arms and other weapons. Arms proliferation has been a problem contributing to insecurity and instability in the region since the 1870s. As John Reader reported in his 2007 "biography" of Africa, guns were a "popular purchase" of those working in the Kimberly (now South Africa) diamond mines: "It has been argued that some African leaders sent cohorts of young men to the mines expressly to acquire weapons for use in territorial disputes."²⁸ Due to the easy availability of automatic weapons, loosely guarded armories worldwide, and "aid" rendered to client states by both sides in the Cold War, mercenaries have the capacity to add to this problem by returning home with their own private arsenals, better trained and equipped than their own national government troops, as the situation in Mali attests.

In response to the coup in Mali, ECOWAS placed severe economic sanctions on the country, which re-

sulted in the junta leader agreeing in early April to step down in exchange for amnesty for all coup participants (and a pension and mansion for himself), and for permitting the Parliamentary Speaker Dioncounda Traore to serve as Interim President for 2 months while elections were prepared. However, on May 20, ECOWAS approved Traore's request to remain in power until April 2013, which resulted in mass protests during which members of a mob entered President Traore's office and physically attacked him. Many coup supporters view the extension of Traore's term as "unilateral" interference in Mali's affairs by ECOWAS and as propping up the old regime. Although ECOWAS has agreed to monitor the election preparation process to ensure transparency and to provide an opportunity for Tuareg grievances to be aired, protestors are in favor of holding elections sooner than had been originally planned.²⁹

On the other hand, Niger, which has also had a history of Tuareg rebellion, dealt with their heavily armed returnees from Libya through a proven post-conflict disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) strategy. The Niger government disarmed Tuareg groups as they entered the country and integrated their leaders into the government, including the new Tuareg prime minister appointed in April 2011 and the majority of local officials in Agadez, the Tuareg-majority region. The United States is assisting these efforts by conducting aerial surveillance of the region through its Pan-Sahelian Counter Terrorism Initiative.³⁰

Ensuring that demobilized militants are able to quickly reintegrate into society and contribute economically so that they are able to support themselves, their families, and maintain or increase status in their

communities are critical elements of post-conflict security and stability. However, the Niger government rightly fears that if not managed quickly, the unrest in Mali could undermine its own fragile peace.

While the Tuareg situation has encouraging aspects, it is a typically complex situation. It presents an opportunity for an African REC to immediately respond to a crisis and work productively with all sides to resolve it without relying exclusively on external powers, such as the UN, to take the initiative, or on individual countries to deal with a problem with cross-border implications. This is an excellent test case for ECOWAS' ability to serve in a regional security capacity, building upon its recent success in ending the October 2010 post-election violence in Cote d'Ivoire. However, at this stage, a single member with U.S. assistance is faring better at dealing with the Tuareg situation than is the REC. Future efforts should focus on developing more effective REC mechanisms for managing conflict within its sphere of regional influence. As the RECs become more effective and influential, they will form the base for full integration in the entire Sub-Saharan region.

Dangerous Spaces.

When we talk about dangerous spaces, our minds first turn to Somalia or other such weak or failing states. Such appellations might apply to parts of Mexico and to large pockets of the Middle East since early 2011. Much of the American "Wild" West and Southwest were also essentially "ungoverned" until the beginning of the 20th century, but those regions have since been "tamed."

These spaces can even exist in the most stable and secure states where, as Dr. Phil Williams puts it, there are “governance gaps,” such as the roughest, lawless parts of America’s big cities. In these urban zones or in very remote rural areas, neither side calls 911 or hails the friendly policeman on the corner.

These areas are mainly populated by people Dr. Steven Pinker calls “stateless,” those for whom the larger justice system is not intended or inclined to support. This can be due to ethnic, economic, or other demographic circumstances, which the larger society tends to ascribe to such individuals. Such “stateless” individuals, regardless of where they are located, cannot rely on the state at any level for protection and assurances of security. Therefore, they must rely on what elites derisively call the “code of the street” or “self-help justice,” while the same educated Westerners look approvingly upon the phenomenon, depending upon who is exhibiting it and where, calling it a “code of honor” or a “tribal” or “cultural norm,” and insisting that it be maintained and respected. Therefore, zones of state failure can exist inside states seen to have achieved “success” in terms of security, stability, and prosperity.

Although they once were prevalent in many places in the United States, today these governance gaps represent small pockets of the American landscape. They have largely been brought under control in the past 100 years, and again since the 1980s, when the crack cocaine craze seemed poised to tear American cities apart. Today, we are now shocked by stories of clan violence and feuds in Africa, although they are not dissimilar from the lawlessness and violence that often wracked the U.S. frontier as the line of settlement continued moving farther west from the original colonies through the 1880s.

Just because Africa marks time on the same calendar we do, does not mean all the 21st century developments have occurred to bring it to the place where we are now. While the United States is now far less violent than it was a century ago, it is still three times more violent than its northern neighbor or than Western Europe. Pinker argues this is due to the shorter time the United States has had since consolidation to benefit from civilizing influences. America has had over 200 years to become only three times as violent as Europe, where violence began to diminish only in the mid-1600s as city-states consolidated and Hobbes' *leviathan* began to develop, while African states have only had, in most cases, 30-50 years, and we wonder why they have not yet caught up.

Post-colonial Africa unfortunately developed in much the same way, at least at the outset, as did post-colonial America, as Pinker points out:

In Europe, first the state disarmed the people and claimed a monopoly on violence, then the people took over the apparatus of the state. In America, the people took over the state before it had forced them to lay down their arms—which, as the Second Amendment famously affirms, they reserve the right to keep and bear. In other words, Americans in the South and West, never fully signed on to a social contract that would vest the government with a monopoly on the legitimate use of force. In much of American history, legitimate force was also wielded by posses, vigilantes, lynch mobs, company police, detective agencies, and Pinkertons, and even more often kept as a prerogative of the individual.³¹

Since the 1960s, Africa has been rent by interstate and intrastate conflict with the Sub-Saharan region still home to many of the “dangerous spaces,” where

Dr. Williams notes “the danger flows out from its origin or locus in zones characterized by turbulence, through various forms of connectivity, to zones of order and stability.”³²

The key for the RECs, therefore, is to identify and prioritize the most lawless or “ungoverned” spaces within their respective region, and with U.S. assistance to develop action plans to “tame” these areas in order to reduce their attractiveness to destabilizing forces, such as insurgent, extremist, or criminal groups that naturally gravitate toward them for bases of operation, as is being done in the Sahel. This will give the RECs additional influence and capability over individual governments that are not effectively dealing with the problems in their own territory and further support the regional integration process.

Demographics.

The issue of developing countries’ burgeoning youth bulge is a subject dealt with in depth in many other fine research efforts and does not need to be dived into headlong here. However, it is certainly a potentially destabilizing factor in regions without clear gains in economic development. What are the options for the exploding population of young men now aged 15 to 30 in Sub-Saharan Africa? Like gangs in the lawless sprawling U.S. housing projects, the mercenary or criminal life is likely to present an attractive alternative to many of those without other options.

The RECs can play a role in mitigating this problem by coordinating with each other and with the countries willing to provide training and education to develop the human capital needed to participate in existing labor markets. Such efforts are likely to

present opportunities for young men to participate in increasingly viable labor markets and enable them to support their families, becoming integrated into society, rather than encouraging them toward “outlaw” status. Viewing these young men as potential destabilizers and as a problem to prevent instead of eradicate after the fact should provide the impetus to develop a sort of pre-DDR approach to literacy and vocational skills development across the region, once needed skills have been identified.

One of the major issues preventing the growth of labor markets in Sub-Saharan Africa, beyond the failure of governments to require indigenous labor quotas to be met by those intending to invest or operate in the region, is the high level of labor protection that makes using such indigenous resources highly restrictive. As Scott Taylor reported in 2009:

Across five measures used [by the World Bank] to calculate the ease (or difficulty) of employing workers—indices for difficulty of hiring, rigidity of hours, difficulty of firing, rigidity of employment, and firing costs (weeks of salary)—sub-Saharan Africa ranks substantially lower than every other region of the globe. These ancillary costs related to hiring and firing workers render the business climate unattractive, particularly to potential new investors, who simply choose to take their capital elsewhere.³³

The RECs can work together to assess and mitigate this problem on a regional level in order to augment the value of their collective markets.

The RECs’ enhanced ability to attract FDI can also provide the opportunity to set labor requirements for investors requiring a given percentage of regionally-indigenous labor in order to receive permits or tax

abatements. Such requirements can only be made without undermining FDI flows once the requisite skills are made available in the region. One of the major complaints of Africans against Chinese investment is the lack of opportunities created for the indigenous labor force. The Chinese argument is that this labor force lacks the skills and the work ethic to push investment projects forward.

One example of unrest that has continued for decades is in the Niger Delta, due to the Nigerian government's disastrous environmental policies in the region and its extraction of oil without return remittances or services, as well as a failure to provide employment opportunities for Niger Delta residents in the oil industry. This situation can be reversed across REC areas with a concentrated effort to develop human capacity, which will enhance the attractiveness of investment, reduce the instability caused by unemployment, and raise the level of economic development within the regions in the long term.

Resource Shortages Resulting in Conflict.

Western studies have increasingly shown the likelihood that change will cause or exacerbate shortages of water and other resources over the next 100-plus years. Even U.S. military assessments have expressed concern for, and discussed prevention of, an anticipated increased violence in already resource-poor areas. However, violence over resources may not be inevitable.

In 2008, political scientist Ole Theisen produced a regression analysis on armed conflicts between 1980 and 1992 that indicated an unsurprising correlation among poverty, high population, political instability,

and the abundance of oil—conflict was more likely in the presence of these factors. More surprisingly, drought, water shortages and some land degradation had little effect in increasing the likelihood of an outbreak or continuation of violence.

However, Theisen suggests that poverty and agricultural dependence are likely to have a greater effect on lower-level conflicts. He further suggests a need for “closer scrutiny of whether it is the scarcity of renewable resources *per se* or their social distribution that is the most important factor in linking conflict to scarce resources.”³⁴ John Reader spends hundreds of pages describing the historically symbiotic relationships that existed across Africa among very different peoples with varying divisions of labor who cooperated in times of environmental pressure to cope with changing conditions without resorting to intergroup violence.³⁵

It is more likely that the introduction of cash crops and valuable resources for export result in wide-scale oppression and conflict. As one Kenyan observer noted, “All the Kenyans I know pray every night that oil will not be discovered in our country, or it will tear itself apart in no time.”³⁶ Unfortunately for these Kenyans, trouble began in early 2012 with the announcement that oil had indeed been found in their country. With the 2008 example of violent conflict over which group had the right to plunder the country still a fresh memory, this is a case in which a functioning AU and its supporters should prepare for the worst before the first drop of oil comes out of the ground.

Rather than continuing the current practice of a few national elites exploiting natural resources to fill their own coffers, RECs can help to develop regional approaches to resource exploitation. Botswana has

shown that its diamond revenues can be reinvested into health and education for its population so as to increase the standard of living and, thus stability and security, for continued economic development. In 2008, the country had the highest level of Gross Capital Formation as a percent of gross domestic product (GDP) (32.4 percent) in the SADC region, even ahead of South Africa (22.8 percent), which is actually Botswana's biggest foreign investor.³⁷

While the countries with the most lucrative extractive industries, such as Angola and Nigeria with their known oil reserves and questionable stability, will continue to attract the most FDI, instability notwithstanding, in the long term, more sustainable approaches to FDI attraction will need to be formulated as these resources disappear. Botswana's diamonds may be mined out one day, but its educated population will maintain its skills and competitiveness in the region and beyond. Applying this approach to human capital formation on a regional scale will further enhance investment potential to the larger regional market and thus opportunities for economic development, reducing dependency on limited resources.

DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT THROUGH REGIONAL MARKETS

Much of the approach to development in Africa has been backward, with international organizations from the UN to United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to the World Bank trying for decades to create transparent governing institutions that reduce corruption and encourage foreign investment. However, they tend to work with the same elites that are gorging themselves at the public

trough. The organic path that Western Europe itself followed over centuries to nourish an environment in which economic development begins and then, once people have something to protect, such as productive private land or a small manufacturing facility, they themselves spearhead development of the institutions needed to protect those assets, is lacking in the African post-colonial experience. Creating the opportunities to develop such assets should be the first step, not the last. This means a secure and stable environment in which investors will see a greater return than risk.

Africa has thus far failed to develop a robust industrial base to enable it to evolve beyond a commodity provider, which keeps export prices low and devalues individual African currencies. This in turn, reduces interest in investing in African industry beyond commodity extraction, and maintains a lower standard of living for the majority of Africans. As Ake noted in 1997, "Africa needs to be productive and competitive and to diversify and strive for industrialization instead of being fixated on commodity prices. . . ." ³⁸ Even with this dependence upon subsistence industries such as agriculture and extraction, the Chicago Council on Foreign Affairs estimates that only 4 percent of sub-Saharan farmland is irrigated, and one-third to one-half of its harvest routinely goes to waste due to poor storage facilities, outmoded markets, and a lack of transportation infrastructure. ³⁹

Ralph Olaye, Manager of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) Division at the African Development Bank (AfDB), noted in January 2012 that Africa needs \$360 billion in infrastructure investment to achieve full connectivity with the rest of the world by 2040. ⁴⁰ A December 2011 World Bank report noted that the SADC region needs \$2.1 billion

annually for a decade to complete and maintain its required infrastructure and that for southern Africa, “[r]egional integration is the only likely way to overcome existing handicaps and to allow the SADC member states to participate in the global economy.”⁴¹

With over one billion potential consumers, who currently have very little collective purchasing power, Africa remains a poor investment risk. However, African industries in which African entrepreneurs can sell to African consumers can be based on African purchasing preferences and indigenous inputs. This can increase the standard of living and enhance the power of individual Africans as consumers, provide more jobs of varying skill level and type, and broaden the economic power in order to wrest it from a handful of national elites who ensure that African economies continue to fail to trade with one another.

British economist Barrington Moore stated in 1967, “[C]ertain historical processes need to develop, notably the emergence of a large middle-class, in order to sustain a viable democratic state.”⁴² The keys to creating opportunities for producing that middle class include security, stability, and infrastructure, not more aid. As former World Bank economist Moyo emphasizes:

Not only is aid easy to steal, as it is usually provided directly to African governments, but it also makes control over government worth fighting for . . . Foreign direct investment and rapidly growing exports, not aid, have been the key to China’s economic miracle. Africa needs to learn from Asia.⁴³

Moyo further notes:

Africa’s common challenges are real and undeniably stark, fortunes and misfortunes are intertwined. Even

where there are pockets of economic success, it is worth remembering that in the long term no country in Africa can truly exist as an island of prosperity on its own.⁴⁴

Erastus Mwencha, Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa's (COMESA) outgoing Secretary-General, declared in 2008 that:

Efforts to develop regional infrastructure projects, which are especially critical for landlocked states and are often beyond national capacities, have been hampered by investor concerns about the financial viability of regional economic communities. Hence, it becomes essential for RECs to develop transparent and stable regional frameworks in order to attract greater investments. In recent years they have registered some successes in this sphere, particularly in promoting regional energy cooperation. They have also made inroads in the removal of non-tariff barriers to trade.⁴⁵

To this end, SADC and ECOWAS have steadily increased their credibility even beyond that of relatively successful independent states. Aside from its proposed Free Trade Zone, SADC still mainly provides information for potential investors on its individual member countries; while ECOWAS has begun developing region-wide policies. For instance, ECOWAS announced in May 2012 the plan to form an ECOWAS Investment Guarantee Agency to support its Common Investment Policy.⁴⁶ In June 2012, ECOWAS announced its intention to begin using the UN Industrial Development Organization's (UNIDO) new portal for data collection in support of the UN's African Regional Investment Promotion Programme.⁴⁷

The Infrastructure Consortium for Africa also notes:

Africa's fragmentary infrastructure networks isolate smaller countries and prevent them from harnessing efficient large-scale technologies. Regional integration is essential to reducing Africa's high infrastructure costs."⁴⁸ A 2004 study funded by the EU found that market size is the primary determinant of FDI inflow level and advocates that the SADC "further deepen and harmonize policies within and among member states."⁴⁹

A worthwhile goal for a U.S.-led process would be to support the REC's increasing capacity to work as individual policymakers and planners, and to service as both recipients and allocators of funds. In this vein, REC oversight of infrastructure and other critical development projects is likely to enhance the attractiveness of investment across southern Africa. As the RECs continue to prove their value in promoting security and good governance, they can begin to work in concert and provide a framework for greater Sub-Saharan integration.

The U.S. Federal government and the states share responsibility for infrastructure development and maintenance, but Interstate highways, for instance, fall under the purview of Federal mandates, as do transcontinental railways. Of course, the concern always arises about corruption in the developing world, but as Joseph Lapalombara pointed out in 1994, although the infrastructure development process in the United States was a perfect model of corruption, the railroads, roads, airports, industrial sectors, etc., are now in place to support economic development. So how much does a little graft really matter as long as they get built?⁵⁰

CONTINUED U.S. DIPLOMATIC AND MILITARY ENGAGEMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Post-independence U.S. efforts to engage with Africa have concentrated on short-term goals and cozy relations with national leaders who have often used U.S. patronage to wage war on their neighbors or their own people, thus diminishing the average African's faith in American ideals. After the abrupt U.S. disengagement from Africa in 1993, policymakers hesitated to re-engage even during the genocide in Rwanda. In 1994, after the scale of that crisis became apparent, U.S. President Bill Clinton signed the African Conflict Resolution Act,⁵¹ which offered U.S. support to the OAU's Conflict Prevention, Management, and Resolution Mechanism, but as the OAU developed closer ties to Gaddafi, the United States gradually scaled back its support for this and other Africa-centered security initiatives.

From 1996, the United States began to provide some funding and materiel for a number of security initiatives in Africa, including the African Crisis Response Force (ACRF), followed by the African Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI). By this time, U.S. policymakers had realized the key to viable cooperation was not in simply providing arms, but in building the capacity of African military institutions to operate effectively on their own, which led to the Enhanced International Peacekeeping Capabilities (EIPC) program, the Africa Regional Peacekeeping Program (ARP) and increased African participation in the existing International Military Education and Training (IMET) program. In 2001, the administration of President George W. Bush transformed earlier efforts into the African

Contingency Operations Training and Assistance program (ACOTA), which later became part of the multinational Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI).

By 2005, for instance, the GPOI had trained more than 69,000 military personnel from 73 countries, more than 48,000 of whom have deployed to 20 operations around the world. These are effectively trained and equipped troops able to manage security crises *in place of U.S. troops*. The 5-year mandate for GPOI was extended for another 5 years in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 with, as the Congressional Research Service (CRS) reported in June 2009, a goal to “shift from direct training to building the capacity of foreign nations to develop their own peacekeeping infrastructure and capabilities.”⁵²

The United States does not do this alone, but in concert with its partners in both the developed and developing world. The Group of Eight (G8) has supported peacekeeping preparedness in Africa, with the United Kingdom (UK) training over 12,000 peacekeepers since 2005 through its support for 13 country-located centers. France mainly uses African training centers and has trained over 6,800 troops from 27 countries in the same period, including nine peacekeeping battalions in 2008 alone. A 2009 G8 Peacekeeping Report commended the AU and RECs for their ownership of capacity-building efforts for regional missions. The report stated, “We recommend expanded partnerships with the AU and with sub-regional organizations to reinforce local capacities in all sectors. . . .”⁵³

Despite U.S. support for the security initiatives in the intervening period, the United States did not have a clear focus on African security until the October 2007 formation of AFRICOM. As Benedikt Franke argued in January 2007:

[I]t may be difficult to muster political support for further increasing the African regional peacekeeping budget(s), however, only by supporting both immediate demands as well as long-term needs will African capacity be enhanced in a sustainable manner and thus be able to safeguard the growing number of U.S. national interests on the continent.⁵⁴

Robert Berschinski's 2007 Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) monograph on what AFRICOM should *not* be is still fully accurate. Commingling of humanitarian and anti-terrorist rhetoric and activities has led to a scattershot and uncoordinated effort that has not inspired the faith of the African audience, which still views AFRICOM's mission as anti-terrorism first, securing oil reserves for U.S. exploitation second, countering Chinese influence third, and with African interests somewhere down the line.⁵⁵

Some recent reviews undertaken on AFRICOM's behalf indicate that an improved public affairs campaign is in order. Assessments illustrate that positive stories on the very real humanitarian activities AFRICOM has undertaken since its inception, such as building schools, providing clean water and medical care and repairing places of worship, are not making their way into the international or even local press.⁵⁶ An efficient way to increase AFRICOM's visibility is through the public relations capabilities of the regional communities. Identifying the key regional and REC leaders and encouraging them to assist in informing their constituencies of the positive effects AFRICOM's presence has had in their larger communities is a more direct target than approaching leaders in all the individual countries under AFRICOM's purview. These leaders can assist AFRICOM in understanding what

projects are likely to have the most impact across their regions and how to gain the support of individual groups. This also lets the REC leaders know that AFRICOM officials truly aim to be their partners in the future security, stability, and prosperity across the larger Sub-Saharan region and throughout the path to AU integration and development.

Encouraging Integrative Strategies to Address Regional Security Concerns.

As AFRICOM continues to expand its engagement in Africa, senior leadership both within and above the Command must ensure the most efficient use of limited resources, especially in times of reduced budgets. One way to do this is to increase the reach of existing and planned training and other activities not on an individual country basis, but on an economies of scale model, by revising programs to become “train-the-trainer” focused and by directing activities to REC participation, rather than toward individual countries or U.S.-determined country blocs.

The more interoperable the RECs’ own security structures become with each other and with the United States, and AU security apparatus, the more likely they are to become ingrained to the U.S. “way of doing things” and to prefer U.S. equipment, which will further enhance engagement opportunities. Gradually, as more REC-specific trainers can produce more effective REC-centered military groupings, the RECs themselves will become more integrated. Longer-term focus would then be on integrating training and activities among the RECs and ultimately with the AU to create security structures across Sub-Saharan Africa.

U.S. ARMY ROLE IN AFRICAN SECURITY INTEGRATION

Cross-Cultural Training and Synchronizing Strategic and Tactical Leadership.

While the U.S. Army and Special Operations community already play a significant role in AFRICOM activities, especially logistical support for missions across the continent and military-to-military training, there is more the Army can do to enhance security and stability in Africa, especially through its strategic analysis capabilities. While the Army continues its efforts to prepare for smaller conflicts by cross-training personnel, it has recognized that the more cross-cultural competency the service can impart before deployment to those on the ground in Africa, the greater the chances of operational success. This is clearly manifested through the Army's regional approach to using Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs), particularly the 1st Armored Division's 2nd Brigade dedicated to Africa, which has proven to be successful in working in this multicultural environment.

It is not clear that the same understanding is carried through to the strategic level. The U.S. Army Culture Summit, held every Spring at or near Ft. Huachuca, Arizona, from 2005 through 2011, was part of an effort to integrate academic, private, and military assets to enhance cultural awareness and cross-cultural competency for the warfighter. This effort worked in tandem with the Human Terrain System, which was deployed in Afghanistan and Iraq beginning in 2007. However, it is increasingly critical for success in forward deployed operations to have personnel trained to operate with more integrated personnel from various contributing

countries in many alien environments and not just in “hot” war operations. As the United States expanded its interest in Africa, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command's (TRADOC) Culture Center began developing blocs of language and culture training with limited resources for “phase zero” target locations, such as Africa and the larger Middle East.

Ft. Huachuca's previous Commander, General John Custer, a U.S. Army War College graduate with a background in Russian language and culture, emphasized the importance of this training. However, when he retired, the Culture Summit was abandoned, the Culture Center disbanded, and its highly skilled trainers moved on base and were absorbed into the civil service where, despite years of doing identical work, they have no seniority. This has not necessarily been the most effective way for the Army to support the public emphasis it claims to place on cultural training. The United States is nearly certain to continue to engage in Africa and the Middle East for the next 100 years, and this kind of training should not be closed down simply because the “hot” wars are ending.

While the Army has spent significant funds on cross-cultural skills training, such as the Cadet Troop Leader Training (CTLT) program, which sends Reserve Officer's Training Corps (ROTC) and West Point cadets to foreign countries for leadership and cultural training, it mainly prefers to do so either in classrooms at U.S. bases like Ft. Huachuca or Ft. Leavenworth, KS, or via video games formatted for hand-held mobile devices. While there are many African military personnel in the United States studying military science and other skills through IMET and other programs, U.S. personnel are not encouraged to use these opportunities to interact with African military personnel, unless they happen to share a classroom.

The U.S. Army War College, as the Army's "think tank," can provide programs to help strategic planners understand and apply the important lessons learned from prior failure to take culture into account when preparing to deploy forces or engage a new ally or adversary. In Iraq and Afghanistan, the U.S. military instituted cultural training because it was a tactical necessity. Tactical commanders understand this and this tactical necessity must be "synched" with strategic thinkers' ability to facilitate and enable tactical operations. Rather than downsizing on the soft skills that will truly enhance military readiness to operate in increasingly multicultural environments in smaller teams in intimate settings, the U.S. Army War College can be at the forefront of research on how to best achieve effective cross-cultural skills training.

In addition, as Phillip Van Neikerk noted in his 2009 article, *Africa's Leadership Vacuum*, "Africa's hope for leadership is a younger generation that for now remains on the margins."⁵⁷ The U.S. Army War College can, therefore, provide research opportunities to identify up-and-coming individuals in countries and counterpart organizations, such as RECs, who are especially suited as partners for enhancing security and stability in the region. This requires a clear understanding of the local decisionmaking environment and the stresses and influences under which such leaders or "leaders-to-be" may be operating. Socio-cultural and network analysis are invaluable techniques for enhancing the Army's and AFRICOM's ability to engage in the region and meet their mission goals.

ENDNOTES

1. PROTOCOL TO THE TREATY ESTABLISHING THE AFRICAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY RELATING TO THE PAN-AFRICAN PARLIAMENT, available from www.africa-union.org/Official_documents/Treaties_%20Conventions_%20Protocols/protocol-panafrican-parliament.pdf.

2. *Ibid.*

3. Claude Ake, "Democracy and Development in Africa," Washington, DC: Brookings, 1997, p. 70.

4. Richard Dowden, *Africa: Altered States, Ordinary Miracles*, New York: Public Affairs, 2009, p. 65.

5. H. Wolpe, and S. McDonald, "Democracy and Peace Building: Rethinking the Conventional Wisdom," *The Round Table*, Vol. 97, No. 394, 2008, pp. 137-145.

6. Francis Fukuyama, *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004, p. 120.

7. Dr. Steven Pinker, *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*, New York: Penguin Groups Viking, 2011, p. 291.

8. Samuel M. Makinda and F. Wafula Okumu, *The African Union: Challenges of Globalization, Security, and Governance*. London, UK: Routledge Press, 2008, p. 33.

9. Dr. Steven Metz, *Refining American Strategy in Africa*, Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, February 2000, available from www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?PubID=199.

10. *African Union Strategic Plan 2009-2012*, available from www.au.int/en/sites/default/files/Strategic_Plan2009-2012.pdf.

11. *African Union Commission's Mission Statement*, available from www.au.int/en/commission.

12. Makinda and Okumu, p. 77.
13. African Union Treaty Protocol Relating to the Peace and Security Council, Washington, DC, available from www.au.int/en/organs/psc.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*
16. *African Union Constitutive Act*, available from www.au.int/en/about/constitutive_act.
17. Lauren Gelfand, "Regions make slow progress towards African Standby Force," *Jane's Defence Weekly*, February 2009.
18. The most current open source information from SADC notes that the second part of Golfinho III Command Post Exercise was held to general satisfaction in April 2010 in Mozambique. "Southern African Development Community," available from www.sadc.int/index/browse/page/488.
19. Partnership for Integrated Logistics Operations and Tactics (PILOT) Fact Sheet available from www.africom.mil/fetchBinary.asp?pdfID=20091019125255.
20. Barry Malone, "Africa to Miss Gaddafi's Money, Not His Meddling," *Reuters Insight*, November 11, 2011, available from www.reuters.com/article/2011/11/11/us-gaddafi-africa-legacy-idUSTRE7AA27120111111.
21. Author discussion with Dr. Tseggai Isaac, Eritrean political scientist and Culture and Language Advisor at the Maneuver Support Center of Excellence in Fort Leonard Wood, MO, at U.S. Army Culture Summit V on March 2, 2011, in Sierra Vista, AZ.
22. Andrew Harding, "Libya: Concerns over Missing Weapons," *BBC Africa*, September 9, 2011, available from www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-14863180.
23. Joshua E. Keating, "How Do You Hire Mercenaries?" *Foreign Policy*, February 23, 2011, available from www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/02/23/how_do_you_hire_mercenaries.

24. Charles Onyango-Obbo, "The Rise of the African Mercenary," *The Citizen*, November 16, 2011, available from www.the-citizen.co.tz/editorial-analysis/20-analysis-opinions/17121-the-rise-of-the-african-mercenary.html.

25. Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Labor Statistics available from www.ubos.org/index.php?st=pagerelations2&id=20&p=related%20pages%202:Labour%20Statistics.

26. Onyango-Obbo.

27. Thomas Fessy, "Gaddafi's influence in Mali's coup," *BBC News*, March 22, 2012, available from www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-17481114.

28. John Reader, *Africa: A Biography of the Continent*, New York: Vintage Books, 2007, p. 509.

29. "Mali President Traore beaten up by protesters," *BBC News Africa*, May 21, 2012, available from www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-18142488.

30. Celeste Hicks, "Tuareg rebels make troubled return from Libya to Mali," *BBC News Africa*, February 29, 2012, available from www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-17192212.

31. Pinker, p. 99.

32. Dr. Phil Williams, "Here Be Dragons: Dangerous Spaces and International Security," Anne L. Clunan and Harold A. Trinkunas, eds., *Ungoverned Spaces: Alternatives to State Authority in an Era of Softened Sovereignty*, Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010.

33. Scott D. Taylor. "Labor Markets in Africa," *Current History*, May 2009, pp. 214-20.

34. Dr. Ole Magnus Theisen, "Blood and Soil? Resource Scarcity and Internal Armed Conflict Revisited," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 45, No. 6, 2008, pp. 801-818.

35. Reader, p. 368.

36. March 2010 discussion with Kamba Kenyan Stella Kagwange at the U.S. Army Culture Summit in Sierra Vista, AZ.

37. Southern Africa Development Community's "Foreign Direct Investment in SADC," available from www.sadc.int/english/regional-integration/tifi/investment/about-sadc/foreign-direct-investment/.

38. Ake, p. 112.

39. Roger Thurow, *The Last Hunger Season: A Year in an African Farm Community on the Brink of Change*, New York, NY: Public Affairs, 2012.

40. "NEPAD says private sector "critical" in developing Africa's infrastructure," The New Partnership For Africa's Development (NEPAD) Press Release, July 11, 2012, available from www.nepad.org/regionalintegrationandinfrastructure/news/2748/nepad-says-private-sector-%E2%80%9Ccritical%E2%80%9D-developing-afric.

41. Rupa Ranganathan, "The SADC's Infrastructure: A Regional Perspective," *Policy Research Working Paper 5898*, Washington, DC: The World Bank Africa Region Sustainable Development Unit, December 2011.

42. Todd J. Moss, "US Policy and Democratisation in Africa: The Limits of Liberal Universalism," *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 2, June 1995, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 189-209.

43. Dambisa Moyo, *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way for Africa*, New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2009, pp. x-xi.

44. *Ibid.*, p. xvi.

45. "African Regional and Subregional Organizations: Assessing Their Contributions to Economic Integration and Conflict Management," Conference report, Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, April 10, 2008.

46. "ECOWAS Experts Meet To Examine, Adopt Reports On Member States' Investment Policies," Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Press Release No. 139/2012, May 16, 2012, available from news.ecowas.int/presseshow.php?nb=139&lang=en&annee=2012.

47. "ECOWAS Supports UNIDO'S Tool For Regional Investment Promotion," ECOWAS Press Release No. 176/2012, June 26, 2012, available from news.ecowas.int/presseshow.php?nb=176&lang=en&annee=2012.

48. "Transportation infrastructure for regional integration focal points," The Infrastructure Consortium For Africa, available from www.icafrica.org/en/topics-programmes/focal-points/.

49. Nomathemba Mhlanga, Garrick Blalock, and Ralph Christy, "Understanding Foreign Direct Investment in the Southern African Development Community: An Analysis Based on Project-Level Data," Paper Presented at the International Association of Agricultural Economists' Conference in Beijing, China, on August 16-22, 2009, p. 26.

50. Joseph Lapalombara, "Structural and Institutional Aspects of Corruption," *Social Research*, Vol. 61, No. 2, 1994, pp. 325-350.

51. Senate Bill 2475, "African Conflict Resolution Act," signed by President William J. Clinton on January 25, 1994.

52. Nina Serafino, "The Global Peace Operations Initiative: Background and Issues for Congress," *Congressional Research Services Report*, Washington, DC: Congressional Research Services, June 11, 2009, available from www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL32773.pdf.

53. "2009 G8 Report on Peacekeeping/Peacebuilding," available from www.canadainternational.gc.ca/g8/summit-sommet/2009/index.aspx?lang=eng&menu_id=121&view=d.

54. Benedikt Franke, "Enabling a Continent to Help Itself: U.S. Military Capacity Building and Africa's Emerging Security Architecture," *Strategic Insights*, Vol. VI, Issue 1, January 2007, available from www.nps.edu/Academics/centers/ccp/publications/OnlineJournal/2007/jan/frankejan07.html#references.

55. Robert G. Berschinski, *AFRICOM's Dilemma: The "Global War on Terrorism," "Capacity Building," Humanitarianism, and the Future of U.S. Security Policy in Africa*, November, 2007, Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College available from www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=827.

56. PHONCON on June 7, 2012, with U.S. Government contractor stationed in Djibouti supporting the assessment described.

57. Phillip Van Neikerk, "Africa's Leadership Vacuum," *Current History*, May 2009, pp. 232-234, EBSO Host, available from ejscontent.ebsco.com.ezproxy.mercyhurst.edu/ContentServer.aspx?target=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.currenthistory.com%2Fpdf_org_files%2F108_718_232.pdf.

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE

**Major General Anthony A. Cucolo III
Commandant**

**STRATEGIC STUDIES INSTITUTE
and
U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE PRESS**

**Director
Professor Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr.**

**Director of Research
Dr. Steven K. Metz**

**Author
Ms. Diane E. Chido**

**Editor for Production
Dr. James G. Pierce**

**Publications Assistant
Ms. Rita A. Rummel**

**Composition
Mrs. Jennifer E. Nevil**



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE
SSI
STRATEGIC STUDIES INSTITUTE

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE
CSLD
CENTERS FOR STRATEGIC
LEADERSHIP & DEVELOPMENT

PKSOI

P
PARAMETERS

U.S. Army War College
SLDR
Senior Leader Development
and Resiliency



FOR THIS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS, VISIT US AT
<http://www.carlisle.army.mil/>

ISBN 1-58487-563-1



This Publication



SSI Website



USAWC Website