

The Roles of African Union Vis-À-Vis Human Security in Africa

Eze-Michael, Ezedikachi. N

Department of Political Science, Public Administration and International Law and Diplomacy, Babcock University

Abstract

The incompatibility of sub-regional blocs with the progress and unity of Africa brought about the call for a strongly unified instrument that would champion the course of a united Africa within the international system. As a result, the defunct Organization of African Unity (OAU) was established in 1963, mainly to ensure and assist liberation movements in Africa. The O.A.U. registered some modest successes but unfortunately, there were also significant failures and numerous problems that hampered its successes. The price of its failure, left Africa with many developmental and security challenges and it was the search to solve these problems of O.A.U that led to its metamorphosis into the African Union.

The aim of this study was to examine the roles of African Union vis-à-vis human security in Africa. The study was historical and qualitative in nature and also involved the use of secondary data for analysis. The secondary data used were in form of books, journals and articles, both published and unpublished materials and internet sources that are related to the study.

Based on the analysis, it was established that AU scored a number of successes during its early history especially in mediation, settling of border disputes and giving financial supports. The organization was also involved in the Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development. The objectives and desire to bring about a virile peace and human security in African region brought about the transformation of OAU to AU but those objectives were clearly defeated.

The study concluded that African governments failed to address key and specific values of human security and thus raising questions on the relevance of AU and it was recommended that African leaders should be more committed to the principles and objectives that underline the formation of the African Union. And also, they should incorporate all social structures within the region in achieving human security objectives.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Since no man is an island unto himself, states also are not islands unto themselves. The emergence of International Organizations cannot be unconnected to the realization by states that problems, issues and challenges are easily tackled in concert rather than individually. This notion was perhaps, the principal recognition of the independent states of Africa that political independence has not engendered the much adored cooperation for their economic, social, financial, and cultural emancipation especially from their former colonial masters. This is because, most African states seem to maintain closer ties (then) with their colonial masters than they did with their neighboring African states. These contacts subsequently, precipitated the fragmentation of the continent of Africa into different sub-regional power blocs like Casablanca and Monrovia.

The incompatibility of these sub-regional blocs with the progress and unity of Africa necessitated the call for a strongly unified instrument that would champion the course of a united Africa within the international system. Hence in 1963, the defunct Organization of African Unity (OAU) was established, mainly to ensure and assist liberation movements in Africa. Although the charter of O.A.U was predicated on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of member states, its activities included mediation of boundary conflicts, regional and civil wars, diplomacy and cooperation. The O.A.U. registered some modest successes but unfortunately, there were also significant failures and numerous problems that hampered its successes. The price of its failure, left Africa with many developmental and security challenges. For instance, wars within and between African states have killed millions of people and forced millions of others to leave their homes and live elsewhere as refugees. Poverty, illiteracy, endemic diseases such as malaria and HIV/AIDS, high child mortality, ethnic and religious conflicts are largely confined to Africa (World Bank, 2000).

These failures, according to Tordoff (2002:250) were due to the organization's cumbersome structures, its insecure financial base, its lack of a ground swell of popular support and its tendency to make economic plans without realistic prospect of fulfilling them. It is the search, to defeat these problems of O.A.U that led to its metamorphosis into the African Union (AU) on July 10, 2002. Today, humanitarian, social, economical, political, cultural and financial challenges are seriously militating against human development in Africa. This paper contends that human security informed the formation of AU as a result, the objective of the paper will be hinged on exploring the contribution of AU to the promotion of human security in Africa as well as its failures and possible reasons for its failure. The argument of the paper is structured into: Historical background of the AU, Conceptual clarification of Human Security, African Union and Human Security in Africa, the roles and achievements of the AU in regional security, failures of AU in addressing the issue of Human Security and

Conclusion.

1.1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF AFRICAN UNION

The creation of the African Union as a new Pan-African body is not a sudden happening that has not been anticipated in history of Africa. It was rather a result of the age-old process of pan-African movements in different courses of history. It will be difficult to have a full-fledged figure of the historical roots of the African Union without paying much attention to the Pan-African movements, which may be considered as a founding stone of the OAU, the African Union and any other forthcoming political and economic integration between and among the African states. The spirit of Pan-Africanism has been used as an engine for the creation of cooperation of African peoples and states in different generations, and is expected to be the same in the future.

Having regard to the instrumental character of Pan-Africanism in any form of African solidarity, it seems imperative to define what it is. (Schoeman 2003) in his writings defines Pan-Africanism in the following manner:

Pan-Africanism is an invented notion. It is an invented notion with a purpose.... Essentially, Pan-Africanism is a recognition of the fragmented nature of the existence of Africans, their marginalization and alienation whether in their own continent or in the diasporas. Pan-Africanism seeks to respond to Africa's underdevelopment. Africa has been exploited and a culture of dependency on external assistance unfortunately still prevails on the continent. If people become too reliant on getting their support, their nourishment, their safety from outside sources, then they do not strive to find the power within themselves to rely on their own capacities. Pan-Africanism calls upon Africans to draw from their own strength and capacities and become self reliant. Pan-Africanism is a recognition that the only way out of this existential, social and political crisis is by prompting greater solidarity amongst Africans.

As seen and read from the above, Pan-Africanism is neither a name of an African organization; nor an ideal imagination of what Africa should be in the future. It is rather an engine for a continued African solidarity and integration that can spur the effectiveness of Afro-Centric regional integrations. It has served as such in different times in history.

The idea of Pan-Africanism would remain futile unless it is capable of taking an institutional form. It can be said that Pan-Africanism has so far undergone three phases of institutionalization. By institutionalization we are referring to the coming up of an organization that claims to further the ideals enshrined in the Pan-African movement.

The first institutionalization of Pan-Africanism is the series of Pan-African Congresses. In describing this form of institutionalization, Schoeman stated 'Depending on how one chooses to interpret or define Pan-Africanism, the first attempt to institutionalize it is more than three centuries old. It has to follow the standardized form of quoting it Pan-Africanism can be situated either at the 1896 Congress on Pan-Africanism held in Chicago or at the creation of the African association in London in 1997. In both instances, the term 'Pan-African' was widely used to signify the coming together of people of African descent' (Schoeman, 2003).

In 1900, the first Pan-African conference was held in London where a new organization called the Pan-African Association was established with the objective of securing the rights of the African descendants. From that time onwards, up to seven Pan-African congresses were held in Europe and Africa with similar objectives of creating African solidarity.

The second institutionalization of Pan-Africanism came with the inauguration of the OAU in 1963. This achievement witnessed a greater commitment on the part of the African states to the Pan-African movement which served as a driving force for such occurrence. This historical trend goes ahead with the third institutionalization of Pan-Africanism under the existing African Union.

One might dare to internalize the proper link between the aforementioned institutionalizations of Pan-Africanism. In connection with this issue, (Clapham, 1996) has the following to say. The fundamental insight gained from the emergence of the organized Pan-Africanism is that the power of individual country or society is amplified exponentially when it is combined with the forces of other countries and societies. It is a similar way of thinking that animated and informed the founders of the OAU and the present African union. This same type of thinking is potentially expected to animate and inform future generations of Africans and their diaspora to be kin in promoting ever-increasing social, political and economic union.

Making the Pan-African movement a stepping-stone in the study of historical antecedents to the contemporary African Union has a lot to serve. If one knows the purpose of Pan-Africanism, then the steps to achieve its goals become clearer to understand. It is in this context that one can be able to appreciate the emergence of the African Union. Considering the African Union as a new phenomenon that came into picture in the beginning of the 21st century is a regrettable historical mistake that can in no way give one a full-fledged historical picture of the Union. It would be more appropriate, to understand that the African Union is not a new happening, but the latest incarnation of the idea of Pan-Africanism. It is with this idea in mind that one can better understand the beginning and destiny of the African Union.

2.0 THE METAPHYSICS OF OAU TO THE AFRICAN UNION

The aim of this section is not to give the detailed account of the OAU as an African organization. Rather the OAU is highlighted to show in a way that it can be considered as a metaphor to the African Union.

The OAU, placed in a longer term of historical current, is a manifestation of the Pan- African movement which originated in the United States of America during the late 19th century. In the USA, thousands of blacks, with African origins could not tolerate and also bear the agonizing experience of racial discrimination and alienation of the blacks with African blood. Some of their prominent leaders, namely WEB Du Bois (1868-1963) and Marcus Garvey (1885-1940) raised a flag of revolt against the then prevailing injustice and chose to speak for the entire black race which was leading to a dehumanized existence. They subordinated the immediate problems of American blacks to a grand and enlarged vision of Pan-Africanism, which, in essence, stood for the unity and dignity of the black race.

As it has been reflected by (Ibok 1999) that, the Pan-African movement has grown, substantially, acquiring different forms with changing times. The period prior to the birth of OAU had its own historical contribution to fully appreciate the ongoing Pan-African process.

Before the emergence of the OAU, there was an inter-state politics in Africa which was characterized by growing rivalry between the Casablanca and Monrovia group of states. This rivalry, for some time, hindered the realization of the OAU.

The Casablanca group was principally led by Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, Sekou Toure of Guinea, and Madibo Keita of Mali. The group vehemently opposed colonialism, racism and neocolonialism. Among other things, it opposed the Katanga secessionist movement, gave an extended support to Patrice Lumumba's efforts to oust the Belgians from Congo, demanded French withdrawal from Algeria and was sympathetic towards the Soviet Union due to concrete Soviet support to their activities. This group had a more radical approach involving the creation of the federation of African states with joint institutions with a joint military command.

The Monrovia group, on its part, was constituted by the Brazzaville group including most of the moderate Francophone states such as Ivory Coast, Gabon, Niger, Senegal, and Monrovia. Again, it had members like Ethiopia, Liberia, Nigeria and Somalia, which were neutral towards the rivalry between Casablanca and Brazzaville groups. It stood for the protection of national sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of its members. It defended the principle of mutual non-interference in inter-state relations and welcomed interstate technical and economic cooperation. Instead of snapping the ties with the west, the Monrovia group sought western cooperation in the process of promoting development.

The rivalry between the Casablanca and Monrovia groups was not, however, an unbridgeable gulf that could prevent the birth of the OAU. Ibok stated three basic justifications for this historical scenario. To begin with, like the Monrovia states, the Casablanca states were also getting absorbed in the world capitalist economy despite their sporadic tirade against neo-colonialism and imperialism. The penetration of western finance capital in the extractive sectors of Guinean economy and Ghana's membership of British Commonwealth amply illustrated this position. When succinctly expressed, both groups were eventually moving in the same direction. Secondly, despite their theoretical differences, both groups were keen to regulate and promote inter-state cooperation in Africa. Thirdly, though on their own ways, both groups aimed at liquidating colonialism and racism (Ibok, 1999).

He concludes that both groups had a lot in common. These commonalities were backed by the mediatory efforts of uncommitted (i.e. not strictly a proponent of either group) states like Ethiopia gave birth to the Organization of African Unity. Having passed all these ups and downs, the OAU was formally established in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in May, 1963. The OAU Charter presented both views but using the vision of the Monrovia group as its core.

The tension in early days of the OAU and the compromise adopted as follows: The main contention that surrounded the founding of the OAU is well known: whether the institution should lead to a union of states or merely to an association of the independent units also the OAU was the product of a compromise between African statesmen who wanted political union of all independent African states and those who preferred functional cooperation as a building block towards the construction of an African socio-psychological community (African Union 2005).

The above statements can create a historical link between the OAU and the African Union. In the contention that surrounded the founding of the OAU, the latter statement views the OAU as an association of the independent units prevailed over the creation of a union of states. The latter view had to wait for another favorable historical ground to be a reality. The former position which failed to be operational has left its foot prints in the naming of the organization. He states "the agreed name [for the organization] was proposed in French by President Hubert Maga of Dahomey (possibly at the instigation of President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana); and President William Tubman of Liberia insisted that the English translation be organization of African Unity, rather than organization for African unity" (African Union 2005).

The AU became the result of the clamour for a more organized African instrument to promote peace,

security, development, cooperation in Africa. Its history dated back to the origin of its predecessor, the Organization of African Unity (O.A.U) which was founded on May 25th, 1963. Tordoff (2002) observed that, the O.A.U registered some modest successes, it provided a meeting ground for African leaders and in a loose sense, sponsored sub-regional organizations and UN agencies, such as the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), it tried to settle inter- state disputes and its liberation committee, to an extent helped several countries to throw off the colonial yoke. But there were significant failures and problems that militated against the smooth operation of O.A.U, for instance the issue of managing conflicts in the regions was becoming challenging and complex. Perhaps because of these failures, the O.A.U. was replaced by a more economy directed African Union (AU) on July 10th, 2002 at the conference of African Heads of State and Government after thirty-nine years of existence. AU as an intergovernmental organization is geared to promote unity and solidarity of African states, to spur economic development and to promote international cooperation. It is a continental organization that calls for major changes to Pan-African approaches to peace and security. The constitutive Act of the African Union and its Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council place renewed emphasis on building a continental security regime capable of preventing, managing and resolving conflicts in Africa (Powell, 2005: 4). It still maintains its headquarters at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

One spectacular feature of AU is that its approach to peace and security diverges significantly from the O.A.U's mechanism. It expanded its roles and goals to serve as an instrument that ensures complete human development and security. Some of its goals and principles include:

- i. To achieve greater unity and solidarity between the African Countries and Peoples of Africa.
- ii. Promote peace, security and stability on the continent.
- iii. The right to intervene in a member state pursuant to a decision of the Assembly in respect of grave circumstances, namely; war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity.
- iv. Respect for democratic principles, human right, the rule of law and good governance.
- v. Respect for the sanctity of human life, condemnation and rejection of impunity and political assassination, acts of terrorism and subversive activities.

As a matter of fact, there is no gain-saying that AU is not human security oriented based on its principles but the question is; what is human security? How has AU propelled the human security in Africa? What are the challenges militating against the AU?

3.0 CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS OF HUMAN SECURITY

Human security, defined as the protection of people and communities, rather than of states, from violence and imminent danger, has become a central feature of the contemporary international order. Human security doctrines inform the foreign policies of many states, particularly middle powers. They have strong support within research and academic institutions. Human security ideas occupy a privileged position in many institutions of higher learning in Europe, the Americas and Asia. In Canada alone 1 016 courses on human security were taught in institutions of higher learning in 2006 (Canadian Consortium on Human Security 2007). Human security is a priority area in the assistance programme of aid agencies. International organizations such as the United Nations have also assumed leadership roles in the promotion of human security. So what role, if any, is Africa's premier organization, the African Union, playing in the promotion of human security?

The term "Human Security" came to limelight during the 1994 United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and Human Development Report to identify specific values of security: economic security, food security, community security and political security. Professor Charles Kegley has referred to it as "a concept that refers to the degree to which the welfare of individual is protected and advanced" (Kegley, 2007). The first refers to the absence or protection against hunger, natural disaster, torture and so on. The second refers to the opportunities that individuals should have to develop their potentials as much as possible and to enjoy life to the fullest. (Langenhove , 2004).

Human security is a concept that identifies the security of human lives as the central objective of national and international security policy. It contrasts with, and grew out of increasing dissatisfaction with, the state-centered concept of security as an adequate conceptual framework for understanding human vulnerabilities in the contemporary world and military interventions as adequate responses to them.

As Kegley explains, human vulnerability is pervasive, threatened by 'new wars' where actors are no longer states, that do not follow the rules of conduct of 'old wars', and that cannot be won by the means of old wars. Moreover, these new wars are intertwined with other global threats including disease, natural disasters, poverty and homelessness. "Yet our security conceptions, drawn from the dominant experience of the Second World War, do not reduce that insecurity; rather they make it worse." (Kegley 2007). Similarly, Mahbub ul Haq proposes human security as a new paradigm of security: 'the world is entering a new era in which the very concept of security will change and change dramatically. Security will be interpreted as: security of people, not just territory, security of individuals, not just nations, security through development, not through arms. Security of all the people everywhere and that includes in their homes, in their jobs, in their streets, in their communities,

in their environment.” (Weiss 2004).

The concept has become increasingly widely used since the mid 1990s (Malan 2002). While initially used primarily with reference to state policies and the search for new international security and development agendas after the end of the Cold War, it is increasingly being used in policy advocacy by civil society groups on a broader range of contemporary issues from civil war to migration to climate change (Malan 2010). Academic institutions have developed research programs and degree programs in human security. Yet human security is a contested concept. There are multiple formulations of its definition and divergent efforts to evolve associated global agendas. Efforts to promote human security for foreign policy of states and institutionalize it at the UN have generated controversies. A large literature has emerged challenging, defending, or explaining the meaning and the added value of the concept. Many practitioners in international affairs, in both security and development fields, remain skeptical of its practical usefulness and political relevance.

Often criticized as ambiguous, and subject to as many interpretations, questions remain as to exactly what function it is serving. Is it a full scale conceptual paradigm, a doctrine for a new global security policy, a norm, or just a term – or as Paris (2001) asks in his article ‘Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? While human security is now used as a general term with a wide range of meanings in many contexts from domestic violence to migration, it originated in the many debates about ‘collective security’ around the end of the Cold War. The central idea is the primacy of human life as the objective of security policy – or the referent object. This is a claim that has major implications for almost all aspects of thinking and acting on security which had for decades been built around the primacy of the state. The concept of human security expands the scope of analysis and policy in multiple directions.

According to (Kioko, 2003), it extends downwards “to the security of groups and individuals;” upward, “to the security of international systems;” horizontally, from military security “to political, economic, social, environmental, or ‘human security;”” and in all directions “upwards to international institutions, downwards to regional or local government, sideways to nongovernmental organizations, to public opinion and the press, and to the abstract forces of nature or of the market”.

In effect, human security approach is about creating and enhancing access, protection and empowerment of people and individuals to the material or quantitative dimensions of human existence which can be food, shelter, clothing, education and health care; and the non-material or qualitative conditions of human existence namely freedom, liberty and participation in the decisions of the community that affect their lives.

4.0 AFRICAN UNION AND HUMAN SECURITY IN AFRICA

As it has been hinted above the transformation of Organization of African Unity to African Union was necessitated by the increasing desire of the African leaders to derive a better way to achieve peace and security in Africa, in the face of other new realities and global concern and to further a more accelerated process of integration. This will enable it to play a rightful role in the regional human security. This New organization, thus, call for a major change in Pan-African approaches to peace and security. In this case, the constitutive act of the African Union and its protocol relating to the establishment of peace and security placed a renewed emphasis on building a continental security regime capable of preventing, managing and resolving conflict in Africa (Powell, 2005).

The AU human security agenda in the areas of peace and security is clearly expressed in article 4(h) of the Constitutive Act (CA) of the African Union. Article 4(h), which empowers the Union to intervene in the affairs of a member state in order to ‘prevent war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity’, was inserted into the CA, as a number of informed writers on the CA have eloquently argued, with a view to protecting ordinary people in Africa from abusive governments (Malan 2002; Cilliers & Sturman 2002; Kioko 2003). To provide an operational arm to this specific human security element, the AU made room for the creation of an African Standby Force (ASF) charged with the task of intervening militarily in states for humanitarian purposes (African Union 2001). The condition laid down for human security intervention under the AU ‘goes “beyond” the provision made for intervention in the internal affairs of a country in the UN Charter’ (Schoeman 2003). The CA has actually set lower thresholds for intervention than those outlined in any international legal code (Weiss 2004). The specification of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity by the drafters of the CA as grounds for intervention has provided a clearer set of criteria for the Union to intercede in a state to protect human security. The AU, unlike other international organizations, does not necessarily require the consent of a state to intervene in its internal affairs when populations are at risk. That is, the OAU’s system of complete consensus has been abandoned. Under the AU, a decision on the part of a two-thirds majority of the Assembly is required for intervention (Powell & Tiekou 2005). The AU used this principle to arrive at the decision to deploy a peacekeeping force to monitor a ceasefire in Burundi in April 2003. The Assembly also used this principle to decide on the mission to the Darfur region of Sudan in the summer of 2004.

The AU also approaches economic development from a human security perspective.

The development agenda in articles 3 and 4 of the CA is intended to create conditions necessary for

sustainable development. As part of this agenda, the AU commits its member states to ensuring balanced economic development, to promoting gender equality and good health, and to working towards eradicating preventable diseases (articles 3(j) and (n); 4(l) and (n)). The AU has adopted an approach to political governance in Africa that is human security-centered in as much as the CA commits member states to promoting 'respect for the sanctity of human life' (article 4(o)). Article 4(i), moreover, makes it clear that African people have a 'right to live in peace'. Article 3(h) therefore commits member states to a path where they will 'promote and protect human and peoples' rights in accordance with the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and other relevant human rights instruments'. It is significant that 3(g) enjoins member governments to promote democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance. This provision is important, because it is generally understood in the human security research community that democratic development is a critical aspect of human security (Hammerstad 2005). The decision to exclude from the AU states whose governments came to power through unconstitutional means therefore advances the human security agenda. The strength of the human security ideas embedded in the CA provokes questions on how and why these human security doctrines entered the discourse, agenda, documents and programmes of the AU.

4.1 THE ROLES AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE AFRICAN UNION IN REGIONAL SECURITY:

Despite its challenges, the organization scored a number of successes during its early history. The OAU mediated a border dispute between Algeria and Morocco in 1964 and 1965. It also mediated the border conflicts of Somalia with Ethiopia and Kenya from 1968 to 1970. The OAU formed the African Liberation Committee in 1963 to channel financial support to movements trying to defeat Portuguese colonial rule in Guinea-Bissau, Angola, and Mozambique. Those movements were victorious in 1974. It also supported movements against white minority rule in South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Namibia. South Africa was excluded from OAU membership until 1994, when white minority rule and apartheid (the policy of racial segregation) ended. The organization sent an *observer mission* to the United Nations (UN) in 1963. An observer mission refers to the representatives sent by a nation or organization that is not a member of the UN, but wishes to participate in UN discussions. Observer missions cannot vote on UN actions. The OAU also coordinated collective action among African nations at the UN. It promoted decisions that led to South Africa being barred from participating in the UN's General Assembly in 1974, and to the admission of the People's Republic of China to the UN in 1971. In 1986 the OAU established the African Commission on Human and People's Rights to monitor human rights practices in member nations.

The African Union established the Ministerial Committee on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development in Sudan in July 2003 and elected South Africa to lead the work of the Committee and South Africa continued to chair the Committee. The Committee has made significant strides in all three of its mandates, namely:

1. Assess the post-conflict development needs of the Sudan;
2. Mobilize African and other supports in meeting the developmental challenges in the Sudan;
3. Advocate support for Sudan in international developmental forums.

In 2005, a ministerial delegation of the Committee conducted a comprehensive needs assessment in Sudan. Thereafter, former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr. N.C. Dlamini Zuma, led a Ministerial delegation to the 2005 Oslo Donor Conference where she articulated the African position of the post-conflict development needs of Sudan. Since 2005, several delegations of the Committee visited Sudan to identify emerging needs. The Committee met on 30th January 2010 in Addis Ababa on the margins of the African Union summit. Here, it was resolved that the AU Ministerial Committee would undertake an assessment visit to Sudan in the first quarter of 2010 to reinvigorate its work as called for by the Tripoli Plan of Action of 31 August 2009. In essence, that visit determined post-conflict reconstruction and development needs in light of the elections which took place in April, 2010 and the self-determination referendum in southern Sudan held in January 2011.

South Africa was integrally involved in capacity building projects in Sudan. South Africa, working in partnership with the University of South Africa (UNISA) and the government of Southern Sudan, embarked on a Capacity and Institution Building Project which has trained more than 1,500 officials from the Government of Southern Sudan (GOSS). South Africa's Public Administration Leadership and Management Academy (PALAMA), established a Management Development Institute in Southern Sudan to provide training to officials in the public service. The development of Higher Education has offered five scholarships to senior education planners in the then GOSS Ministry of Education to post-graduate work at the University of Witwatersrand. The South African Police Service (SAPS) was part of the process that provided training to the Sudan Police Services and the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development has committed itself to providing capacity building to the nascent judiciary and legal affairs institutions. Importantly, South Africa's post-conflict reconstruction and development efforts in Southern Sudan attracted additional interest from donors who engaged in trilateral partnerships.

One of the major provisions of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was to ensure that Sudan

held national general elections in 2010 and was followed by a referendum on self-determination for the people of Southern Sudan in 2011. In this regard, significant progress was made in ensuring that Sudan conducted the general elections according to the CPA provisions.

The Sudan Peace Liberation Movement/ Army (SPLM/A) disputed the credibility of the census results and demanded that they should not be used for the purposes of determining geographical constituencies or in determining the seats allocation in the National Assembly. Furthermore, the armed movements in Darfur continued their demands that elections cannot be held in Darfur in the prevailing security and political environment of the region. One of the key demands of the Justice and Equity Movement (JEM) in signing the framework Peace Agreement with the Government of Sudan was that elections should not be held in April 2010 but at a later date.

4.2 FAILURES OF AU IN ADDRESSING HUMAN SECURITY:

Since the end of the cold war, there has been a profound change in the nature of conflicts around the world especially in Africa. What has been witnessed is a rapid increase in complicated intra-state conflicts and decline in inter-state conflicts. The reason for this is not unconnected with the rapid collapse of human security in these countries or societies (the pressure and expectation of the global community in the realm of human security in Africa AU has performed relatively low). Africa is a continent where the human security situation is extremely problematic, complex and challenging. The concept of human security itself has several dimensions but essentially it takes human beings and their communities, rather than states as the measure of security. Failure of African governments to address these key specific values of human security questioned the relevance of AU in several ways:

- (1) African leaders failed to address the issue of threats to economic security because lack of productive and remunerative employment, precarious employment, low levels of GNP/per capita, regional economic instability and high debt burden profile are the characteristics of an average African country, when economic security value is being considered.
- (2) Threats of food security is the second threats to the values of human security in terms of lack of food entitlement including insufficient access to assets, lack of safe water which are common in many countries in Africa.
- (3) Threats to health security. Africa has the highest occurrence of infectious and parasitic diseases, diseases of circulatory systems and cancer air pollution, lack of access to health-care facilities.
- (4) Threats to environmental security is also of concern in Africa, there are decline of water availability, declining arable land, deforestation, desertification, population displacement, regional global refugee migration.
- (5) Threats to personal security which involve violent crime, drug trafficking, violence, abuse of children, use of child soldiers, kidnapping and trafficking of women and children are on the increase in Africa.
- (6) Threats to community security, like breakdown of the family, collapsed traditional languages and cultures, ethnic discrimination and strife, genocide and ethnic cleansing are all obvious in Africa.
- (7) Threats to political security are the last of the threats to value of human security. According to the UNDP's report, these include government repression, systematic human right violation militarization, detention of political opponents and rigged trial.

HIV/AIDS is not a traditional threat but the consequences are more serious and multi-dimensional to threats to human security. HIV/AIDS overwhelms health services, shorten lives, destabilizes government; disrupt societies, affects the basic functioning of society. The ability to produce and distribute food has been reduced. The skills and human resources needed for effective governance has become even limited. Political instability may result in these complex humanitarian emergencies. Failure of African leaders to address the sources of HIV / AIDS is having a huge and detrimental impact on economies of Sub-Saharan Africa. Both the production and the consumption levels of economies are affected, and this has dire implication for foreign investors' willingness to make any long-term investment in sub-Saharan Africa. Failure of its holistic solution to these identical and other threats to values of human security in Africa remains a great challenge to AU.

4.3 FACTORS INHIBITING HUMAN SECURITY IN AFRICA

The New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) statement of the African Problem notes that the impoverishment of the African continent was accentuated primarily by the legacy of Colonialism, Cold war, the working of the international system and the inadequacies of and shortcomings in the policies pursued by many countries in the post-independence era. Post Colonial Africa inherited weak states and dysfunctional economies that were further aggravated by poor leadership, corruption and bad governance in many countries" (NEPAD, 2001).

Today, the weak states remain major constraints to sustainable development which will adequately address the challenges of human security in countries in Africa. Indeed, one of Africa's major challenges is to strengthen the capacity to govern long-term policies to address human security. On the balance, the increasing

inability of the African states to translate the continents' abundant natural resources into prosperity remain a major issue for policy to all those who want to see Africa turn table of underdevelopment and improve on human security. Inter and intra states conflicts had, since the colonial period, bedeviled many Africa states. Development and human security can only be achieved in the atmosphere of peace. Africa, more than any other continents in the last two decades have witnessed frequent severe and indeterminate conclusion of both. There is a long list of inter-states conflicts and civil war in Africa - Eritrea and Ethiopia, Congo, Liberia, Sudan, Sierra-Leone and Somalia. Wide spread famine and chaos usually accompanied fighting; people are internally displaced or seek refuge outside their countries.

Although AU and other regional bodies in Africa are making efforts to stem the trend of conflicts through the collaboration of UN in terms of AUIUN peacekeeping, and cease-fire agreement. They are slow and unable to lay foundation for long term stability for peace in the region.

Another reason that has assailed human security in Africa is non-sensitivity of African elites to the plights of the masses. African elites only engage in selfish political conflicts and contentions aims at strengthening their stronghold on power at the expense of the masses. There is also the problem of dependence on foreign donors to cater for the needs and improvement of African states and this has resulted in the threats to value of human security. Most African states depend heavily on donations from humanitarian gesture of western countries to combat health challenges such as HIV / AIDS and other health related issues in Africa, refugee and peacekeeping in the continent, the issue of corruptions and cheer greediness on the part of the African leader are also reasons for failure to address human security. Most leaders in Africa virtually lack accountability and abhor the principle of checks and balances. They also make use of the national resources for personal purposes. We also have some African leaders, who are believed to be richer than their own countries. People like Mubutu Sese Seko (Zaire), Idi Amin (Uganda), and late Sanni Abacha (Nigeria), converted the national resources and loots that were meant to be used to support and cater for human security of their citizenry to their personal use.

5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The AU was formed as a result of the outcry for a more organized African instrument in order to promote peace, security, development and cooperation in Africa. One feature of AU which is worthy of special notice is that its approach to peace and security diverges significantly from the O.A.U's mechanism. It changed its roles and goals to serve as an instrument that could ensure complete human development and security and also had its goals, objectives and principles enshrined in the constitutional act of the organization.

The idea of changing the name from Organization of African Unity to African Union was necessitated by the increasing desire of the African leaders to derive a better way to achieve peace and security in Africa, in the face of other new realities and global concern and to further a more accelerated process of integration. The AU human security agenda in the areas of peace and security is clearly expressed in article 4(h) of the Constitutive Act (CA) of the African Union. The specification of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity by the drafters of the CA as grounds for intervention provide a clearer set of criteria for the Union to intercede in a state to protect human security. This organization, unlike other international organizations, does not necessarily require the consent of a state to intervene in its internal affairs when populations are at risk.

Africa is a continent where the human security situation is extremely problematic, complex and challenging. The issue of human security has several dimensions but essentially it takes human beings and their communities, rather than states as the measure of security. It is the failure of African governments to address key specific values of human security in several ways that brought about the question of the relevance of AU.

To conclude, it is obvious that the objectives and desire to bring about a virile peace and human security in African region brought about the transformation of OAU to AU; however, these objectives were clearly defeated. This is as a result of the fact that African leaders have not been able to collectively harness their various political, economic and military resources to a capable level that will outweigh the challenges that are facing the African continent. In the light of this, the following recommendations have been proffered:

1. African leaders should be more committed to the principles and objectives that underline the formation of the African Union;
2. African leaders should incorporate all social structures within the region in achieving human security objectives;
3. African leaders should set up a mechanism that would allow political, economic and socio-cultural integration.
4. African leaders should embark on the sustenance of democratic principles in the Sub- Saharan region; and
5. There should be a legal framework that will promote the prosecution of corrupt political leaders who have created political, economic, social and human insecurity in their various countries.

REFERENCES

- Adeniji, O. (2000) *"Essays on Nigerian foreign policy, Governance and international Security"*, Ibadan, Dokun Oni publisher.
- African Union (2001). *The Constitutive Act*. Addis Ababa: African Union.
- African Union (2005). *African Union, Non-Aggression and Common Defense Pact* [online]. Available at <<http://www.africaunion.org/root/AU/Documents/Treaties/text/Non%20Aggression%20Common%20Defence%20Pact.pdf>> [accessed 1 March 2015].
- Canadian Consortium on Human Security (2007). *Teaching human security Canadian course database* [online]. Available at <http://cchs.xplorex.com/page282.htm> [accessed 02 March 2015].
- Cilliers, J (2003). *A summary of outcomes from the 2002 OAU/AU summits in Durban*. Institute for Security Studies Occasional Paper 76.
- Cilliers, J and Sturman, K (2002). The right intervention: enforcement challenges for the African Union. *African Security Review*, 11(3) [online]. Available at <<http://www.issafrica.org/pubs/ASR/11No3/Cilliers.html>> [accessed 4 March 2015].
- Clapham, C (1996). *Africa and the international system: the politics of State survival*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hammerstad, A (2005). *AU commitments to democracy in theory and practice: an African human security review*. South African Institute of International Affairs Monograph [online]. Available at <<http://www.africanreview.org/forum/docs/feb04partmeet/saia1.pdf>> [accessed 2 March 2015].
- Ibok, S (1999). *The OAU Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution*. Addis Ababa: Organization of African Unity.
- Kegley, C. W. (2007) *"World Politics, Trends and Transformation"*, Thomson Wadworth, Belmont.
- Kioko, B (2003). The Right of Intervention under the African Union's Constitutive Act; Non-Interference to Non Intervention. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 85:807–825.
- Lagenhove, V (2004). *"Regionalizing Human Security in Africa"* (UNU- TICAD workshop Paper, 29-30 March).
- Malan, M (2002). *New Tools in the Box? Towards a standby force for the African Union*. Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies.
- Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.
- Powell, K. (2005) "The African Union Emerging Peace and Security regime: Opportunities and Challenges for delivering on the responsibility to protect" (worked paper)
- Powell, K, (2005) "The African Union's Emerging Peace and Security Regime: Opportunities and Challenges for Delivering on *The Responsibility to protect*. A Worked paper by the North- South institute; Canada; New York.
- Powell, K and Tiekou, T K (2005). The African Union and *The responsibility to protect*: towards a protection regime for Africa? *International Insights*, 20(1&2):215–235
- Rourke, J.T. (2005) *"International Politics on the World Stage"*, Tenth edition, McGraw-Hill Companies, New York.
- Tordoff, W (2002). *"Government and Politics in Africa"* 4th Ed., New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Schoeman, M (2003). The African Union after the Durban 2002 Summit [online]. Available at <http://www.teol.ku.dk/cas/nyhomepage/mapper/Occasional%20Papers/Schoeman_internetversion.doc> [accessed 4May 2016].
- Weiss, T G (2004). The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era. *Security Dialogue*, 35(2):135–153.
- World Bank (2000) *"Can Africa Claim 21st Century?"* Washington DC: The World Bank.