



III. L'Afrique sub-saharienne : vers un engagement collectif durable

Afrique subsaharienne

Nathalie Delapalme

(Janvier 2009)

Résumé

Au tout début du nouveau siècle, alors que le spectre de la récession, la fragilisation effarante des systèmes financiers, l'enlisement préoccupant des conflits irakien, afghan et Israël- Palestine ébranlent les grandes démocraties développées occidentales, l'accélération des dynamiques africaines impose à la fois une relecture approfondie de la situation et des perspectives du continent africain et la redéfinition de nos modes de relations à son égard.

Plusieurs évolutions fondamentales caractérisent désormais ce grand continent mitoyen de l'Europe : la poursuite d'une forte poussée démographique, à rebours du reste de la planète, la conclusion de plusieurs conflits historiques, l'installation d'une croissance moyenne très supérieure à celle des économies développées. Surtout, le continent africain concentre sur son territoire l'ensemble des principaux enjeux du monde contemporain, qu'ils touchent à la poursuite d'une croissance durable et équitable ou à la garantie d'une sécurité globale. Il héberge d'abord le spectre le plus large des grands risques contemporains – terrorisme, épidémies émergentes, catastrophes environnementales, migrations massives et incontrôlées, trafics de drogue et d'armes, piraterie maritime. Mais il recèle aussi un potentiel vital pour la poursuite de la croissance des économies développées, qu'il s'agisse des ressources naturelles ou du formidable marché potentiel lié aux perspectives démographiques.

L'afflux récent de nouveaux partenaires sur le continent africain atteste de l'ampleur des enjeux. La concurrence qui s'y exerce désormais devient forte. Le temps d'un monopole occidental sur les équilibres politiques et les perspectives économiques de l'Afrique est révolu.

L'enjeu pour l'Europe, voisin immédiat et vieillissant de la remuante Afrique, peut sembler plus aigu que pour les Etats-Unis, plus distants géographiquement. De fait, avec l'adoption en décembre 2007 à Lisbonne de la Stratégie conjointe UE- Afrique, l'Europe s'organise désormais pour mettre en place de véritables partenariats portant sur des sujets d'intérêt mutuel, comme les migrations, l'énergie ou le changement climatique. Mais l'interpénétration des enjeux et des risques dans un monde globalisé atténue cette apparente différence. Surtout, l'élection de Barack Obama modifiera sensiblement l'impact du message américain sur nos interlocuteurs africains et accroît dès lors sa responsabilité, au moment où, dans un contexte de concurrence accrue, les grands partenaires européens paraissent handicapés par leur passé colonial.

Les discussions tenues à Washington à l'automne dernier attestent de l'ampleur et de l'enjeu du chantier primordial de la reconstruction de l'architecture de la gouvernance mondiale. Dans un cadre nécessairement remanié, les grands dossiers africains - stabilisation des conflits et des zones grises, insertion dans le commerce mondial, sécurité alimentaire, emploi local, renforcement des capacités de gouvernance, etc. - seront les sujets privilégiés d'une coopération renforcée.

Trop souvent, le continent africain apparaît encore comme le parent sombre, presque maudit, de la famille planétaire, voué à la pauvreté sans avenir, aux guerres civiles sans issue, aux épidémies sans rémission. De fait, l'approche des pays développés à son égard, qu'il s'agisse des responsables politiques ou surtout des opinions publiques, repose encore pour l'essentiel sur une logique définie par la compassion, l'obligation morale, ou la fidélité à une histoire momentanément partagée. Au tout début du nouveau siècle, alors même que le spectre de la récession, la fragilisation effarante des systèmes financiers, l'enlisement préoccupant de la crise en Afghanistan, en Irak ou au Moyen-Orient, ébranlent les grands pays développés occidentaux, l'accélération des dynamiques africaines, illustration emblématique des grandes évolutions géostratégiques, impose à la fois une relecture approfondie de la situation et des perspectives de ce grand continent et la redéfinition des modes de relations des partenaires occidentaux (européens et américains) à son égard.

1. Dynamiques africaines

1.1. La fin des conflits ?

Les dix dernières années ont été marquées par la fin presque simultanée de plusieurs conflits lourds, interminables et apparemment sans issue : Angola, ex-Zaïre, Burundi, Sierra-Leone, Liberia, Sud-Soudan. Certes, la situation reste très fragile en République démocratique du Congo. Certes, de nouveaux fronts se sont ouverts. À la lisière de la frontière entre le continent africain et le Moyen-Orient, le dramatique conflit du Darfour est une crise majeure qui fait peser un risque d'implosion sur le Soudan et menace également une bande sahélienne qui se fragilise d'Est en ouest de façon croissante, de la Mauritanie au Soudan, en passant par le Niger, la Centrafrique et le Tchad. Immédiatement sous la péninsule arabique, la Corne de l'Afrique, en particulier la Somalie, reste un foyer majeur d'instabilité. D'anciens « champions » longtemps choyés par les pays occidentaux, comme la Côte d'Ivoire ou le Kenya, sont désormais secoués par une grave crise politique. Mais la tendance est là, qui traduit deux évolutions essentielles. La première, c'est la prise de conscience, par les protagonistes locaux, que les intérêts économiques de la paix peuvent désormais dépasser ceux de la guerre. Dès lors, l'incitation à terminer un conflit, qui fit tant défaut lors du dernier quart de siècle, semble commencer à prévaloir.

La deuxième, qui découle en partie de la précédente, c'est l'implication déterminante des acteurs régionaux, sur la base d'une analyse cynique de leurs intérêts bien compris, bien davantage que sous la pression des déclarations du Conseil de Sécurité des Nations-unies. L'endogénéisation, l'africanisation des processus de règlement des conflits est désormais un élément-clé de réussite, la condition incontournable de leur aboutissement. Si la crise ivoirienne s'achemine vers l'issue, c'est moins grâce à la détermination de la communauté occidentale – qui a même pu contribuer parfois à la durcir – qu'à cause de l'implication devenue constructive du Burkina-Faso, dès lors que celui-ci, mesurant que la communauté internationale ne le débarrasserait pas de son voisin, a bien voulu considérer qu'il valait mieux pour lui faire avec que contre. De la même façon, la solution de la crise du Darfour repose essentiellement sur la reconnaissance mutuelle de leur intérêt politique par les présidents Béchir et Deby, et sur l'attitude constructive de leurs différents voisins ou parrains régionaux, notamment l'Érythrée,

l'Éthiopie, l'Égypte et la Libye. La encore, les prises de position des partenaires occidentaux ont pu contribuer à compliquer l'issue, dès lors qu'elles pouvaient sembler choisir un camp plus que défendre une solution.

1.2. La poussée démographique

L'installation de la croissance économique sur le continent africain constitue une autre évolution fondamentale qui marque le passage au 21^{ème} siècle. Depuis maintenant plus de dix ans, la croissance économique moyenne africaine est supérieure à 5%, soit le triple de la croissance moyenne de la zone euro sur la même période (de l'ordre de 1,4%). Aujourd'hui, le grand isolement du continent africain, resté à l'écart des grands circuits financiers mondiaux, lui évite la contagion de la crise financière qui secoue les économies développées, et pourrait bien constituer un avantage comparatif inédit, après avoir longtemps paru son principal handicap. De fait, alors que les perspectives révisées du FMI¹ pour 2008 et 2009 tablent désormais sur un ralentissement généralisé, le décrochage va s'accroître, avec l'entrée en récession de la zone euro et des États-Unis (+5,4% en 2008 puis +5,0% en 2009 pour l'Afrique subsaharienne, contre +1,2%, puis -0,5% pour la zone euro, et +1,4%, puis -0,7% pour les États-Unis).

Certes, on part de très bas. Certes, le nombre total de pauvres continue de s'accroître, du fait de la progression démographique. Mais la tendance est là. Surtout, la croissance du revenu moyen africain, entamée depuis le milieu des années 90, s'accélère et s'élargit. En 2007, 39 pays africains ont enregistré une croissance du PIB par habitant, contre 27 en 2000². En dix ans, de 1997 à 2007, 23 pays ont enregistré une croissance moyenne de 5 à plus de 50% du PIB réel par habitant, supérieure à 25% pour 12 d'entre eux.³ Cette évolution inédite est porteuse d'une conséquence essentielle : l'émergence d'une classe moyenne désormais évaluée, avec des divergences, au tiers environ des 900 millions d'Africains. Cette donnée majeure pèsera nécessairement sur l'évolution économique mais aussi sur les équilibres politiques des pays africains, comme elle l'a fait dans les pays asiatiques.

Plus fondamental que le décrochage des dynamiques de croissance, l'extraordinaire élan démographique du continent africain va profondément modifier les équilibres économiques et politiques, à la fois au sein du continent et vis-à-vis de ses partenaires. D'ici 2050, une génération à peine, la population africaine devrait plus que doubler, passant de 906 millions en 2000 à 1937 millions, soit de 14% à 21% du total mondial. L'Europe, pendant ce temps, régressera de 488 millions à 472 millions (7,5% à 5,2% du total). Les États-Unis, grâce à la poursuite assumée d'une forte immigration, devraient passer de 297 à 409 millions⁴. D'ores et déjà, les 2/3 de la population africaine ont moins de 25 ans, dans une proportion presque inversée avec le continent européen. Fondamentalement surtout, désormais, nos partenaires africains considèrent moins leur poids démographique comme un frein à leur développement économique que comme un élément essentiel pour conforter leur poids politique dans un jeu mondialisé. Enfin, le « *Yes we can* » qui vient de porter un président noir à la tête des États-Unis, nourrit manifestement, comme en attestent les réactions de la presse et de la rue africaines, un formidable élan, notamment chez les jeunes générations.

¹ FMI - Perspectives de l'économie mondiale – octobre 2008 – révision en novembre 2008.

² FMI - Perspectives économiques régionales - Afrique subsaharienne – octobre 2008.

³ 25% à 50% : Burkina-faso, Éthiopie, Gambie, Ghana, Madagascar, Mali, Sao - Tomé, Tanzanie ; croissance supérieure à 50% : Tchad, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sierra - Leone.

⁴ Nation -unies – Département des affaires économiques et sociales – Perspectives de la population mondiale – révision 2006

1.3. La reconfiguration des points d'équilibre du continent

Ces évolutions lourdes s'accompagnent d'une modification sensible des équilibres internes du continent. Celle-ci se traduit d'abord par l'apparition de risques de fragilisation chez les « grands » États du continent, partenaires privilégiés des pays développés occidentaux -Afrique du Sud, Nigeria, Égypte, Sénégal –, soit parce que l'excellence de leur image à l'international s'est construite au détriment de leur consolidation intérieure, soit parce qu'ils sont ou seront, à brève échéance, comme d'autres à ce titre, – Algérie, Gabon, Guinée équatoriale, Libye notamment – confrontés à des successions difficiles. Les puissances montantes du continent, comme déjà le Ghana, la Tanzanie, ou le Mozambique, sont désormais plutôt des pays de taille moyenne, qui privilégient d'ailleurs des relations diversifiées, au-delà des seuls membres occidentaux du Conseil de sécurité ou du G8.

Plus fondamentalement, cette fragilisation reflète aussi l'impact, inédit sur un continent traditionnellement respectueux de l'âge et de l'ancienneté, inévitable avec l'accélération du rajeunissement démographique et le poids nouveau des médias et de l'internet, du phénomène de conflit de générations, qui se traduira par une exigence accrue pour un véritable changement de génération (de dynastie ?) des responsables politiques africains.

Ce rééquilibrage se traduit aussi par un déplacement sensible du centre de gravité du continent africain vers son flanc Est – immédiat avec les pays du Golfe, plus lointain avec la Chine et l'Inde, alors que semblent se distendre, au moins avec les pays européens anciens colonisateurs, les liens forgés par l'histoire, plus que par la mitoyenneté géographique. Significativement, alors que le nombre total de passagers transportés a stagné en 2007, les liaisons aériennes entre le continent africain et le Moyen-Orient ont continué de progresser de près de 7% et de près de 10% avec l'Asie⁵. La Chine est désormais, devant la France et après les États-Unis, le deuxième partenaire commercial de l'Afrique, dont elle importe le tiers de ses besoins pétroliers actuels⁶. Mais l'Afrique n'est pas seulement pour la Chine un réservoir stratégique de ressources énergétiques, minières et forestières. C'est aussi un débouché essentiel pour sa population active, un marché conséquent pour ses entreprises, un terrain de partenariat privilégié pour son système financier, et surtout un enjeu politique majeur dans la redistribution des cartes du jeu international. Moins explicite et moins connue, la stratégie indienne poursuit les mêmes objectifs de sécurisation des ressources énergétiques et minières, de renforcement des débouchés, et de représentativité dans les instances internationales. Enfin, les relations avec les pays pétroliers musulmans, monarchies du Golfe, mais aussi Iran ou Malaisie, se renforcent de façon marquée dans le domaine commercial et financier, mais aussi dans celui de la coopération militaire. Les fonds souverains arabes se concentrent en particulier sur la maîtrise des infrastructures de débouchés, en particulier sur les ports. Ainsi, déjà présent dans les ports de Djibouti, Dakar, Le Cap, *Dubai Ports World*⁷ s'intéresse désormais aux Comores et à Alger.

Il est essentiel de mesurer que cette évolution majeure n'est pas circonscrite aux intérêts économiques et commerciaux. Elle s'inscrit dans une stratégie politique de long terme, qui inclut, comme chez les partenaires occidentaux au siècle précédent, le décompte des positions dans les enceintes multilatérales. La Chine draine sans doute désormais davantage de voix africaines au Conseil de sécurité que la France. Sur la Côte d'Ivoire, sur le Zimbabwe, sur le Soudan, elle a clairement contré les positions occidentales dans les débats au Conseil de sécurité. De façon croissante, dans les enceintes collectives africaines, notamment à l'Union africaine, sur les grands sujets transversaux – changement climatique, migrations internationales, maîtrise de l'urbanisation, approvisionnement en eau – comme dans le règlement des crises du continent, le partenariat arabe prend le pas sur le partenariat occidental. Le Qatar, participe activement depuis l'origine aux sommets et réunions de l'Union africaine. De fait, le Qatar est devenu pour le

⁵ IATA - International Air Transport Association

⁶ OMC – Organisation mondiale du commerce

⁷ Filiale de Dubai World, société holding propriété du gouvernement émirati.

Conseil de sécurité ou l'Union européenne un intermédiaire incontournable sur de nombreux dossiers africains qui les préoccupent, qu'il s'agisse du Darfour ou de la Mauritanie. Dans le règlement difficile de la crise du Darfour, l'Union africaine privilégie désormais la liaison avec la Ligue arabe et l'OCI.

2. L'Afrique, nouveau théâtre géostratégique ?

Dans ce cadre profondément bouleversé, il est essentiel pour les partenaires occidentaux du continent africain de bien mesurer les enjeux d'une part, et l'évolution de la « concurrence » de l'autre, pour définir une stratégie nouvelle qui valorise à la fois leurs intérêts, leurs avantages comparatifs et leur potentiel de complémentarités.

2.1. *Des risques partagés*

Mesurer les enjeux d'abord, sur le double terrain de la croissance et de la sécurité.

Dans le contexte mondialisé du siècle qui commence, la fracture n'est plus entre pays du nord riches et pays du sud pauvres. Elle est désormais celle qui s'élargit entre pays vieillissants, essentiellement préoccupés par leur sécurité et la stabilité de leur situation acquise, et pays jeunes, obsédés par leurs perspectives et animés par une volonté parfois violente de changement. Le vrai risque est dès lors celui qui consisterait à alimenter, ou simplement entretenir la contradiction entre la sécurité des premiers et les aspirations des seconds. Bien au contraire, et en tout premier lieu pour le voisin européen, la sécurité des pays développés, et leur capacité à maintenir une croissance durablement forte, dépendent, de façon étroite et immédiate, du développement et de la stabilisation du continent africain.

Dans ce cadre, l'enjeu pour l'Europe, voisin immédiat et vieillissant de la remuante Afrique, peut sembler plus aigu que pour les États-Unis, à la fois plus distants géographiquement et plus proches démographiquement. Mais l'interpénétration des enjeux et des risques dans un contexte désormais globalisé atténue cette apparente différence.

De fait, nouveau théâtre géostratégique, le continent africain concentre sur son territoire toute la liste des risques et des enjeux du monde contemporain. Risque sécuritaire, d'abord. Plus de dix ans avant le 11 septembre 2001, c'est d'abord sur le sol africain qu'ont lieu les premiers attentats terroristes – DC10 d'UTA au-dessus du désert du Ténéré, en 1989, puis Dar-es-Salam et Nairobi en 1998. Aujourd'hui encore, sur un continent qui conjugue à la fois les facteurs et les instruments de la menace avec un niveau aléatoire de contrôle et de sécurité, le risque demeure élevé d'une nouvelle atteinte à des intérêts ou à des symboles occidentaux. La transformation récente du GSPC (Groupe Salafiste pour la Prédication et le Combat) initialement centré exclusivement sur l'Algérie, en AQMI (Al Qaïda Maghreb Islamique), l'élargissement de son terrain privilégié d'activités à l'ensemble de la bande sahélienne, et le durcissement de ses modes opératoires en attestent. Au-delà de la seule menace terroriste, le départ massif des grands circuits de trafic de drogues, chassés du sous-continent sud-américain, vers le continent africain, est préoccupant, de même que le développement de la piraterie maritime et des trafics financiers, les risques inédits qui menacent la sécurité informatique, la multiplication des opérations de prises d'otages, l'arrivée constante d'armements déclassés en provenance des théâtres situés plus à l'Est – notamment APLC (armes légères et de petit calibre).

Risque sanitaire aussi, dans un contexte de progression exponentielle des déplacements, sur un continent qui présente la proportion la plus élevée au monde de maladies transmissibles – sida, certes, mais aussi recrudescence de la tuberculose de la rougeole et des méningites, et qui héberge toutes les épidémies émergentes – SRAS, grippe aviaire ou chikungunya.

Risque environnemental enfin, que traduisent déjà l'avancée des zones désertiques, l'enlèvement progressif des grands fleuves conjointement à l'inondation de leurs deltas,

l'engorgement incontrôlé des zones urbaines, la déforestation, l'extension des risques phytosanitaires dans un continent à prédominance agricole. Sur le continent africain, première victime du changement climatique, tout en étant le moins « pollueur », l'apparition prévisible d'un afflux de réfugiés climatiques, redoutée par Antonio Guterres (HCR), risque de peser sur les perspectives de développement et de raviver les facteurs de conflits.

2.2. Un potentiel considérable

Mais s'il héberge des risques majeurs, le continent africain recèle aussi un potentiel considérable. Il ne détient pas seulement 12% de la production mondiale de pétrole et 10% des réserves aujourd'hui prouvées – en-dehors des zones encore inexplorées. Il possède aussi, souvent en monopole, parfois en partage avec l'Australie ou la Russie, la plupart des métaux et minerais essentiels à la poursuite de la croissance industrielle et au développement des nouvelles technologies : près de 90% des réserves prouvées de platine, chrome et coltan, 60% des réserves de manganèse, 30% des réserves d'or et de phosphates, de cobalt, d'uranium et de bauxite, 25% des réserves de titane. Alors que la pression de la demande, notamment asiatique, s'inscrit nécessairement dans la durée, ce potentiel reste encore largement sous-exploité, en raison de l'insuffisance des infrastructures de production et de commercialisation ainsi que des crises qui ont secoué et secouent encore certains grands producteurs potentiels, gelant toutes perspectives en dehors des trafics liés aux conflits. De fait, ainsi qu'on l'a vu, l'apaisement relatif des conflits en Angola, en République démocratique du Congo (RDC), ou au sud du Soudan a ouvert des perspectives considérables – qui ne sont pas étrangères à l'accélération du règlement des crises –, et attiré de nombreux « nouveaux amis ».

Surtout, la très forte croissance démographique qui marquera encore longtemps le continent désormais le plus jeune de la planète comporte certes un indéniable risque économique, social et politique à court terme pour les pays concernés d'abord et leur environnement régional immédiat, et un risque migratoire réel qui préoccupe leurs voisins européens. Mais elle représente aussi un formidable marché potentiel en termes de biens de consommation ou de grandes infrastructures. Pour des économies occidentales menacées par la récession induite par la crise financière, alors même que le vieillissement démographique altère déjà les perspectives de demande, l'enjeu devient vital à brève échéance.

2.3. Une concurrence inédite

L'afflux récent de nouveaux partenaires sur le continent africain atteste de l'ampleur de cet enjeu. La concurrence qui s'y exerce désormais devient forte. Le temps d'un monopole occidental sur les équilibres politiques et les perspectives économiques de l'Afrique est révolu.

Pendant que l'Europe peinait près de dix ans pour organiser après le premier sommet du Caire en 2000, la deuxième édition fin 2007 à Lisbonne du sommet entre l'Union européenne et l'Afrique, en raison du blocage britannique sur le Zimbabwe, les grands partenaires émergents du continent ont multiplié les rencontres : premier sommet Afrique-Chine et premier sommet Afrique-Amérique latine en 2006, deuxième sommet IBSA⁸ en 2007, quatrième TICAD⁹ au Japon et premier sommet Afrique-Inde en 2008. La présence marquée d'Hugo Chavez et Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, invités d'honneur au sommet de l'Union africaine de juillet 2006, a été un signe essentiel. De fait, à l'instar de la Chine et de l'Inde, le Venezuela, mais aussi le Brésil, comme l'Iran déjà du temps de Khomeiny, mettent en place en Afrique une véritable stratégie économique et commerciale, mais aussi politique. Depuis 2000, le montant des échanges commerciaux entre le Brésil et le continent africain a été multiplié par quatre, le président Lula a effectué sept voyages sur le continent et y a ouvert douze nouvelles ambassades. Comme l'Inde,

⁸ *India – Brazil - South Africa*

⁹ *Tokyo International Conference on Development*

le Brésil développe sa coopération dans des domaines de compétence très pointus : agriculture tropicale, médicaments génériques, bio- carburants. La Russie elle-même, nouvelle venue sur le continent, témoigne d'un intérêt croissant pour l'Afrique, dans une stratégie de maîtrise des approvisionnements énergétiques, mais surtout d'équilibre des puissances. La Turquie enfin, régulièrement invitée d'honneur aux sommets de l'Union africaine, renforce ses liens avec le continent.

2.4. L'émergence des acteurs non-étatiques

Au-delà des relations classiques d'État à État, le paysage est également modifié par l'apparition d'un maillage étroit entre partenaires non-étatiques et par le développement des opérateurs et instruments de partenariat non-publics. Les diasporas libanaise, ismaélienne, indienne et chinoise jouent un rôle croissant en Afrique, comme les diasporas africaines installées à l'extérieur du continent. Grands bailleurs émergents, les fondations – comme la fondation Gates, qui dépense chaque année pour la santé en Afrique davantage que l'OMS, ou la fondation Aga Khan, présente depuis longtemps dans le secteur des infrastructures sur le flanc Est du continent et qui intervient désormais dans les pays de la bande sahélienne – et surtout les fonds souverains¹⁰, deviennent des acteurs majeurs, dont les marges de manœuvre financières sont sans commune mesure avec les disponibilités budgétaires des bailleurs publics occidentaux. La Banque Mondiale travaille d'ailleurs au montage d'un partenariat qui pourrait porter sur 1% des disponibilités actuelles estimées des fonds souverains, soit 30 milliards de dollars, c'est-à-dire presque l'équivalent du montant total des investissements directs étrangers (IDE) en Afrique en 2007 (...et l'équivalent des bonus distribués en 2007 par les banques occidentale). Les banques islamiques, avec l'appui des pays du Golfe et de l'Iran, deviennent des partenaires importants, voire privilégiés, des banques et des investisseurs locaux, tout en jouant un rôle croissant pour héberger les capitaux africains expatriés, récemment évalués par le Parlement britannique à plus de 700 milliards de dollars.

4. Une stratégie commune

4.1. Faire évoluer les opinions

Avocat privilégié depuis l'origine du traitement de la dette africaine et de la mise en place de financements innovants pour le développement dans les grandes enceintes internationales, la France souligne depuis longtemps le lien incontournable entre développement et résolution des conflits. Ces dernières années, elle s'est engagée résolument dans la résolution des crises africaines, y compris sur le terrain militaire, en Ituri avec l'opération Artémis comme en Côte d'Ivoire avec l'opération Licorne, et a œuvré pour la mise en place de la Facilité de paix européenne, qui permet depuis 2004 de financer les opérations de maintien de la paix menées par l'Union africaine, à partir des ressources non affectées du FED (Fonds européen de développement). L'accent est mis désormais sur le renforcement des instances régionales africaines – économiques, politiques, et militaires – et sur le partenariat entre l'Union européenne et l'Union africaine, enceintes privilégiées pour traiter les grandes problématiques communes : migrations, changement climatique, sécurité énergétique, notamment. Enfin l'appui au secteur privé comme vecteur essentiel de la croissance économique, seule à même de garantir le développement, au-delà de l'aide limitée des donateurs, est un élément déterminant de la politique mise en œuvre par le président Nicolas Sarkozy.¹¹

¹⁰ Aujourd'hui estimés à 3000 milliards de dollars, dont Abu Dhabi Investment Authority : 875 milliards \$, Kuwait Investment Authority : 213 milliards \$, State Administration of Foreign Exchange (Chine) : 311 milliards \$.

¹¹ Discours au Cap (Afrique du sud) -28 février 2008

Dans un contexte de préoccupation domestique croissante en matière économique et sociale, ces évolutions soulèvent généralement incompréhensions ou critiques auprès d'une opinion publique lassée qui, alternativement, considère que l'engagement pour la « stabilité » en Afrique revient à préserver coûteusement des régimes corrompus, ou que l'accent porté sur l'« appropriation africaine » et la mise en valeur d'« intérêts mutuels » sacrifie notre devoir de solidarité et masque le retrait de notre aide. Ces réticences sont évidemment confortées par le rejet inédit, désormais rageur, souvent violent, de l'ancien colonisateur par les jeunes générations des pays francophones, rejet démultiplié par le développement des médias et le recours généralisé au net.

Plus que jamais pourtant, l'enjeu partagé du développement et de la stabilisation du plus grand continent de la planète doit être mesuré et traité. L'arrivée de Barack Ismail Obama permet à cet égard des perspectives nouvelles considérables. Moins sur la perception des dossiers africains par la nouvelle administration : B. Obama est un Américain, qui défendra en priorité les intérêts de son pays que, de façon essentielle, sur la perception des États-Unis par les Africains : le fait que la majorité du peuple américain ait pu choisir de porter un noir à la tête des États-Unis modifie très profondément la donne et confèrera aux positions américaines une écoute et un impact sans précédent.

4.2. *Quelques pistes*

Dans ce cadre, plusieurs pistes d'action, conjointes ou complémentaires, peuvent être évoquées.

La première porte sur la nécessaire accélération de la résolution des conflits et sur la relation incontournable entre sortie de crise et développement. Mis en évidence par les travaux de Paul Collier¹², le lien entre paix et développement doit être conforté. Pas de développement sans paix et sécurité certes, mais pas de sécurité durable non plus sans développement, ni surtout de sortie de crise acquise sans perspectives économiques concrètes pour les protagonistes. L'intervention des partenaires occidentaux dans la résolution des crises africaines gagnerait à se déplacer du terrain de la médiation politique, devenu improductif, voire contreproductif, dans un contexte de durcissement des revendications à la souveraineté politique, et de montée en puissance des médiations locales, vers un terrain plus économique, visant à faire en sorte que les dividendes de la paix apparaissent clairement plus prometteurs et plus stables que les intérêts de la guerre. Le cadre récemment mis en place avec la Commission de consolidation de la paix des Nations-Unies pourrait être conforté par une liaison plus forte avec les grandes institutions financières internationales et les organismes et agences d'aide. En outre, si les États occidentaux souhaitent réellement privilégier l'intervention sur le terrain des forces africaines, l'appui financier à l'Union africaine et la formation des brigades régionales devront être complétés par la mise à disposition effective de moyens de surveillance et de transport, notamment hélicoptères, qui font cruellement défaut sur les théâtres africains – le cas du Darfour est emblématique à cet égard. En tout état de cause, une attention plus étroite doit être portée à la zone grise qui continue de menacer le passage de l'étape prolongée du maintien coûteux de la paix – plus de 5 milliards de dollars sont consacrés chaque année aux seules OMP (Opérations de maintien de la paix) sur le continent africain, généralement enlisées bien plus de dix ans, – et de l'urgence humanitaire à celle d'un développement plus autonome.

La deuxième porte sur la nécessaire évolution de l'aide publique au développement. Dans un contexte de régression générale des capacités d'aide publique des grands donateurs du CAD (Comité d'aide au développement) de l'OCDE, au moment où parallèlement le Plan Paulson envisage de consacrer 700 milliards de dollars au seul sauvetage des banques occidentales, soit dix fois le montant auquel les pays du G8 s'étaient engagés en 2005 à Gleneagles à porter leur aide

¹² Paul Collier, *Breaking the Conflict Trap*, 2003 et *The Bottom Billion*, 2007.

annuelle à l'Afrique d'ici à 2010, un effort particulier, au minimum de pédagogie, devra être fait sur ce sujet. Le retard flagrant sur la réalisation des Objectifs du Millénaire pour le Développement (OMD)¹³ pèse déjà sur les relations avec les pays en développement, dans un contexte où le discours sur la gouvernance risque de devenir inaudible, et fortement contesté, au regard des errances financières massives enregistrées dans les pays développés.

La coordination et la complémentarité des bailleurs deviennent un objectif prioritaire, réclamé par les pays bénéficiaires eux-mêmes¹⁴. Les principes de « bonne conduite » établis par la Déclaration de Paris de mars 2007¹⁵ méritent d'être élargis aux pays non-membres du CAD de l'OCDE. Y associer aussi, autant que faire se peut, les bailleurs émergents que sont désormais les grandes fondations et les fonds souverains est essentiel. Ces principes doivent également être étendus à la problématique de la dette, face aux risques réels d'un réendettement massif et non régulé auprès de créanciers extérieurs au Club de Paris, alors même que le service de la dette continue de dépasser le budget consacré à la santé dans 52 pays africains sur 54 et le budget consacré à l'éducation dans 19 d'entre eux. Au regard de l'effort massif qui a été consacré jusqu'ici consacré par les membres du Club de Paris, en particulier la France, au traitement des dettes africaines, il y a là un enjeu considérable. À la complémentarité entre bailleurs doit enfin correspondre la complémentarité entre bailleurs et bénéficiaires. Cette démarche répond à la logique de partenariat revendiquée de part et d'autre. Elle permettra aussi de mieux partager les responsabilités face à des résultats jugés insuffisants. En particulier, dans ce cadre, la gouvernance passera du statut de condition d'octroi de l'aide à celui de facteur essentiel de son efficacité. C'est l'insuffisance de gouvernance qui explique l'inefficacité de l'aide, bien davantage que l'insuffisance de ses montants. Et l'insuffisance de gouvernance doit moins susciter la baisse de l'aide que sa réaffectation.

De fait, l'accent devra être mis sur l'identification des résultats plus que sur le montant des moyens comme seul « témoin » de l'engagement des donateurs, sur la capacité d'absorption des partenaires, sur la complémentarité de l'aide extérieure avec les budgets nationaux, sur la nécessaire hiérarchisation des secteurs d'intervention, et enfin sur l'importance de la croissance économique comme moteur du développement, en complément de l'aide.

À une condition : y intégrer en amont la préservation des équilibres écologiques et environnementaux. Essentiel, cet accent mis sur la croissance implique qu'une attention plus soutenue soit portée au développement du secteur privé et aux facteurs qui le favorisent : maîtrise cruciale de l'approvisionnement énergétique, développement des grandes infrastructures de communication – réseau routier et aéroports régionaux mais aussi accès aux nouvelles technologies et à internet large bande –, mise en place de structures bancaires solides de nature à canaliser à la fois l'épargne des migrants, les capitaux des diasporas et les capitaux expatriés, et surtout intégration des pays africains dans les grands circuits commerciaux mondiaux. L'aboutissement des négociations du cycle de Doha est à cet égard une priorité.

Une attention prioritaire devra enfin être portée à la sécurité alimentaire et au développement agricole du continent africain, dont le potentiel considérable, déjà handicapé par les retards de productivité et les contraintes des marchés européen et américain, est désormais menacé par les conséquences du changement climatique.

Conclusion

Tout ceci implique un effort pédagogique préalable auprès des opinions publiques, pour sortir des stéréotypes encore répandus sur une Afrique vouée à la crise, qui n'appellerait en retour

¹³ Rapport du groupe de réflexion sur le retard pris dans la réalisation des OMD – Banque mondiale – 2008.

¹⁴ On compte aujourd'hui dans le paysage de l'aide, pour les seuls donateurs institutionnels, 280 donateurs bilatéraux, 242 programmes multilatéraux, 24 banques de développement, 40 agences onusiennes.

¹⁵ Cf OCDE-CAD : 2006 Survey on monitoring the Paris Declaration.

qu'opérations militaires de maintien de la paix, observations électorales, et actions humanitaires. Une réflexion conjointe devra en particulier être menée sur l'approche adéquate de plusieurs notions emblématiques – démocratie, gouvernance, droits de l'Homme. En effet, sur ces sujets toujours prioritaires pour nos opinions publiques, l'approche occidentale se confronte désormais à la posture des grands partenaires émergents du continent africain, attentifs à préserver la souveraineté politique de ceux qu'ils prennent soin de traiter comme leurs homologues, ce qui leur confère un réel avantage comparatif dans un contexte de concurrence inédite.

Plus généralement, cette réflexion partagée devra porter sur les contours et la configuration institutionnelle adéquate d'une « communauté internationale » qui ne peut plus raisonnablement se limiter à ceux qui ont été dessinés au lendemain de 1945, sauf à se voir, *horresco referrens*, désormais qualifiée d'« ordre cannibale ».¹⁶ .

¹⁶ Jean Ziegler

Africa Policy in an Era of Franco-American Cooperation

Gwendolyn Mikell

(January 2009)

Summary

As the U.S. and France debate what directions they should take toward Africa from 2008/9 onward, they need to be guided by an understanding of the complex local and global realities that Africa now faces. The Africa policies of the Obama Administration will need to be sensitive to the social contexts in different African countries, as well as how people perceive policies as impacting their lives. Therefore, Africa policies must depart from past practices by not being security-driven, but by also recognizing and utilizing effectively the other two legs of the 3-legged stool mentioned by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton—diplomacy and development. This would allow us new opportunities to examine policy challenges and multilateral possibilities within broader frameworks.

The goal here is to examine aspects of Anglo-Francophone cooperation through an exploration of the dynamics of the strategic players, the security/peacekeeping approaches, and current governance challenges, looking especially how these play out in Africa. Instead of an exclusive focus on anti-terrorism or AFRICOM, there needs to be greater concern with how to engage the needs, aspirations, and initiative of African publics and civil society, and to strengthen democratic institutions that help offset and prevent crises. As we continue the commitments made to development we need to consider how to expand our fights against HIV/AIDS and other diseases so that we assist in rebuilding health systems within African countries, giving Africans the capacity to attack these problems from the ground up. Given the predominantly moderate nature of African Islam throughout the continent, what are needed are development approaches that reinforce this moderate stance, rather than derail it. The Obama administration should be supportive of collaborative initiatives focused on how to prevent the exploitation of African state vulnerabilities through strategic partnerships with African states and regional organizations, as well as with the U.N. This will involve breaking old unilateralist behavioral molds so that multilateral initiatives are more in sync with African needs and developments on the ground.

Overview

As the U.S. and France debate what directions they should take toward Africa from 2008/9 onward, they need to be guided by an understanding of the complex local and global realities that Africa now faces. As someone with years of policy and on the ground familiarity with Africa, I am inclined to see policy formulation as well as national interest as being continually challenged to keep up with the social context and with how people perceive the changes in their lives. In the recent past, anti-terrorism and security/defense concerns drove much of the American agenda toward Africa. However, the new Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said: “there are three legs to the stool of American foreign policy: defense, diplomacy, and development – and two of those reside at the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development.”¹⁷ This may mean that the Obama Administration will offer us a new opportunity to examine policy challenges and multilateral possibilities within broader frameworks.

My goal here is to examine aspects of Anglo-Francophone cooperation by exploring the dynamics of the strategic players, the security/peacekeeping approaches, and current governance challenges, especially how these play out in Africa. Despite ongoing conflicts, many African states are emerging on the other side of the civil wars and rebel conflicts of the 1990s, with newly acquired knowledge about how to defuse militarized conflict and fight diseases like HIV/AIDS.

¹⁷ Mark Silva, “Hillary Clinton: Its Going to Be Hard,” *Chicago Tribune: The Swamp*, February 22, 2009.

These crises evoked a flowering of civil society organizations determined to offer critical commentary on the process of nation-building. The West has played a critical role in providing support for this civil society evolution. But while the rewards are becoming evident, the tasks are far from being completed. The expansion of global terrorist networks and their exploitation of the vulnerabilities of young African states have placed new burdens on these African polities. Yet most African states, including those with majority Muslim populations, have moderate religious-political cultures, and they have not bought into the terrorist enterprise. What are needed are development approaches that reinforce this moderate stance, rather than derail it. These approaches would help encourage a positive trajectory for African states and the African Union, and require that the U.S., France and the European Union work together in sensitive and effective ways to sustain it.

Creating a new Franco-American relationship with Africa that can help guide policy development will be a challenging, yet achievable task. The Bush Administration approach to Africa was primarily a unilateral one that focused on military/security, trade, and the fight against HIV/AIDS. It acknowledged the historical military and trade relations of France with francophone Africa, but saw this as potentially limiting American influence on the continent. The Obama Administration's approach aims to be different, and must involve working more closely with France and other EU countries, instead of competing or displacing them. This will involve breaking old behavioral molds so that multilateral initiatives are more in sync with African needs and developments on the ground.

American Policy in the Past

Initially, the U.S. did not have a coherent Africa policy, relying instead on cold-war strategies and treating Africa as an extension of the European sphere of influence in the 1970s and 1980s. The only historical relationships were with Liberia and South Africa, although the U.S. had fluctuating relations with harsh regimes in Congo/Zaire, Ethiopia, and Somalia.¹⁸ With the end of the cold-war, the U.S. preferred to rely on the U.N. to address the expansion of violent conflicts in Africa. However, following the unsuccessful American interventions in Somali in 1992, the U.S. was concerned about 'mission-creep,' and more reticent to engage with Africa on security, political or development issues. Once elected in 1992, President Clinton began to craft a new economic diplomacy for Africa operating through the Departments of Commerce and Transportation. The earlier reticence to engage on political and military issues continued as the Rwandan genocide unfolded in 1994, severely damaging U.S./African relations. Americans had been content to rely upon the French, Belgians, and the UN in Rwanda, although clearly these proved inadequate to the conflict.

The American focus was on South Africa as it went through its 1994 democratic elections. Using the bi-national conferences for South Africa, Vice President Al Gore oversaw a set of exchanges and conversations between our Foreign Service Institute, and our Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, Transportation, and Education with their South African counterparts. During the regime of General Sani Abacha in Nigeria, the U.S. withdrew most diplomatic resources and deliberately funded pro-democracy civil society organizations which became vocal advocates for the restoration of democracy. When the Abacha regime ended, the process of matching of development assistance to specific needs of the new government, and the pairing of political and security assistance through a bilateral relationship (such as in South Africa) was replicated in 1999 as President Obasanjo assumed office. Post-election Nigeria was a more

¹⁸ Marguerite Michaels, "Retreat from Africa," *Foreign Affairs*, 1992/3. Elliott P. Skinner, *African Americans and U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Africa, 1850 – 1924: In Defense of Black Nationality*. Washington DC: Howard University, 1993.

complicated process for the US, which involved restoring diplomatic resources,¹⁹ navigating the Muslim-Christian tensions within the country, reinforcing Nigeria's capacity to play a central role in ECOMOG conflict resolution, targeting funding toward women's civil society groups, and addressing HIV/AIDS as a civilian and military issue. The roots of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) were laid during this period as U.S. civil society agitated for a coherent Africa policy that moved Africa from the margins to the center.

Each era has its policy interest and needs, as well as its distinct awareness of national interests. The terrorist assaults of September 11th 2001, when seen against the backdrop of the bombing of U.S. embassies in Nairobi Kenya and Dar es Salaam Tanzania in 1998, strengthened American concern about security and President George W. Bush's commitment to pre-emptive diplomacy. From 2002 onward, Bush began to establish a new set of relations with Africa, initially based on the traditional security and trade emphases of Republican administrations, but gradually with a determination to help prevent African countries from becoming sites exploited by Islamic militants and global terrorist networks. The Bush Administration's stated policy of 'African solutions to African problems' and of relying on regional hegemony to handle the security demands of the region, was viewed critically within Africa; and there was increased pressure for the U.S. to be a more involved advocate for multilateral peacekeeping at the U.N. Nevertheless, this approach was partially successful in West Africa, especially as the U.S. gradually acquiesced to greater support for Nigeria's role in ECOWAS peacekeeping in Liberia and Sierra Leone, although it proved less successful elsewhere on the continent.

The need for sophisticated regional and country-specific analyses that are fine tuned to conditions on the ground was evident in the Horn. The Horn of Africa continued to be a major concern, especially as anxiety about transnational networks operating in Somalia fed American advocacy for 'draining the swamps,' as it fueled Ethiopian and American collaborations, and as African tensions heightened in the region.²⁰ The French Parliament also debated how to approach policy in the Horn, especially in its dialogue with representatives from the region, but no productive conclusions emerged.²¹ More recently, the phenomenon of piracy off the coast of Somalia had cemented the conclusion that policy for this area is not just a unilateral issue, but must be the outcome of collaborative American, Francophone, and United Nations discussions about how to fight the poverty that may feed piracy off the Horn of Africa.²²

Such crises involving the Middle East and the Islamic world have highlighted the importance of Nigeria and Angola from which the United States derives the bulk of the roughly 22% of African sweet crude oil imports into the U.S.²³ Also implicit within the security and trade focus was a greater concern with strengthening and rationalizing the military institutions in Africa, dealing with conflict resolution, increasing public diplomacy and outreach to the African Islamic world, as well as heightening the support that U.S. defense institutions could provide for civil-military relations in Africa. These initiatives, combined with the 2002 U.S. national security strategy²⁴ of defending and preserving the peace, the promotion of democracy, preventive assaults on terrorist networks, and disrupting the financing for terrorism, have had significant impacts on Africa. The Obama Administration must now respond to this.

¹⁹ Gwendolyn Mikell and Princeton Lyman, "Critical Bilateral Relations in Africa: Nigeria and South Africa," Chapter 6 in J. Stephen Morrison and Jennifer Cook (ed), *Africa Policy in the Clinton Years: Critical Choices for the Bush Administration*, Washington DC: CSIS Significant Issues Series, 2001

²⁰ Princeton Lyman and J. Stephen Morrison, "The Terrorist Threat in Africa," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2004. See also "Draining the Swamp: The Financial Dimension," Council on Foreign Relations, The American Response to Terrorism series, March 25, 2002; and "Why Ethiopian and American Interests Conflict on Somalia: Commentary," *Ogaden Online Editorial Board*, January 15, 2002.

²¹ "France Renews Ties with the Horn of Africa," *Ethiomedias*, February 6, 2004.

²² "Pirates force the world to see sad plight of Somalia," *Irishtimes.com*, October 29, 2008.

²³ "African Crude Exports to the US Jump," *Energy Tribune*, April 18, 2007. See also, David Shin, "China, Africa, and Oil," Center for Strategic and International Studies, Africa Program, Washington, DC, 2006.

²⁴ President George W. Bush, "National Security Strategy of the United States," *New York Times*, 20 September 2002.

In 2007 both Africa and many U.S. groups were suspicious of the Bush Administration's creation of a U.S. African Command – AFRICOM— and thus what they perceived as a 'militarized foreign policy.' AFRICOM also had development components that were alternatively criticized as inadequate and more appropriate for USAID rather than the Pentagon. While the initial response was almost uniformly negative, a more considered response is emerging as the African Union reflects on AFRICOM's new and more consultative agenda and its decision to build a base in Stuttgart Germany rather than on the African continent for the foreseeable future.²⁵ There are lessons here for both the U.S. and other western countries that will be explored more fully later: post-Cold War security-focused approaches usually do not take sufficient note of the fact that terrorist challenges are often predictable results of failing to address development needs and give poor people options.

What earned President Bush an 85+% approval rating from Africans was not his security initiatives, but his eagerness to travel to varied African countries to assess trade and development as well as humanitarian projects, his willingness to talk with ordinary Africans about democratic processes, his joy in 'dancing' as he did in Liberia and Ghana, and his passionate commitment to fighting HIV/AIDS and other diseases in Africa. He proudly asserts that he has more than doubled development assistance to Africa relative to its level in 2004, and that he has worked on partnering with African leaders to overcome poverty by growing their economies. His policy initiatives have included the signing of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA-2001), the African Education Initiative (2002), the Millennium Challenge Corporation grants totaling \$3 billion to democratic and liberalizing African countries (2003), and the President's Emergency Fund for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR-2003). PEPFAR came in for enormous criticism within the US because of its ABC (abstinence, be faithful, and condoms) approach, and its reliance upon support from religious groups which backed the initiatives. 'Just say no,' which was a hold-over republican mantra, found its way into PEPFAR. Yet, even critics have to grudgingly congratulate Bush on the impact of the antiretroviral drugs and counseling that are changing the face of HIV/AIDS in many African areas.²⁶ The successes and failures point to new possible US/French/EU collaborations, especially if they move beyond the treatment component to deal with the health systems and health education components, which are key to health success.

Bush's initiatives included the President's Malaria Initiative (2005), Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (2005), five new investment funds supported by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), the African Global Competitiveness Initiative (AGCI-2006), and training over 39,000 African peacekeepers in 20 countries (especially ECOWAS), in addition to working with local partners to address security challenges and peace prospects in Africa. The U.S. is the largest donor to the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), which gave more than 40% of that funding to Africa in 2007; and also "the largest contributor to the Global Fund for HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and Tuberculosis, pledging over \$3.5 billion and providing over \$2.5 billion since 2001."²⁷ On receiving an honor from Africare for his Africa policies, especially his African health initiatives, President Bush proudly noted: "People across Africa now speak of a Lazarus effect: communities once given up for dead are being brought back to life."²⁸

²⁵ "African Union Rejects America's AFRICOM Military Base," *Ligali* 19 February 2008. "AFRICOM: Assessing the African Perspective," Council on Foreign Relations, Washington DC, October 1, 2008. See also Gwendolyn Mikell, "U.S. Academics and the Security Sector: Issues and Concerns," Plenary Paper for the AFRICOM Symposium, The Africa Center for Strategic Studies, National Conference Center, June 10, 2008.

²⁶ Giles Bolton, "How is America's Extra Aid Being Spent?" in *Africa Doesn't Matter: How the West has failed the Poorest Continent and What We can do about It*, NY: Arcade Publishers, 2008:279.

²⁷ Fact Sheet: U.S. Africa Policy: An Unparalleled Partnership Strengthening Democracy, Overcoming Poverty, and Saving Lives. *White House News*, February 1, 2008.

²⁸ PEPFAR has supported treatment for approximately 1.7 million Africans, and it was increased by \$48 billion in 2007 after being extended by Congress. See Brian Kennedy, "Top U.S. Charity Lauds Bush Africa Policy," *AllAfrica.Com*, 17 November 2008 Washington DC.

Other colleagues have delved into France's African approaches, so I only touch on it lightly in this paper. France too has gone through different phases in its foreign policy over the last two decades—albeit, with less publicity than have American because of the nature of our Congressional and political party systems. France has had a century of deeply developed entrenched economic and military relations with Sub-Saharan countries like Senegal, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Chad, Central African Republic, Gabon, Zaire/DRC, Rwanda, and Burundi. Hansen claims that the more than 250,000 French citizens residing in Africa, and the economic ties through trade and investment in African oil and metals, increased France's stake in these countries, and caused France to view Africa as its exclusive sphere of influence.²⁹ Yet over the last decade, global dynamics have encouraged people on the ground to be pragmatic, cross borders to work, to take advantage of education and opportunities, and to participate in social movements for change outside this orbit.

The de-linking of the African franc (CFA) from the French franc in 1994 created dislocations, but it was the difficult military relationships in Rwanda in 1994 and Zaire/ DRC in 1997 that have further intertwined the relations of Anglophone and Francophone African countries. Hansen reports that despite France's implied determination to move away from bilateral military engagements in favor of multilateral cooperation in peace and humanitarian assistance, France still engaged in military interventions in Chad in 2007/8, CAR in 2006, and in Cote d'Ivoire in 2005-6.³⁰ Perhaps the intense dynamics of globalization have further sped up France's search for a new type of relations with African countries. Hansen quotes Andre Dulait, the parliamentarian as saying that "The African continent is our neighbor, and when it's shaken by conflict, we're shaken as well" (2008). But other French citizens and officials have begun to rethink their strategic priorities, and ask where African ranks vis-à-vis their long-held interests in Asia, or their emerging interests in South America.

2008 brings another moment of change for both the U.S. and France, because the post-Cold War transition in Africa has ended, and a new phase of continental and global dialogue has begun. Will the EU under President Sarkozy or the Czech presidency in 2009 look beyond their borders and be poised to try to make a difference? People everywhere have a more nuanced view of 'global terrorism' than they did seven years ago. There are many African immigrants who, as new citizens in both the U.S. and France, do vote and register their desire to see a nuanced and pragmatic policy emerge with their chosen candidates. In this new phase, African countries are assuming greater control over their own destinies, trying to create the regional and continental mechanisms to deal with the many crises they face.

Strategic Players in Africa: U.S., France, China

The ground has shifted, and the former territorial divisions of Africa that emerged from the Berlin Conference are dissipating. The American assumption that Africa belonged to the Europeans has disappeared, to be replaced by confusion over when and where the US should intervene, and how to respond to African requests for assistance without increasing international tensions. Over the last two decades, driven largely by economic and security interests, U.S. influence has been felt in every corner of the African continent, and France has competed for influence in both Anglophone countries like Nigeria and South Africa. On both economic and security issues, real collaboration among the big power players has yet to happen, perhaps because of historical competitions, tensions within the UN General Assembly, or different priorities despite the dialogues and commitments surrounding the G8 African Agenda. Some have argued that the US/French competition which played out in the search for economic trade

²⁹ Andrew Hansen, "The French Military in Africa," *Backgrounder*, February 8, 2008

³⁰ Ibid. See also, David Gauthier-Villars, "Continental Shift: Colonial Era Ties to Africa Face a Reckoning in France," *Wall Street Journal*, May 16, 2007.

and protection agreements has negative regional impacts especially for SADC. Trade with South Africa is the prize, guaranteed to bring American or French products to an enormous national and regional market, but the impact on the smaller neighbors in SADC could be devastating, say many concerned southern Africans.³¹

The New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) reflects Africa's determination to coordinate regional and continental development. The U.S., France, and the EU have yet to craft a coherent policy response to NEPAD's development agendas, although they have partial responses to the African security agenda (discussed below). This is largely because they have pursued their own national/strategic interests to the neglect of multilateral initiatives. There are enormous economic issues that await discussion, especially how to focus attention on sustainable agriculture, which must be at the core of poverty alleviation in the coming years. Neither AGOA nor other initiatives have sufficiently addressed the importance of encouraging local agricultural production and agro-industry to sustain local communities, thus decreasing abject impoverishment as they balance global market dynamics. Indeed, there is a need to see the Millennium Challenge Corporation's initiatives integrate broad concerns for poverty alleviation and gender equity contained within the Millennium Development Goals.

Meanwhile, the African Union is also debating the eventual amalgamation of African states into the 'United States of Africa,' and collaborative approaches will be essential in the future. The three different positions taken by African states within the Great Debate' on Pan-Africanism at the 9th Summit of the African Union was emblematic of the difficult challenges facing Africa³² -- i.e., how to blend states that are at different levels of development, with different institutional and constitutional capacities, having widely different international networks and partnerships, and widely differing economic realities and potentials. Africans are becoming convinced that the old Francophone, Anglophone, and Lusophone divides of the colonial past are of lessening relevance to their lives, and that African states must find national policies and foreign policies that meet their needs, no matter from where they emerge and with whom they forge alliances. This new flexibility forces the U.S., France, and the EU to be much more collaborative than they have been in the past, and more creative in imagining how their initiatives on the ground and their economic, political, security, and development policies in general, can be integrated in ways that are more productive and efficient for Africa and the West.

A portion of that concern is irreparably altered, given that China's entrance onto the global stage changes the economic balance sheet, offering new opportunities and approaches to some African states, and new competitions for African resources. This has created trauma and anxiety for many in the West, given the possibility of US/Chinese/ French interests. It has not yet been possible to negotiate with China regarding the impact of their trade and concessional loans on poverty and growth in African areas, but this should not be ruled out as a possibility in the current difficult global economy. Do Chinese imports and exports serve to increase Africa's dependence without assisting with longer-term growth strategies? Does Chinese trade benefit disproportionately from African debt relief by absorbing capital that might be used for development purposes, or occupying development space that?

³¹ Margaret C. Lee, "The 21st Century Scramble for Africa," *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 3, September 2006, pp. 303-330 (Also to be published in *Africa in Global Power Play: Debates, Challenges and Potential Reforms*, Behekinkosi Moyo, ed., London: Adonis & Abbey Publishers, Ltd (forthcoming 2007). See also "European Union-South Africa Free Trade Agreement: In Whose Interest?" *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 1, 2002, pp. 81-106.

³² The three positions are: Instantivism (unity now), Gradualism (regional integration first), and Opposition (national sovereignty only). See T. Murithi, "Institutionalizing pan-Africanism: Transforming African Union values and principles into practice. ISS Paper, No. 143, 2007. Also, James Butty, "Analyst suspects Khadafi phobia in Summit Outcome," Ngwane [<http://www.gngwane.com/2007/07/analyst-suspect.html>].

These concerns have been raised recently by researchers like Margaret C. Lee,³³ or Kweku Ampiah and Sanusha Naidu, as they consider whether China is a development partner or a scrambler: “Clearly what is demonstrated in most of the case studies is that the economies of the African states are quickly becoming overly dependent on commodity exports to China, while at the same time ignoring the need to devise robust and coherent national industrial policies” (Naidu and Ampiah, 2008: 11-12).³⁴

Likewise, Ampiah and Naidu and other analysts raise questions about the ‘oil and weapons’ link, and whether China’s lack of concern for human rights in countries with which they trade is having a negative impact on democratic governance. In the context of Sudan and Zimbabwe, China initially protested that it did not mix politics and business.³⁵ Their subsequent defenses have included statements about China’s policy of non-interference in the domestic affairs of another country, despite the uproar created by their shipment of arms to the Zimbabweans and the Sudanese.³⁶ Initially, the UN Security Council was unable to mobilize sufficient pressures on China to help persuade Sudanese President Bashir to accept UN and AU troops, and the prolongation of the Darfur crisis reflected this lack of political will to resolve the crisis. But now China has begun to move on the Darfur issue, and we need to understand better how Bashir was convinced to accept the hybrid UNAMID force in 2008.³⁷

There are many lessons to be drawn from the Sudan crises, including ones about the complexity of African Union deliberations, the alliances between Libya, Sudan, and other Arab countries in approaching UN negotiations on Sudan, and the difficulties that Sub-Saharan Africans feel in questioning African ‘brotherhood’ by pressuring Bashir on Darfur. But other important lessons are that China may be poised to become a more integrated partner in global alliances, and perhaps coordinated pressures from Western countries can begin to discourage a Chinese arms trade linkage that the world finds repugnant. The US, France, and the EU must work on finding ways to increase the collaborations with China on Zimbabwe,³⁸ and to draw China more fully into the security and governance dialogues so that there is greater coordination in multilateral conflict resolution, and more moral resources available to support African democratic initiatives.

The United States may be poised to undergo another fundamental shift in Africa policy during the Presidency of Barack Obama. Africans all over the world were inspired and thrilled by his candidacy, and there have been increased civil society pressures from many new constituencies within the U.S. Although we have yet to see what it will mean for Africa, it is instructive to think about Skinner’s (1992:1-19) earlier description of the use of symbolic power by African-Americans in pushing recalcitrant American policy makers to forge ties with Africa in the late 19th century.³⁹ In like fashion, the mass organizational power that brought about Obama’s election will cause Congressional and State Department officials to think longer and look deeper as they craft new policies for Africa. Clearly, an Obama administration will build on the economic

³³ Margaret C. Lee, “Uganda and China: Unleashing the Power of the Dragon,” in Margaret C. Lee, Henning Melber, Sanusha Naidu, and Ian Taylor, *China in Africa*, Nordic Africa Institute, Current African Issues 35, Uppsala, Sweden: Nordic Africa Institute, 2007, pp. 26-40.

³⁴ Kweku Ampiah and Sanusha Naidu (Ed), *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon? Africa and China*, Scottsville SA: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2008.

³⁵ China and Sudan Fact Sheet, http://www.savedarfur.org/newsroom/policypapers/china_and_sudan_fact_sheet/

³⁶ Lloyd Sachikonye, “Crouching Tiger, Hidden Agenda? Zimbabwe-China Relations” in Ampiah and Naidu (Ed), *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon? Africa and China*, Scottsville SA: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2008. Hilary Anderssen, “China is Fueling War in Darfur,” *BBC News*, 13 July 2008. See also, “South African Union Refuses to Unload Chinese Arms Headed for Zimbabwe,” *Reuters*, April 18, 2008.

³⁷ “China Presses Sudan Over Darfur,” *Reuters*, *New York Times*, Asia-Pacific, June 12, 2008.

³⁸ Adekeye Adebajo, “An Axis of Evil? China, the United States, and France in Africa,” Ampiah and Naidu (Ed), *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon? Africa and China*, Scottsville SA: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2008.

³⁹ Elliott P. Skinner, *African Americans and U.S. Policy Toward Africa, 1850-1924: In Defense of Black Nationality*, Washington DC: Howard University Press, 1992.

and conflict resolution achievements of previous U.S. administrations,⁴⁰ and hopefully the President will rally support for Western countries to make good on the promises of aid for poverty reduction that the Make Poverty History/One campaigns exacted in 2005.⁴¹ Certainly, his administration will have to rethink and refocus many of Bush's policies, but as they do so they will be challenged to convey as strong a personal interest in Africa did President Bush. President Kikwete of Tanzania, who benefited from trade and investment supports from the U.S., has been quoted as advising President Obama to: "be as good a friend of Africa as President Bush has been."⁴²

It is possible that American and the Francophone directions will converge on some African issues, given growing symbolic and formal pressures from new constituents. There is a growing American sense that we got it wrong in Iraq between 2003 and 2007, so the Obama Administration's policies are likely to be more sensitive to conditions on the ground in Africa, utilize more subtle and sustained diplomacy in dealing with difficult situations like Darfur and Zimbabwe or DRC. As a result of the 2007/8 American election mobilization, there will be a broader range of groups within civil society voicing opinions about what our Africa policies should be, and it will require a greater responsiveness of government to the public. But will the same be true in France and in the wider EU community over the next few years? Balancing the formal and public diplomacy and the official and unofficial policymaking will be an exciting yet challenging process.

Security and Governance Transitions in West Africa

If foreign policy periodically recalibrates with realities on the ground, then the American and French security and governance relationships with Africa should become less militarized and more focused on human security⁴³ during the terms of President Obama and the EU Presidencies of France and Czechoslovakia. With few exceptions, over the last decade West Africa has moved away from the crises of the immediate post-cold war period, and has demonstrated excellent ECOWAS regional collaboration in conflict resolution, national rebuilding of state institutions after civil war and regional collaboration on oil and gas projects with support from international financial institutions. Even within the successes, it is possible to see the problems that African states have experienced in finding the resources necessary to face the military/security challenges posed by civil war and rebel action, to deal with the difficulties of balanced 'nation-building' after conflicts end, to protect and empower women, to rebuild agricultural and trade economies so that poverty reduction and food security are achieved, and then to deal with the burden of HIV/AIDS at all levels.

Let us remember that in the area of peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and conflict resolution West African neighbors to Liberia and Sierra Leone have often had their hearts in the right places, and enthusiastically supported peace dialogues, negotiations, and agreements. However, African leaders (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, ECOWAS as well as the

⁴⁰ "Obama Presidency Would Bring New Dimension to Africa Policy; Africa Specialist Howard Wolpe discusses future of U.S.-Africa relations,"

[<http://www.america.gov/st/elections08-english/2008/October/20081022083943WCyeroCO.2450067.html>].

⁴¹ Giles Bolton, "Make Them Pay: What They Promised and By When," in *Africa Doesn't Matter: How the West has failed the Poorest Continent and What We can do about It*, NY: Arcade Publishers, 2008:156-7.

⁴² Bush Confronts Africa Policy Critics," AFP, Sunday February 17, 2008. http://rawstory.com/news/afp/Bush_confronts_Africa_policy_critic_02172008.html

⁴³ Kofi A. Annan, *In Larger Freedom: Toward Development, Security, and Human Rights for All*. United Nations, March 2005. See also, *Human Security in Africa*, Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA), United Nations, Dec. 2005 [<http://www.un.org/africa/osaa/reports/Human%20Security%20in%20Africa%20FINAL.pdf>]. See also, African Human Security Initiative 2: *Enhancing the Delivery of Security in Africa: Complementing the African Peer Review Mechanism*, London: DFID, [<http://www.africanreview.org/>].

OAU) generally lacked sufficient tactical/political strength and economic resources to handle the peace processes alone, and reliance on the regional hegemon (Nigeria) proved inadequate. The emphasis must always be on African ownership of peace processes. Yet, the West African experiences highlight questions about the kinds of bilateral and multilateral (UN) commitments that are essential to make African peace missions really work. Therefore, two examples and sets of suggestions are contained here – one about peace processes, and the other about collaboration on civil-military relations in Africa.

The goal of AU Standby Forces to rapidly move to an emerging crisis must be addressed, because clearly the African Union has the desire to deal with African conflicts, but lacks the financial and logistical capacity to do so. Throughout the 1990s, Americans were largely unwilling to put ‘boots on the ground’ to help stop the fighting. Many professed distrust that the UN was able to handle the funding and the execution of peace missions, and they did not lobby Congress or the State Department to obtain additional funds and support for these missions. Conflicts were lengthened as a consequence, and the Liberian and Sierra Leonean people paid an enormous price in lives and social capital.

But Western countries all have different capacities and strengths which can be joined with African strengths. In Darfur and DRC for example, some can supply tanks, and others can supply troops, others can provide training, and others can supply operational funds. The lesson is that the US, France, the Netherlands, Germany, Canada, and the UK among others, must provide coordinated and engaged support to African states in military retraining and capacity building. We must find innovative ways to help support the African Union and regional initiatives in peace missions, and must be enthusiastic cheerleaders for multinational support within the General Assembly of the UN.

In the Liberian and Sierra Leonean conflicts, Nigeria bore the brunt—providing the largest numbers of troops as well as the financial burden of payment for soldiers and equipment.⁴⁴ After President Obasanjo’s election in 1999, Nigerians were unwilling and unable to go further without Western support of the process, and Nigeria withdrew from ECOMOG and UNOMSIL in Sierra Leone in May 2000. Just as in Liberia with UNOMIL, the Sierra Leonean UNOMSIL mission was too small and unarmed with only a Chapter VI mandate, rendering it unable to stop the re-entry of rebel forces into Freetown in January 1999. Olonisakin says that although Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the U.S. – in that order—provided some funding for the new UNAMSIL mission, initially it was inadequate.⁴⁵ While UNAMSIL could not function without Nigerian troops and influence or without Chapter VI authorization to use force, it also could not have pushed the Rebels out of Freetown without the bilateral IMATT troops supplied by the UK. UNAMSIL alone could not have conducted the negotiations that led to the Nigerian facilitated Abuja agreement; nor could it have won the ‘hearts and minds’ of Sierra Leoneans without the humanitarian initiatives that were grafted onto the original UNAMSIL mission in 2000.

Only in 2000, under the new leadership provided by Sir Jeremy Greenstock of the UK, and the engagement of the new US Permanent Representative to the UN Richard Holbrooke did we see a major shift. Holbrooke’s efforts led to a change of heart within the American Congress on UN funding for UN-DPKO Africa missions, increased support within the UN Security Council for the Sierra Leonean peace mission, and the expansion of UNAMSIL troop strength to 17,500 spread over much of the country. UNAMSIL became a model of what effective peacekeeping could be, although its reputation also suffered from accusation of child and female exploitation by UN troops.

⁴⁴ Margaret A. Vogt (Ed), *The Liberian Crisis and ECOMOG: A Bold Attempt at Regional Peace Keeping*, Lagos: Gabumo Publishing Co, 1992. See George Klay Kieh, *Ending the Liberian Civil War: Implications for United States Policy Toward West Africa*, Washington DC: TransAfrica Forum, 1996.

⁴⁵ Funmi Olonisakin, *Peacekeeping in Sierra Leone: The Story of UNAMSIL*, NY: International Peace Academy, 2008.

But there is also another story here, about the Security Council's initiative in creating a joint UN-Sierra Leone Special Court—which did not have Chapter VII authorization-- to try cases of war crimes and crimes against humanity, exactly two years before Sierra Leone established the Truth and Reconciliation process (TRC-2002) outlined at the Lome Agreement of 1999. Many Sierra Leoneans angrily pointed out that the Special Court was a creation of the UN Security Council and General Assembly in which American influence was pronounced or that it appeared to contravene the Constitution of Sierra Leone,⁴⁶ while the TRC grew out of Sierra Leonean and African negotiations and agreements. Conflict also ensued from the fact that the Special Court could hand down indictments and sentences – some of which punished lower level persons more than those higher up, some of which threatened to reignite conflict within the country, and some of which contradicted understandings that Africans on the ground had about justice and penalties (as in the transfer of Charles Taylor from Nigeria to the Special Court, and then to the Hague).

The above example demonstrates that national advocacy for African peace and justice processes can have an enormous impact on the ground, but we must make sure that it is overwhelmingly positive. Only when Holbrooke succeeded in engaging the Americans with the UN peace issues did we see effective movement forward. The issue is whether such advocacy, welcomed and potentially productive as it might be, is also calibrated to work well with African derived institutions and processes for peace and justice, and with Security Council Resolution 1325 of 2000, which African women representatives worked hard to bring to fruition.⁴⁷ As we contemplate working more in tandem over the coming years, it would stand us in good stead to seek out information on what the Africans themselves have in mind, what institutions and agreements of their construction are already in operation, and how bilateral or multilateral activism could increase the effectiveness of consensus approaches.

Where does military preparedness to prevent terrorism clash with the concern for supporting positive democratic civil-military relations in Africa? Americans remember that in 1996, while on an Africa tour Secretary of State Warren Christopher was roundly criticized by the Africans for proposing the creation of an African Crisis Response Force, which could be used by the OAU to respond to humanitarian needs during crises or assaults on states and citizens.⁴⁸ Such a force was never created, but by 1997, the African Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI) had been created within the U.S. State Department, with the mission of helping to “train African militaries to respond effectively to peacekeeping or humanitarian relief operations on the Continent. Deployment of ACRI-trained troops is a sovereign decision of the ACRI partner in response to requests from international political entities such as the United Nations or the Organization of African Unity or a sub-regional organization such as the Economic Community of West African States.”⁴⁹

With ACRI training countries like Ghana and Mali sent their trained troops to Sierra Leone as part of the ECOWAS peacekeeping force, Senegalese troops were engaged under the UN program to be sent to the Central African Republic, and many other countries developed training and follow-on capacities through this program. However, in 2004, ACRI was transformed into ACOTA, which tailored programs to individual African country needs. In all these efforts, ACRI And ACOTA made significant contributions to peacekeeping.

⁴⁶ Abdul Karim Bangura, Sami Gandi-Gorgla, and Abdul Razak Rahim, “An Appeal to Discontinue Funding the Special Court for Sierra Leone,” and “An Open Letter to Sierra Leone’s Parliamentarians,” The Sierra Leone Working Group, 2004.

⁴⁷ Gwendolyn Mikell, Jeanne Maddox Toungara, and Vivian Lowery Derryck, *Empowerment of Women in Africa: Gender Equality and Women's Leadership*, British Embassy and DFID Policy Paper, April 2008. See also, Gwendolyn Mikell, *African Feminism: The Politics of Survival in Sub-Saharan Africa*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.

⁴⁸ Newsmaker: Warren Christopher, *Lehrer News Hour*, October 15, 1996;

⁴⁹ “African Crisis Response Initiative; African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance,” *Global Security.Org*, Military. <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/agency/dod/acri.htm>.

The preoccupation with global terrorism, and generalized anxiety about the consequences of the Iraq War, have left a legacy that the US and France will have to deal with in the coming period. For example, Pham described AFRICOM as partially premised on “America’s strategic interest in preventing Africa’s poorly governed spaces from being exploited... by Islamic terrorists.” Relatively few people understood the objectives of the initiative, and military leaders themselves had not sufficiently thought through AFRICOM’s mission, responsibilities, location, its relationship to African militaries, as well as relationship to civil society both African and American.⁵⁰ The African Union, following the lead of its regional giants Nigeria, South Africa, and Egypt, voiced the AU’s rejection of an AFRICOM base in any country on African soil. Ghana’s president John Kufour spoke up to say that his country would not allow an AFRICOM base there. Thus, Liberia’s president Ellen Sirleaf-Johnson and Ethiopia’s president Lucha were the only two Heads of State to extend a welcome and a request the base.

In the initial hysteria, many Africans saw this as a neo-colonial American power play, in much the same way as some the Linas-Marcousis Accords emerging from the Roundtable convened by France in January 2003, which was reputed to have challenged Cote d’Ivoire’s constitutional sovereignty before the UN intervened.⁵¹ For the most part, they did not understand that AFRICOM was primarily a replication of the US regional commands that existed for other parts of the world, and would consolidate resources not scattered across various agencies. Although it would indeed have a combatant function, AFRICOM officials have emphasized that it would be unique, in that it would respond primarily to the humanitarian and development needs in addition to security ones. In this process, the U.S. military learned an important lesson – the need to engage in public relations campaigns, civic education, and the exchange of ideas about policy initiatives in a systematic and thorough way, with many civil society groups and constituencies, before, during, and after policy implementation.

Important governance questions grow out of the dialogue about security engagement with Africa: how much room is there for civil-military relations training that broadly connect the military and civilian constituencies in dialogue – a dialogue that explicitly links governance and military preparedness issues? The professionalization of the African military in African countries has been a concern for U.S. policy makers for some time, and civilian oversight of the military is critical to this process.⁵² It is important to note that both the U.S. and France have evolved their own institutional processes for dealing with the military institutions in Africa, especially in terms of education and training. Although many conflicts have ended, and more countries have gotten aboard the democratic bandwagon, the legacy of military rule lingers often lingers on in the form of weakened state institutions in comparison to the military, the persistence of a militarized and gendered culture.

It was a pleasant surprise when, in 1999 through initiatives and financing from the Pentagon and the Department of Defense, the Africa Center for Strategic Studies (ACSS) was created to provide training senior seminars for military leaders and members of civil society organizations in countries undergoing democratic transitions. Between 2000 and 2006, ACSS functioned with a mix of military and civilian employees, American, African, Anglophone and Francophone. However, gradually the pressure was felt to pull ACSS more fully into the military orbit, house it on the campus of the National Defense University, and to provide it with senior military leadership and oversight. By 2008, the mission of ACSS had evolved in a direction that

⁵⁰ Gwendolyn Mikell, “Academics and the Security Sector: Issues and Concerns,” Presentation at the ACSS/AFRICOM Seminar, Dulles VA, June 12, 2008.

⁵¹ J. Peter Pham, “Forgotten Interests: Why Cote d’Ivoire Matters,” *World Defense Review*, 3 August 2006. See also, J. Peter Pham, AFRICOM: Ready to Roll, October 2, 2008 [website http://www.familysecuritymatters.org/publications/id.1340/pub_detail.asp]. See also “AFRICOM: The Poisonous Fruit of the Mercy Industrial Complex,” *The Zaleza Post*, November 15, 2007.

⁵² Claude E. Welch, *No Farewell to Arms? Military Disengagement from Politics in Africa and Latin America*, Boulder CO: Westview Press, 1987; and *Military Role and Rule: Perspectives on Civil-Military Relations*, North Scituate MA: Duxbury Press, 1974.

aligned it with national security – one which placed the countering of ideological support for terrorism as primary, followed by harmonizing views on security challenges, promoting institutional partnerships to address fundamental defense and security challenges facing Africa. Education on the role of security in civil societies has now become a distant fifth priority.⁵³ Even so, there is still room for engagements with Africans and Americans that would help demystify the security developments in Africa today, and that would engender multinational dialogues on human security. Given that civilian dialogues are occurring across the Anglophone/Francophone areas on human security issues, this would appear to be an arena in which collaboration between the French and the Americans could usefully occur.

Governance issues loom large now. Intrastate ethnic and religious tensions bridge the security and governance concerns, and generally arise out of a sense of historical inequities or marginalization. Africans have pointed out that in the post-Cold War and globalization period, some quite contentious intra-state dynamics have occurred. At their worst, they yielded Rwanda and Burundi type genocidal crises. But for the most part, they have manifested as ethnic/religious conflicts (Cote d'Ivoire, Sudan, Chad), constitutional issues related to term limits (Nigeria, Ghana), and what I have called 'ethnic entrepreneurs' who sought to capture power and destabilize fragile or emerging democracies (Liberia, Sierra Leone).⁵⁴

As the conflicts subside, African countries have attempted to address the need for institutions and processes that serve as early-warning signals of impending conflicts or that could have prevented the conflicts, but the resources to handle this are often hard to come by. One Ghanaian institution—CHRAJ—serves as an example of this anticipatory function: Ghana's Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAJ) works to enhance good governance, democracy, respect for human rights, and transparency, and tries to head-off conflicts before they explode.⁵⁵ CHRAJ is sharing its conflict resolution experience with other ECOWAS countries. In other countries, African Parliamentarians for Peace have strategized about how to marshal constituencies to resolve the conflicts. This is an arena ripe for action, and for Americans and French, the relevant issues might be how to provide critical resources and support in a way that also enhances local ownership and initiative. There must be a rational division of labor that transcends the former Anglophone/Francophone or Lusophone divides, that emphasizes multilateral initiatives, and that acknowledge the important roles that China could play in regional collaborations.

The African Elders who chair the Mo Ibrahim Prize for Achievement in African Leadership mark a new level of seriousness in governance advocacy. The message is being conveyed that good governance is the wave of the future.⁵⁶ Therefore, the issue of uneven democratic development across Africa demands attention in any Anglo-Francophone collaborations, and leaders who set high standards must be recognized. Clearly, Sub-Saharan African states are still in their infancy, and thus, do not yet have the institutional, constitutional, and processual strengths of older western states. Recent evidence suggests that African democracies that made great strides in the last decade still are vulnerable to internal schisms and political upheavals—Nigeria, South Africa, and Kenya, for example.

The U.S. has poured significant resources into democracy-support and institution-building in Africa, especially through the National Democratic Institute and the International Republican Institute that work with Parliament, the Judiciary, and the police forces. In Nigeria, unsuccessful efforts to secure a third term for the President, and the determination of his party to

⁵³ Africa Center for Strategic Studies, Programs – October 2008 to September 2009, [www.africacenter.org].

⁵⁴ Gwendolyn Mikell, "Ethnic Particularism and New State Legitimacy in West Africa," *Tulsa Journal of Comparative and International Law*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 1997.

⁵⁵ "Ghana: CHRAJ calls for Tolerance as Election Day Approaches," *Africa Mail*, 19 November 2008. See also, Ghana Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice website.

⁵⁶ Celia Drugger, "Botswana's Former President Wins Prize for Good Governance," *Herald Tribune*, October 21, 2008; "Joaquim Chissano Wins the Largest Prize in the World," *Southern Africa Trust*, 22 October 2007; Celia Drugger,

retain power, threatened to derail the democratic transition; and only the emboldened Nigerian civil society and a tough international community push-back prevented a conflagration. The electoral transition in Kenya threatened to explode into violence, and had already generated ethnic clashes that produced internally displaced populations and refugees spilling out into surrounding countries. Only through the invitation of the African Union, and the committed engagement of former Secretary General Kofi Annan and other Western partners did a negotiated settlement to the conflict emerge. To the surprise of many, the rancor within South Africa's African National Congress between President Mbeki and Prime Minister Zuma which burst into conflict in 2008 suggested that there was much work to be done behind the scenes to make sure that the Presidential transition next year stays on track.

Support for democratic transitions in relatively stable African countries as well as weak states needs to rank high on the agenda of any partnership. Even Ghana, where four relatively successful democratic elections have been held since 1992, threatened to flounder on the shoals of party and presidential privilege this year, when the possibilities of a transfer of power to a new party emerged. Only systematic dialogue through Ghana's public and civil society organizations, pressure and support from Western partners, and systematic monitoring seemingly kept the election on track. Of course, there is the category of ethnically fractious or unconsolidated states in the Horn of Africa (Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, and Zimbabwe), that are struggling to evolve approaches to democracy that are tailored to their ethno-histories. Zimbabwe is sorely in need of focused and subtle western consensus and strategizing, in order to off-set the heightened tension that Mugabe has fostered about Western intentions. The problem of how to deal with 'ungoverned spaces' such as Somalia is a thorny one, and the U.S. has devoted significant resources to its Horn of Africa initiative, with modest results.⁵⁷ Since neither the Americans nor the French have been overwhelmingly successful in their attempts to deal with this later group, this is an area upon which combined attention needs to be focused.

Recommendations

While this analysis did not seek to cover the entire waterfront of African policy issues of importance, it has been focused on some of the more significant challenges related to bilateral policies, strategic players in Africa, and selective security and governance transitions in Africa. The need for in-depth conversations between the U.S. and the French on Africa policy on these issues are obvious. As a consequence of the discussion above, the following broad issue areas are identified for possible cooperation and collaborations:

- Overview: Past, Present, and Future: What existing African development policies like AGOA or the Millennium Challenge Corporation should President Obama continue and expand, and what new initiatives demand attention?
- Overview: What are areas of French strength in development which they could bring to American/French collaboration in Africa?
- Strategic Players in Africa: How can Americans and the French enlist greater Chinese engagement and dialogue on the links between trade, resources and conflicts?
- Special courts and TRC processes: Using Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and Darfur as examples, how can the U.S., France, and the EU help make them more responsive to local ownership, more gender sensitive, and derived from local initiatives?
- African Peace Missions: What would it take for the U.S. and France to be more collaborative within the UN Security Council on peace issues, and therefore more supportive of

⁵⁷ James Swan (Deputy Asst Secretary for African Affairs), "U.S. Policy in the Horn of Africa," U.S. Department of State, August 4, 2007. See also, James Butty, Interview with Terrence Lyons, "Avoiding Conflict in the Horn of Africa," *VOA News*, 22 December 2006.

multilateral peace mission in Africa? What divisions of labor could make such collaborations more effective?

- US/French military training and support in Africa: What interesting mechanisms for collaboration exist—ACOTA? ACSS? Others? How might these incorporate concerns for civil-military relations and for human security writ large?
- US/French military commands: What are the best ways to engage a broad African public about concerns related to military commands; and to educate about these initiatives? How do we educate Western publics about these issues?
- Governance issues: What mechanisms for intra-state conflict resolution would be of interest to Congress and the EU Parliaments? The Chinese?
- Governance issues: What additional supports for democratic institutions, for monitoring leadership performance, and for political party education and development could be pursued across Africa? How can the U.S., France, and the EU work collaboratively on this?

Biographies

- **Nathalie DELAPALME**

Nathalie Delapalme est diplômée de l'IEP (Institut d'études politiques) de Paris et titulaire d'un DEA (diplôme d'études approfondies) en économie. Conseiller des services du Sénat, elle a effectué une partie de sa carrière à la Commission des finances, du budget et des comptes publics du Sénat, où elle a notamment suivi les secteurs de l'aide au développement, des Affaires étrangères et de la Défense. Elle a été conseiller pour l'Afrique de plusieurs ministres des Affaires étrangères et en charge de la coopération (conseiller de Dominique de Villepin, Michel Barnier, Philippe Douste-Blazy, Pierre-André Wiltzer et Xavier Darcos). Elle est actuellement Inspecteur général des Finances. Elle est membre du conseil de rédaction de la revue *Commentaire* et membre du conseil d'administration des fondations Elle, Mo Ibrahim et d'Agrisud. Elle a publié, dans les *Notes de la Fondation Robert Schuman*, avec Élise Colette, « Union européenne/Afrique : un partenariat stratégique » (décembre 2007).

- **Gwendolyn MIKELL**

Gwendolyn Mikell is Professor of Anthropology and Foreign Service at Georgetown University. She was the Director of the African Studies Program in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown; and Senior Fellow in African Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. Her research and writing have been focused on political and economic transitions in Africa, and on gender and peace building during African transitions. She has held a number of prestigious positions, including President of the African Studies Association, and fellowships at the U.S. Institute of Peace, the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, the Smithsonian Museum of African Art, the Institute for Developing Economies in Tokyo, the Institute of African Studies at the University of Ghana-Legon, and the Univ. of Natal in South Africa. Currently, she is completing a book manuscript on African women and peace. Her books include *Cocoa and Chaos in Ghana* (Howard University Press, 1992; Paragon Press, 1989) and *African Feminism: The Politics of Survival in Sub-Saharan Africa* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2005; 1997). Her recent articles are in such journals as the *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* (2005), *Encyclopedia on Women and Islamic Cultures* (2005), *SOULS* (2004), *Chimera* (2003), etc. She holds a B.A. in Sociology from the University of Chicago, and the M.A. and Ph.D. in Anthropology from Columbia University.

Présentation du Center for Transatlantic Relations et de la Fondation Robert Schuman

▪ Center for Transatlantic Relations

The Center for Transatlantic Relations has sponsored several activities related to U.S.-French relations including strong cooperation with the Fondation Robert Schuman. For example, in 2004 the Fondation published the French translation of Joe Quinlan's CTR monograph as *Dérive ou rapprochement? La Prééminence de l'économie transatlantique*. We co-hosted a conference in 2005 that resulting in the publication of the widely-distributed volume *Changing Identities and Evolving Values: Is There Still a Transatlantic Community?*

In 2003, SAIS hosted French Ambassador Jean-David Levitte for a public address. In 2005, CTR hosted Defense Minister Michèle Alliot-Marie also for a public address. CTR hosts an annual symposium with faculty from SAIS and the Sorbonne. CTR has co-sponsored two conferences and a book project with Professor Serge Sur and Université Paris II.

CTR regularly engages senior officials, opinion-shapers and experts, diplomats and the media. CTR serves the secretariat assisting the Congressional Caucus on the European Union (for Members of Congress) and the Congressional Staff Roundtable on the European Union (for congressional staff).

▪ Fondation Robert Schuman

Créée en 1991, reconnue d'utilité publique, la Fondation Robert Schuman est devenue une référence en matière d'information européenne en France, en Europe et dans le monde. Principal centre de recherches français sur l'Europe, la Fondation provoque et stimule le débat européen par la richesse et la qualité de ses publications. Son indépendance lui permet de traiter les sujets d'actualité européenne de manière approfondie et objective. Ses études et analyses sur l'Union européenne et ses politiques apportent aux décideurs des arguments et des éléments de réflexion. Vecteur permanent d'informations, elle propose des documents électroniques uniques : une Lettre hebdomadaire (+ 200 000 abonnés, 5 langues), des « policy papers : Question d'Europe », et un Observatoire des élections en Europe.

The Robert Schuman Foundation, created in 1991 and acknowledged by State decree, promotes the construction of Europe and publishes studies on the EU and its policies. It has become the principal institution in this field not only in France but also across Europe and indeed worldwide. The Foundation is distinguished by the quality of its publications and its numerous contributions. Its independence allows it to address topical subjects in a detailed and objective manner. Its studies and analyses provide decision-makers with arguments and insights that are highly esteemed for their concrete utility and scientific quality. Its website provides a wide range of electronic documents: a weekly newsletter (5 languages, 200,000 subscribers), policy papers called 'Question d'Europe', and the 'European Election Monitor'.

Center for Transatlantic Relations
The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced
International Studies (SAIS)
The Johns Hopkins University
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: +1 202-663-5880
<http://transatlantic.sais-jhu.edu/>

Fondation Robert Schuman
29, bd Raspail - F-75007 Paris
Tel : +33 1 53 63 83 00
Rond-Point Schuman 6 / Schumanplein 6
B-1040 Bruxelles / B-1040 Brussel
Tel : +32 2 234 78 26
<http://www.robert-schuman.eu>