The diversity and complexity of today's African security environment present unique challenges to both the U.S. government policymaker and the intelligence officer. While incidents of state-on-state conflict have steadily declined since the end of the Cold War, the continent's ungoverned and under-governed spaces have been exploited by some of the world's most potent transnational terrorist and criminal groups, challenging Africa's security forces and their international partners. Meanwhile, internal unrest in South Sudan, the Central African Republic, and elsewhere threatens to destabilize whole regions of the continent, increasing the potential for mass atrocities and requirements for humanitarian assistance.

Senior policymakers have increasingly taken a deeper, more strategic, and more proactive approach to the continent. The 2007 establishment of U.S. Africa Command and 2012 publication of the Presidential Policy Directive on sub-Saharan Africa underscore this important shift, and the August 2014 U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit highlights the White House's commitment to deeper engagement.

Continued on Page 30
Letter from the President

The National Intelligence University: The Center of Academic Life for the Intelligence Community

By Dr. David R. Ellison, Rear Admiral, United States Navy (Ret.), President, National Intelligence University

This is an exciting time for the National Intelligence University (NIU), as it begins its second half-century with deep roots and a bright future. Established in 1962, the institution has grown in stature and impact over the years, with a mission, curriculum, and student body that have evolved to meet the increasingly complex challenges to the national security of the United States.

Building on more than 50 years of experience delivering rigorous academic programs, NIU today provides career professionals with a rigorous and collaborative joint-learning environment to develop critical thinking and analytical skills, conduct research on real-world problems, and build trust and mutual understanding that will last a lifetime. Its three degree programs—the Master of Science of Strategic Intelligence, the Master of Science and Technology Intelligence, and the Bachelor of Science in Intelligence—are augmented by a growing number of graduate certificates on specialized topics.

In addition to the main campus in Washington, DC, NIU now boasts five academic centers, including the Southern Academic Center in Tampa, Florida, and the European Academic Center at RAF Molesworth in the United Kingdom. The student body has grown to include more than 700 current students from across the U.S. intelligence and national security communities, taught by 149 highly qualified full- and part-time faculty members.

I invite you to explore the National Intelligence University website (www.ni-u.edu). You will find a broad and rigorous curriculum, as well as a growing research program focused on some of the toughest national security challenges.

One of the most exciting developments in recent years has been the expansion of NIU contributions to the literature of intelligence and scholarly research conducted by the Center for Strategic Intelligence Research (CSIR). The newsletter you are reading now is one of the results of that expansion. It grows out of NIU's new Africa Research Initiative, an effort to harness NIU's research capabilities by both conducting research on security issues related to sub-Saharan Africa and reaching out to academic expertise for support with difficult analytic challenges on the continent. This combination of research conducted on behalf of the Intelligence Community with outreach to academia successfully leverages the strengths of both by bringing in important scholarly voices to official discussions on global security.

The research featured in this newsletter also resonates well in the classroom. It exposes students to cutting-edge work conducted by top-flight scholars in academia and the Intelligence Community. Ultimately, research like this will inform policy and analysis, as NIU’s students go on to serve the United States in a wide variety of positions in the military and civilian agencies.

In addition, NIU takes very seriously its mission of contributing its own scholarly research on key regions and issues. NIU faculty members produce, publish, and present a broad and diverse array of research, including work on Africa, the Middle East, Central and South Asia, cyber issues, and science and technology. Much of the research NIU produces has made a positive contribution to intelligence, national security, and policymaking circles.

My vision for NIU is to serve as the center of academic life for the Intelligence Community. In this position, it can encourage, develop, and promote the natural analytic ties between academia and the Intelligence Community. In my experience, IC personnel derive great benefit from the tremendous subject matter expertise found in academia, and promoting ties between the two is in the best interests of the nation as a whole. NIU therefore serves many purposes. It provides a first-class education to U.S. Intelligence Community personnel, fosters and encourages top-flight research on national and global security issues, and forges connections to academia by reaching out to universities around the country and the world. This is indeed an exciting time for the university.
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War and Conflict in Africa

By Dr. Paul D. Williams, Associate Professor of
International Affairs, George Washington University,
pauldw@gwu.edu

Between 1990 and 2009, Africa experienced nearly 400
armed conflicts, a majority of them fought between
different types of non-state actors. My book War and
Conflict in Africa (Polity, 2011) tried to understand why
the continent experienced so many armed conflicts after
the Cold War and the limitations of international efforts
to try to bring those conflicts to an end.

Unfortunately, the goal of ending Africa’s wars was often
hobbled from the start by the prevalence of simplistic
and unhelpful descriptions of what was happening. Too
often, Africa’s conflicts were depicted as an inexplicable
and exotic blend of modern technology and pre-modern
barbarism. Instead, my book’s central argument was that
the nature of armed conflict in Africa grew out of the
continent’s state-society relations and the particular
dynamics associated with the politics of regime survival.
Specifically, regime survival strategies often provided the
crucial intersection between local political dynamics and
international networks, structures and processes. Partic-
ularly when a regime’s legitimacy was challenged, these
strategies frequently involved government actors instru-
mentalizing disorder and using violence to assert author-
ity. This is how many of Africa’s wars owe a great deal to
the combustible mix of state institutions that struggled to
maintain legitimacy among the domestic population and
the political strategies of regimes seeking to preserve
their privileged status within this context.

Popular Myths about Africa’s Wars

Analysts—both inside and outside Africa—have often
reduced the complexity of the continent’s wars to a single
issue or binary problems. Among the most common of
these “big ideas” has been a tendency to blame Africa’s
wars on colonialism, postcolonial elites, ethnicity, and
greedy criminals.
Especially within Africa, colonialism is often identified as the root cause of the continent’s contemporary conflicts. The usual mechanisms of colonial responsibility are said to be the favoring of particular local groups over others and the drawing of arbitrary borders that forced different peoples to live together—or split similar peoples apart—thus sowing the seeds of discord and exacerbating the likelihood of war. The basic problem with this argument is that, while colonialism is an important underlying factor, it is not a principal trigger of contemporary conflicts. Colonialism certainly represents a piece of Africa’s war puzzle, but as an explanation for the continent’s contemporary conflicts, it is flimsy. Not only was colonialism far from monolithic in both its practices and legacies, but significant portions of postcolonial Africa (and elsewhere) have remained free from armed conflicts. Moreover, it does not explain why the 1980s and 1990s in particular proved to be such devastating decades for the continent. Finally, it almost entirely eliminates African agency and responsibility from wars fought predominantly by Africans.

At the opposite end of the colonial responsibility spectrum, Africa’s postcolonial ruling elites have taken most of the blame for the continent’s contemporary wars. Tony Blair’s Commission for Africa (2005), for example, suggested that Africa’s fundamental problem was its lack of “good governance”—the polite way of saying that peace would require stamping out the continent’s “big man culture” that was the root cause of its wars and underdevelopment. Other variants of this view suggested that neighboring regimes and diasporas were often more responsible for Africa’s contemporary conflicts than were the former colonial powers. While this perspective brought African agency back in, its focus on local triggers downplayed the international forces and structures that increased the risks of war on the continent, such as the global trade in conflict goods, transnational ideologies of Islamic extremism, the deeply divisive policies promoted by international financial institutions, and the practice of adopting international business as usual with what Robert Jackson famously described as “quasi-states”—those political entities granted juridical sovereignty despite their lack of domestic legitimacy.

A third big idea was that, in Africa, “ethnicity kills.” This perspective suggested that Africa’s wars were basically tribal conflicts fought between competing ethnic groups. This tended to appear in two main varieties: the “ethnic hatreds” and the “ethnic fears” perspectives. The former suggested that hatred of different ethnic groups persisted over generations but remained dormant or simmered until something triggered an explosion of mass violence against the hated group. In the second variant, political leaders and other elites stoked mass fear of some ethnic “other” using media, organized riots, arbitrary arrests, etc., in order to further their political agendas. The ensuing insecurity dilemma pushed ordinary people to react violently.

A fourth popular explanation for Africa’s wars put the blame squarely on greedy warlords. Championed by a group of economists associated with the World Bank, this approach argued that civil wars were caused either by political grievances or by economic opportunities, and, since grievances were virtually omnipresent in Africa but civil wars were not, the answer must lie on the economic/greed side of the equation. Africa’s wars were therefore blamed on greedy criminals—indeed, insurgency itself was conceptualized as being like any other criminal activity, except that it was rarer than petty theft because of the greater risks and the significant start-up costs incurred. This “greed thesis” was popular with some policymakers, but it too suffered from many serious problems. Perhaps its most fundamental errors, beyond reliance on dubious proxies, were to suggest that the study of the causes of war was synonymous with the study of individual motivations and that greed and grievance were clearly separable categories when, in fact, there has never been such a thing as an apolitical war.

**Africa’s War Recipes**

In light of these points, it would be better to discard these mythical “big ideas” about the principal cause of Africa’s wars and instead think about the many different recipes for making wars and the multiple ingredients that go into them. Thinking of warfare in culinary terms may sound odd, but the metaphor is useful for several reasons. First, wars are complex social systems and, like particular dishes, comprise multiple ingredients. Second, because the ingredients can be combined in a variety of different ways, recipes, like wars, do not always turn out as planned, and, as with wars, it pays to have the correct instruments at hand at the right time. Third, like wars, recipes do not make themselves—there must be cooks, and it is important to know whether one is
dealing with a novice or a master chef. As any beginner in the kitchen will testify, a list of ingredients is little use without details about the proportions, preparation techniques, and cooking instructions, through which separate items should be combined to produce the dish in question. So it is with the causes of war. Moreover, there is always the scope to develop new twists on old recipes or invent new dishes, just as humans have proved inventive at finding different things to fight about.

When trying to understand why Africa experienced so many armed conflicts after the Cold War, analysis quickly runs into the perennial philosophical headache of how the specific ingredients were combined to produce a particular war recipe; or, in more conceptual terms, how to combine general ideas about the underlying conditions that increase the likelihood of warfare with more specific trigger factors that sparked a particular war. The answer lies in using insights from quantitative and qualitative research. Conceptual frameworks that aim to explain warfare in general and the more sophisticated quantitative approaches are good at providing clues about how best to narrow down the list of ingredients that played important roles across a variety of Africa's armed conflicts. On their own, however, general frameworks risk downplaying or ignoring local nuances and idiosyncrasies, while quantitative studies are built on unreliable foundations and are open to widely different interpretations of the data. Consequently, a sophisticated understanding of one of Africa's particular war recipes requires the analyst to move beyond the abstract level to more historical and sociological forms of study.

War and Conflict in Africa focused on five of the most widely debated ingredients that were said to have played significant roles in many of Africa's war recipes: governance, resources, sovereignty, ethnicity, and religion. Based on my survey of these ingredients between 1990 and 2009, I argued that, at the abstract level, analysts interested in understanding why Africa's wars break out would do well to initially focus their attention on the dynamics within the continent's neopatrimonial regimes, the political struggles related to issues of sovereignty and self-determination, and the manipulation of ethnic identities by political elites. I argued that analysts should be more skeptical about viewing so-called “natural” resources and religion as principal ingredients in the outbreak of Africa's wars.

If there is a thread that links Africa's conflict dynamics during the two decades after the Cold War, I suggested that it could be found in the nature of the continent's state-society complexes, especially the dynamics associated with the politics of regime survival in weak states. It is my sense that the political strategies pursued by regimes to maintain their privileged status provided the critical link between important local-level dynamics and the various regional and globalizing networks, structures, and processes that influence behavior in Africa's war zones. When their status and legitimacy were directly threatened, the tendency for regimes to respond by instrumentalizing disorder and using violence to try to restore their authority only exacerbated the risks of war. Once armed conflict began, these same dynamics often prevented rebels from being comprehensively defeated, and encouraged plunder and the manipulation of extreme ethnic and/or religious bigotry to marshal support. Discriminatory and oppressive systems of governance that lacked effective means of resolving conflicts without resorting to violence were thus an important ingredient in every one of Africa's wars.

Ending Africa's Wars

This insight also has important consequences for attempts to bring an end to Africa's wars. First, it suggests that far too much faith has been invested in the healing powers of either peacekeeping operations or development policies. While both instruments have their uses, neither proved capable of transforming political dynamics within neopatrimonial regimes, persuading the belligerents of the merits of abiding by humanitarian principles, or pursuing genuinely national development policies.

Similarly, the top-down peacemaking of elite bargains will not offer any quick fixes. Indeed, most international mediation efforts ended up having to embrace patronage politics to the extent necessary to ensure that the system did not revert to war and that those candidates at the top of the patronal pyramid did not engage in excessive levels of corruption and oppression. In the majority of cases, it was local rather than external actors who retained the greatest ability to shape outcomes on the ground. In comparison with local political elites, most external actors lacked staying power, sufficient leverage, and sometimes political acumen. Nor were they usually willing to invest the amount of time, effort,
and resources that it would take to acquire such things. The rather depressing conclusion that follows is that, if powerful local groups really want to wage war, external forces will have a tough time trying to stop them. If correct, this means that most of the keys required to unlock the secret of building stable peace on the continent are held by local actors who are concerned primarily with local issues. In such circumstances, conflict resolution will not succeed unless these local issues are effectively addressed and local actors are persuaded, incentivized, or coerced into adopting less violent forms of politics.

Although it will take longer and be even more difficult, peacemaking efforts should be reconceptualized as an ongoing process of bargaining designed to demilitarize politics and the institutions that sustained the war. The long-term aim of this process is to delegitimize the idea that violence offers the surest route to status, wealth, and political power—an idea that has been all too prevalent across the continent. A good place to invest more effort is thus with reforming the security sectors across the continent's conflict zones—while realizing that it is the political rather than technical aspects of reform that are the most crucial, but also the most difficult.

These conclusions add up to a hugely daunting agenda that will require considerable time, money, and, most of all, political effort by both Africans and non-Africans alike. Nevertheless, as one African proverb has it: peace may be costly, but it is worth the expense.

### Crisis Mapping for Conflict Analysis

By Dr. Jen Ziemke, Co-Founder & Co-Curator: Crisis Mappers Net, Associate Professor of International Relations, John Carroll University, Fellow, Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, jen@crisismappers.net

As co-founder and co-curator of the International Network of Crisis Mappers, I have been asked to contribute a piece on the ways in which crowdsourced crisis event data (what we call “Crisis Mapping”) may help us understand conflict dynamics. My own research on the Angolan Civil War began over 15 years ago, in-country, but evolved into an analysis of all known battle and massacre events of this war, collected from over 30,000 articles and other reports about the conflict. Some 10,000 georeferenced events were then analyzed and mined for patterns to help explain why the war progressed as it did, over space and time. Testing a series of hypotheses empirically, I found that the variation in the extent of civilian targeting across time in space in the Angolan Civil War was at least partly a function of recently accrued battlefield losses. In particular, when both rebel and government-side actors began to lose territory and men, and as these losses began to accrue, the risk to civilians grew substantially; in such cases, civilians in the area of retreat were increasingly subject to violent targeting by the retreating force.

After completing this study, I wondered how the rapid proliferation of real-time information on conflict emerging from social media, SMS, and other sources would shape both scholarship and the nature of the conflict itself, and thus began investigating how civilians and scholars operating in unclassified environments have been using these tools to understand and analyze dynamic patterns in conflict. Fast-forward to 2014, and the ongoing war in Syria, for instance, is now considered the most socially mediated war in history, with networked individuals outside of the classified space working together to track suspected terrorists using posts on Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and ask.fm for their research. Indeed, we are living in interesting times.

Launched in 2009, the Crisis Mappers network developed in response to the rapid growth of crowdsourced event data, the near-ubiquity of cell phones, and the proliferation of platforms that enable people to tell their stories. This information can then be collected and visualized on a live, online Crisis Map, a map that can be used for enhanced situational awareness or for organizing response. Some Crisis Maps help first responders decide how to respond to a natural disaster, for example, by routing aid trucks around allegedly blocked streets and downed bridges, whereas other maps are used to collect pictures and other evidence alleging war crimes, election fraud, gender-based violence, repression, or mass killings. Practitioners and scholars also use such maps to help understand the changing nature of conflict across space and time, and for conflict early warning.

The increasing availability of participatory mapmaking platforms, such as Open Street Map, Ushahidi, and Google Maps, helped spark the emergence of the new field of Crisis Mapping and the community of practice that it spawned. One such tool, Ushahidi, emerged.
because a woman in Kenya, Ory Okolloh, wanted to leverage crowdsourced reports to help monitor the Kenyan election in 2007–2008. Later, Ushahidi launched Crowdmap: a user-friendly, open, online mapping tool in the cloud that anyone with web access can use to stand up his or her own customized Crisis Map. Today, tens of thousands of Ushahidi Crisis Maps have been created as platforms for monitoring citizen's reports in the wake of floods, earthquakes, and tornadoes, and to monitor war and instability in Libya, Syria, the Central African Republic, and South Sudan, to name a few. For example, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) initiated the Libya Crisis Map in order to improve its situational awareness of this complex and changing environment during the war. This conflict map tracked, among other events, the movement of refugees, food and water requests, and the evolving situation on the battlefield.

The fact that citizens, volunteers, and individuals from all over the world are able to view, use, and contribute to a live map of a conflict as it unfolds raises a number of important questions. We are only now beginning to discover the implications of this work, and to see how citizen engagement actually has the potential to influence the nature of the war itself.

How might the mere presence of a live crisis map, or other social media stream, change the course of events on the battlefield? Because crisis maps are near real time reflections of live conflicts engaging volunteers, translators, and crowds reporting on wars as they happen, the mere fact that these projects and maps exist means that individual events need to be viewed as processes partly endogenous to the project itself. In one hypothetical example, as volunteers tracked the movement of tanks and other army vehicles in one conflict using very recent satellite imagery, they identified the target vehicles by the distinct and unique color of their rooftops. In the next iteration, the volunteers noticed the target vehicles had been painted, in what they surmised might have been in direct response to the online project itself. Thus, volunteers, the cyber domain in which they work, and the map itself become intimate parts of the battlespace.

Recent innovations in microtasking leverage volunteers and expert networks to help clean, translate, georeference, and verify data from the crowd. For example, many may be surprised to learn that many towns, villages, and cities do not appear at all or are otherwise very poorly mapped in publicly available platforms like Bing Maps and Google Maps. The community learned firsthand about this issue when tracking sections of Port-au-Prince in the wake of the 2010 earthquake that devastated this area. Another nonprofit open-source mapping tool, OpenStreetMap, uses volunteers and experts via crowdsourcing and microtasking to help solve this problem. This “Wikipedia of maps” allows volunteers to “swarm” around the geographic area in need, fleshing out missing roads, street names, and tagging destroyed structures, updating the map according to the needs of the particular crisis at hand. Anyone with a browser can edit and trace roads, buildings, and other features of the environment, using satellite imagery as an overlay to guide the rough tracing, outlining, and naming of roads and other features. Thus, working on their laptops thousands of miles from the crisis, volunteers worked tirelessly around the clock to help create the most detailed and up-to-date map available of the area in a very short time. Cab drivers who once worked in Port-au-Prince, but have since moved elsewhere, worked remotely to name previously unnamed streets, and this information helped save lives and direct response. Other volunteers helped translate incoming SOS messages from Haitian Creole to English, which were sent from Haitians on the ground who needed help and thus texted their needs in the hopes of receiving aid. Student volunteers then helped create geolocated reports from these messages, resulting in the creation of the Ushahidi Haiti Crisis Map.

Today, virtual volunteers from around the world continue to process reports in a similar manner and develop roadmaps in areas where their work is needed most, such as in areas of Guinea most impacted by the Ebola crisis. Such assistance not only enhances the maps but also helps improve situational awareness, as is the case with the conflict in the Central African Republic, for first responders who wish to understand how to respond to a complex disaster as it unfolds. Still other volunteers look for evidence of any possible wreckage from the missing Malaysian airlines flight by combing through pictures of the Southern Indian Ocean that can be tagged and sent for further examination and analysis. Other global virtual networks of volunteers extract and examine tweets and other data emerging from the crowd for a variety of events. For example, during the Westgate Mall attack
in Nairobi, one person read every tweet written from all relevant hashtags about the event, helping to identify plausible al-Shabaab handles, relevant hashtags and classifiers, in order to train their automated system to detect relevant bits of information, leveraging machine learning for the automated real-time analysis and treatment of these vast streams of data.

We are only at the beginning of a rapidly changing global movement; daily changes and adjustments reflect the complex challenges of collecting, verifying, analyzing, visualizing, and making sense of vast amounts of georeferenced event data on conflict. We anticipate accelerating innovation in this unfolding domain, leveraging crowds, networks, scholars, and individuals for the rapid understanding of real-time crises as they unfold.

**Funding Rebels: Resources, Crime, and Conflict in Africa**

*By Dr. James Igoe Walsh, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, jwalsh@uncc.edu*

*Dr. Beth Elise Whitaker, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, bwhitaker@uncc.edu*

*Dr. Justin Conrad, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, justinconrad@uncc.edu*

Policymakers and academics have devoted substantial attention over the past two decades to the connections between natural resources, criminal activity, and armed conflict in Africa. Rebel groups in Sierra Leone, Angola, Côte d’Ivoire, and most recently Central African Republic have exploited diamond deposits to fund their activities, drawing global attention to the problem of “blood diamonds.” Armed groups and foreign militaries in the Democratic Republic of Congo have looted gemstones and ores during that country’s complex conflicts, prompting a movement to reduce international trade in conflict minerals. The long-running war that resulted in the independence of South Sudan in 2011 was fueled in part by struggles over the control of petroleum reserves. Al-Qaeda in the Lands of the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) has also funded its activities with smuggling, kidnapping, and other crimes.

Despite the attention that such groups have received, we have remarkably little systematic information about how rebel groups fund their activities or how funding influences the conflict environments in which they operate. How important are natural resources to rebel groups compared with other sources of income? How does this variation in funding sources influence their actions? With the support of the Department of Defense’s Minerva Research Initiative, we are collecting data on how armed groups worldwide use natural resources and criminal activity to fund their operations.

Our project addresses two important limitations of existing data sources. First, most data are collected at the country level. This is problematic because it is possible for rebel groups to operate in parts of the country where there are no natural resources. In such a case, the rebel group might be assumed to rely on the resource, since both the resource and the group exist in the same country, but in actuality the group does not have access to that resource. Second, existing data do not provide information about how, if at all, a rebel group exploits a natural resource. Some rebel groups might directly extract and sell the resource and use the resulting profits to finance their activities. Others might steal the resource from legitimate producers. And other rebel groups might demand that legitimate producers pay them protection money, but are not directly involved themselves in the production and sale of the resource. These different strategies of resource exploitation may influence how rebels treat civilians, where the rebels operate, their military strategies, and how long they fight.

The dataset that we are building through this project includes four categories of natural resource exploitation and criminal activity:

- **Control** of the resource or revenue stream, such as directly producing or selling the resource, or establishing a protection racket over producers;
- **Looting** or theft of a natural resource from legitimate producers;
- **Booty futures**, in which a third party pays an armed group today for the promise to profit from a natural resource in the future; and
- **Crime**, understood as criminal activities such as smuggling, kidnapping, extortion, and theft that are not connected to the production of natural resources.
Our research assistants have consulted a wide range of sources, including reports by United Nations expert committees, monthly research bulletins, news media accounts, and books and scholarly articles, to identify the use of these strategies by rebel groups in each year from 1990 through 2012. Table 1 summarizes our findings for Africa (excluding Egypt). During this time period, there were 120 total armed groups in our dataset, drawn from an existing list of actors in armed conflict compiled by the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP). On average, each rebel group engaged in conflict with its national government for slightly less than four years. This produces a total of 453 “group years,” in which rebel groups were engaged in conflict with their national governments.1

Initial data from African countries reveal some interesting patterns. Although natural resources and crime are widely seen as important funding sources for armed groups in Africa, these strategies have been employed in less than one-third of the group years in our data. In the remaining 69 percent of group years, rebels are financed by foreign governments, diaspora communities, the local citizens whom they claim to represent, and other funding streams. Many journalistic accounts describe armed groups in Africa as engaging in systematic theft of resources such as diamonds and gold, but actual looting of natural resources is rather rare, accounting for only 6 percent of the group years in our data. Far more common is for rebels to control the production of natural resources or set up a protection racket (20 percent of group years). From the perspective of the armed groups, such control is sensible, since it provides a more predictable and longer-term stream of revenue that they can use to finance their activities.

Perhaps most surprising, given that the continent is often viewed as the epicenter of resource-driven conflicts, crime (25 percent of group years) is a more common funding strategy for rebel groups in Africa than strategies involving the production of natural resources. Crime is used especially in countries with few natural resources that rebels can easily expropriate, including Algeria and Somalia. In the longstanding debate about greed versus grievance as a source of conflict, this finding suggests that rebels with a cause will find some way to finance their operations even when they do not have easy access to high-value natural resources. Rebels can be quite creative in this regard, as we found, with their criminal activities including everything from credit card fraud and cigarette smuggling to kidnapping foreigners and stealing humanitarian aid. We have not yet found evidence of virtual financing, which is a current focus of policymakers, but will include it in the broader category of crime if we do.

Our research efforts are still at an early stage. Moving forward, we will expand our data collection to rebel groups in the rest of the world and develop geocoded datasets on the location, extraction, and prices of natural resources. We also will merge our data with existing datasets on external support for rebel groups. In our subsequent analyses, we will seek to determine how rebel groups’ sources of finance influence their political and military behavior. Do armed groups that earn revenue from natural resources and crime fight longer than those that rely on other funding streams? In other words, do resource wars last longer than other types of conflict? How do rebels’ sources of finance influence their actions? More specifically, do some funding sources increase the likelihood that rebels will engage in attacks against civilians or expand their violence overseas? How does rebel group control of natural resource areas influence their participation in conflict resolution efforts? The dataset that we are building in this project

| Table 1: Rebel Group Funding Strategies in Africa |
|-----------------|----------------|--------|
| Funding Strategy                  | Rebel Group Years | Percent |
| One or more of listed strategies  |                 |        |
| Control of natural resources      | 90              | 20%    |
| Looting of natural resources      | 28              | 6%     |
| Booty futures                     | 6               | 1%     |
| Crime                            | 115             | 25%    |
| Two or more of these strategies   | 73              | 16%    |
| None of the above strategies      | 311             | 69%    |
| Total                            | 453             | 100%   |
will allow for the exploration of these and other research questions, ultimately contributing to a better understanding of the sources and potential solutions to violent conflict in Africa and elsewhere.

Note

1 Rebel groups are considered to be in conflict with a state if their activities result in at least 25 battle deaths in a given year.

Research Notes on Gender & Conflict in Africa

By Dr. Lahra Smith, Assistant Professor & Acting Director of the African Studies Program, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, ls356@georgetown.edu

While it may be obvious that conflict affects women and girls in distinct ways, it can be subtle and indirect. Men and boys are killed and injured in far higher numbers in wars and other types of conflicts. But while women and girls are less likely to be combatants in conflicts, they are much more likely to suffer the harms of displacement and sexual violence. At the same time, the impacts of poverty, underdevelopment, and poor health outcomes suggest that women suffer greater medium- to longer-term impacts than previously appreciated.

While there are important instances of women's involvement in combat, particularly during key national liberation struggles in places such as South Africa, Eritrea, and Zimbabwe, in most of Africa's post-colonial conflicts, women and girls have not been directly involved as combatants. They may at times be in support roles, but even then, it is often as a result of direct or indirect coercion, as is the case with the northern Uganda rebel movement activity or in Sierra Leone's civil war. Therefore, their mortality and physical injury rates may be low, but their domestic and care burdens increase substantially. During conflicts, the loss of male labor and the loss or insecurity of economic activities by themselves or male family members result in significant financial distress. Serving as heads of households, often to extended and intergenerational families, substantially increases women's workloads. At the same time, since many conflicts in Africa result in displacement of some kind, women far too often find themselves physically on the move, with the attendant economic and personal security concerns. Injury and death of male family members leave many families without crucial male labor in the aftermath of conflict. This is compounded by the often total collapse of public services, destruction of infrastructure and social services in the form of health and education in particular, as well as various psychological and stress-induced illnesses. Because of all of this, women find themselves throughout and especially at the end of wars as the heads of damaged and fragile family units.

Finally, the vastly disproportionate share of sexual and gender-based violence that women and girls bear in conflict situations leaves often-permanent physical and emotional scars on these victims, and on their families and communities. In one study of 48 wars and armed conflicts in Africa from 1989–2009, 65 percent of those surveyed saw the use of sexual violence as a tool of war. It is important to note that this research found that armed state actors were more likely than rebel groups to carry out high levels of sexual violence during armed conflict. 1 This result is significant for the long-term trust and reconstruction activities that women are then engaged in during post-conflict periods. There are many explanations for why war and conflict lead to what is sometimes a significant uptick in sexual violence. Mazurana and Proctor remind us that gender as a concept points to:

- [Be] differently embodied;
- Symbolize different things to their communities and those that attack them;
- [Be] targeted differently and their injuries have different social and livelihood impacts;
- Have different responsibilities in their families and communities and thus end up in harm's way differently; and
- Have different livelihoods, access to the cash economy, and ability to claim, own and inherit property, all of which impact the resources they can access to aid their survival and recovery.2

It is not only in times of civil war or rebel insurgency that we see these patterns. Other lower levels of political violence have gendered impacts as well. In one study on the aftermath of the post-election violence in Kenya, for
instance, the Nairobi Women's Hospital's Gender Recovery Centre found that 80 percent of the cases they were treating involved sexual violence. Traditional mechanisms of healing and integrating victims may no longer be effective, as conflicts rip away at systems of trust and responsibility. If members of the armed forces or state actors are involved, state institutions and actors are compromised by their actions.

Yet the dire nature of all of these patterns of gendered conflict belies the resilience and courage with which women and their families face these circumstances. They do take advantage of gendered and intergenerational support networks to meet the challenges of displacement and economic or physical uncertainty. Religious and community organizations and associations have been pivotal places for women to get support, both during and after conflict periods. Women's gendered self-help and economic initiatives have a longstanding place in many parts of Africa and have provided tools that women use to rebuild their families, particularly in the absence of adequate state services.

At the same time, crucial opportunities to involve women in peacemaking and conflict resolution are often underutilized or entirely ignored. A United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) study found that of 31 major peace processes since 1992, only 9 percent had women negotiators and only 4 percent of women were signatories in peace processes. Finally, women were completely absent from chief mediating roles in UN-brokered talks. Since women are rarely combatants in conflicts, they stand to have greater moral and political credibility in their communities. This is a place for more emphasis in the peace-building and conflict-prevention arenas. In addition to increasing the role of women in peacemaking processes, research suggests that steps can be taken immediately and over the longer term to improve the context for women and girls in conflict and post-conflict periods. This includes changing norms of violence, but also changing the physical infrastructure of vulnerable populations through interventions such as improved lighting, more patrols, secure buildings, and improved reporting systems. Ending impunity for crimes of sexual and gender-based violence will go a long way, as will ensuring anonymity and employing more female police. Finally, training and accountability for troops and armed state actors is crucial.

Notes


Analytic Lessons from the Tragedy in the Central African Republic: It’s Risky to “Cry Wolf” about Religious Conflict, But Equally Risky to Ignore It

By Dr. Timothy Samuel Shah, Associate Director of the Religious Freedom Project at the Berkeley Center for Religion, Peace & World Affairs, Georgetown University, tbs33@georgetown.edu

During a recent talk with a group of analysts from the U.S. Intelligence Community, my observations that religious conflict is growing precipitously and dangerously in Africa were greeted with skepticism. I was told that experts on African countries such as the Central African Republic (CAR) had just been telling them that these countries had little history of sectarian strife, and that it is dangerous for outsiders to impose a religious construction on essentially nonreligious dynamics and divisions.

I grant that there is a danger in exaggerating the role of religion in conflicts and tensions around the world. Treating a superficially religious conflict as authentically religious can reinforce religious identities and divisions and strengthen the hand of extremist forces—such as al-Qaeda—that may have an interest in mobilizing a target population along religious lines. But I argue that there is equal danger in ignoring or downplaying the genuinely religious dimensions of social and political conflict around the world. I cannot think of a more compelling example of this danger than CAR’s downward spiral into intensifying religious violence in the last 12 months.
There were growing reports from CAR that Muslim-Christian tension and conflict were spreading out of control in the course of 2013, particularly in the late spring and summer. Despite these reports, the international community largely ignored the situation. I suspect that many Western officials were worried about “crying wolf”—about pushing the panic button when there was no real religious conflict. The problem is that a fear of overplaying the danger of religious conflict in CAR caused the world to fall into another danger—that of underplaying rising religious tensions and conflict and, consequently, of failing to act when there was still the opportunity to defuse the situation.

**CAR’s Undercurrents of Religious Tension and Conflict**

Despite the fact that CAR has not witnessed the explosive Christian-Muslim conflict evident in other sub-Saharan African countries, such as Nigeria and Kenya, credible sources have suggested that CAR has experienced growing religious tensions in recent years. The nonpartisan Pew Research Center, for example, recorded levels of political and social restriction and hostility involving religion for the years 2007–2012. Pew regularly analyzes two kinds of religious restrictions: (1) social conflicts and impediments related to religion, and (2) government intervention in religious matters. Together, these two measures provide an excellent quantitative indicator of any given country’s level of religious tension and violence. In fact, given the tendency of government restrictions to generate reactive religious insecurity, violence, and instability, I suggest that these two measures taken together can serve as a useful religious conflict index (RCI). Between 2007 and 2012, CAR’s aggregate score for government religious restrictions and social hostilities involving religion—its RCI—saw a marked increase, rising from 7.0 in 2007, to 8.9 in 2011, to 9.2 in 2012.¹ As a frame of reference, Sub-Saharan Africa’s median score on the social hostilities index rose from 1.5 in 2011 to 2.1 in 2012, and its median score on the government restrictions index declined slightly, from 1.9 in 2011 to 1.7 in 2012. This put Sub-Saharan Africa’s aggregate RCI at 3.8, making CAR’s most recent RCI score more than twice as high as the median score for Sub-Saharan Africa as a whole.

On top of the steady rise in both religion-related social hostilities and government restrictions on religion that has occurred in CAR over this period, this Christian-majority country experienced a coup almost exactly one year ago, in March 2013, in which Michel Djotodia, a Muslim, gained control of the government of this overwhelmingly Christian-majority country for the first time in history (CAR is about 80 percent Christian and 15 percent Muslim). Djotodia, with the backing of a group of guerillas known as Séléka, overthrew the regime of François Bozizé and declared himself president. Bozizé fled the country on March 24, 2013. The coup resulted in a further, sharp rise in religious tensions, particularly dividing Muslims and Christians.²

Perhaps because of a fear of “imposing” an external religious construction on CAR’s political situation, Western analysts and governments failed to pay close attention to the ways in which CAR’s key political actors were casting their actions and decisions in religious terms. For example, President Djotodia was reported to have sent an early signal that he intended to establish an officially Islamic regime. In a two-page letter reportedly addressed to the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), dated April 17, 2013, before Djotodia completed his takeover, the new president portrayed himself as the defender of the Muslims’ cause in Chad and the Central African Republic. He told the OIC that the two countries “have no respect for us”—i.e., Muslims—and asked for support from his “brothers” in the OIC. “In Central Africa, Muslims are insulted and despised every day and they are considered as foreigners...” Furthermore, Djotodia claimed that “all Christians are liars” and revealed his religio-political project for the Central African Republic. “If by God’s will, we reach [CAR’s capital city of] Bangui, we will set up an Islamic regime in order to apply the sharia [law],” he wrote. “Even if we fail to drive out Bozizé, we intend to transform some parts of Central Africa, Chad and Darfur, into a new Islamic republic.”³

Though CAR’s Catholic hierarchy asked President Djotodia in May 2013 whether he was in fact the author of the letter, he initially refused to deny its authenticity or distance himself from its contents. Later, however, he reportedly denied authorship.⁴ However, his failure to deny the letter’s authenticity quickly contributed to anxiety on the part of CAR’s Christian community and added considerably to religious tensions. But regardless of whether Djotodia’s letter to the OIC was authentic, there are at least four specific reasons that Djotodia’s...
armed takeover of the government in March 2013 seriously heightened Christian-Muslim tensions.

First, Djotodia, who often appeared in public wearing a turban, openly identified as a Muslim. Religion was a feature of his identity he deliberately chose to highlight.

Second, CAR's Muslims would have identified with Djotodia, in particular because he was born in CAR's "remote, neglected, and largely Muslim north-east."5

Third, accumulated Muslim resentment was a major reason that "Muslim-Christian tensions, interlaced with ethnic resentments, had been building for 10 years," according to Louisa Lombard, and reached a boiling point in 2012–2013.6 In 2012, according to the U.S. State Department’s most recent Annual Report on International Religious Freedom, there were reports in the course of 2012 that “Muslims continued to face discrimination in access to government services when low-level bureaucrats reportedly created informal barriers… Muslims continued to face consistent social discrimination and, in many cases, were presumed to be sympathetic to rebel groups which were predominantly Muslim.”7 Furthermore, regional disparities and grievances reinforced religious divisions and tensions. According to Louisa Lombard, “the central government does very little [in CAR's Northeast]. People in northeastern CAR feel neglected. People with Islamic-sounding names are made to pay more at the roadblocks that proliferate especially in the southern and western parts of the country than people with Christian names, and it is harder for people from the Northeast to obtain national identity documents. Many Muslims, like former president Michel Djotodia, take a Christian name in order to minimize the discrimination they face” [my emphasis].8 Such longstanding discrimination gave Djotodia and other Muslims in the CAR a strong sense of grievance, particularly against the country’s Christian majority.

Fourth, former President François Bozizé was a lightning rod for Muslim resentment against an unjust Christian majority. Christianity was not just Bozizé’s personal religious commitment, but a crucial part of his profile. Bozizé was—and still is—the leader of an “église de réveil,” as evangelical churches are known in CAR.9 In May 2012, while Bozizé was still CAR’s president, less than a year before he was deposed, he was officially made the Celestial Church’s top leader in the Central African Republic.10 Officially, then, Bozizé was both head of state and head of one of the country’s largest and most high-profile Christian churches. As such, he personified for many Muslims a Christian-dominated political establishment that did not serve them well.

For all these reasons, religion was one important element in the complex package of factors that drove Djotodia and the Séléka rebel coalition to overthrow Bozizé and create a new political establishment favorable to Muslims. These reasons also explain why there was a strong sense of mutual affinity and support between Séléka guerrillas and ordinary Muslims. Many ordinary Muslims apparently viewed Djotodia and Séléka as their saviors. None of this is to suggest that Islamist ideology was necessarily an important motivating factor for Djotodia or Séléka, but religious identity and religious grievances were important factors.

Furthermore, as Djotodia and his Séléka rebels appeared to organize themselves along religious lines and act from a sense of religious grievance, Christians began to believe that the president and his Séléka guerillas were deliberately targeting their churches and communities as early as the spring and summer of 2013. A May 2013 letter signed by the Catholic Archbishop of Bangui claimed, “If not dealt [with] properly, the crisis could have lasting consequences on national cohesion regarding cohabitation between Christians and Muslims.” Similarly, CAR’s Episcopal Commission for Justice and Peace denounced a “rebellion characterised by religious extremism, by evil intentions for the programmed and planned desecration and destruction of Christian buildings, and in particular Catholic and Protestant churches.” The commission contended that rebels had attacked several dioceses. It was claimed that a number of church leaders, such as the President of the Episcopal Conference in Central Africa and the Archbishop of Bambari, had also been attacked, while others were kidnapped by rebels.11

These raw Christian-Muslim tensions deepened even further on August 6, 2013, when the leader of the CAR’s evangelical churches, the Reverend Nicolas Guérékoyamé, was arrested by the new government. Though he was released a few hours later, the fact that the arrest occurred at all immediately increased distrust and suspicion between Christians and Muslims. In particular,
it alarmed CAR's Christians that further restrictions on religious and political freedom would soon be in store for the country's large Christian community. Adding to the seriousness of the arrest and the heightening of tensions was the fact that Guérékoyamé was a member of the National Transitional Council (NTC), a transitional body with parliamentary powers that was set up following the March military coup.

**My Assessment in September 2013**

The foregoing indicators of rising distrust, tension, and conflict between Christians and Muslims in CAR caused me to conclude, in an analysis I wrote for the U.S. Intelligence Community in September 2013, that “the country is highly vulnerable to a precipitous increase in religious tension and conflict within the next five years.”

Despite the accumulating evidence and danger signs, most commentators and governments underplayed the role of religious factors in their approach to CAR's growing crisis in the spring, summer, and fall of 2013. A few analysts highlighted the increasingly dangerous religious dimensions of the conflict in CAR at the time, but most did one of three things. Some ignored the religious dimensions altogether. Some used vague descriptors such as “sectarian” to describe the conflict, utterly failing to analyze the complex and mutually reinforcing dimensions of growing Muslim-Christian conflict. And, finally, some relegated religion to an extremely small and subordinate place in their analysis.

For example, as late as December 2013, a 26-paragraph analysis by the United Kingdom’s Foreign and Commonwealth Office did not note the presence of religious factors until paragraph 22. According to the patently baffling chain of reasoning in this analysis (paragraph 21), it would be a mistake to see Séléka as ethnic or religious on the grounds that it is brutal, nomadic, incoherent, and lacking a declared political base. (How is it inconsistent for a group to be divided, brutal, nomadic, and religious?) In the following paragraph, the analysis does finally acknowledge a place for the role of religion, though a very small one: “That said, Islam has, to some extent, provided cohesion for the group and, conversely, Christianity has played a role in the formation of local self-defence groups. Religion has become an identity marker in the conflict, a way of judging whether someone is on your ‘side’ or not, and therefore important in reprisal attacks.” But none of this, of course, begins to address the fundamental question of why the two “sides” should be organized along religious lines in the first place.

In truth, religion has become more than a mere “marker” of identity in CAR in recent years. It has become a source—one among several, to be sure, but still one important source—of CAR's politically charged identities and conflicts.

We know how the story ends. To fight back against what they perceived as rising Muslim-supported and motivated attacks, some Christians organized anti-balaka (anti-machete) militias in the late summer and fall of 2013. These militias carried out vicious attacks against Muslim individuals and communities in a number of instances. At the same time, Séléka fighters continued to target Christian communities—in one case, they laid siege to some 35,000 Christians who sought shelter in a Catholic church compound. The horrific and increasingly widespread violence prompted France and the African Union to send thousands of troops to quell the increasingly brutal violence.

**What If?**

We are now left to ask: what if? What if the international community had been more sensitive to the signs of rapidly growing religious tension and conflict in CAR? We will never know for sure. But if serious efforts were undertaken a few months earlier to pressure the Djotodia government to stop Séléka attacks on Christians, it is possible that the Christian anti-balaka militias would never have formed in the first place. If serious efforts were undertaken earlier to bring Muslim and Christian leaders together to build interreligious peace and understanding, it is possible that some violence in some regions could have been avoided. If both of these kinds of efforts had been undertaken, it is possible that the displacement of hundreds of thousands of people, the killing of hundreds if not thousands of other people, and the division of the country into deep-seated Christian-Muslim enmity could have been avoided. Alas, key actors failed to grasp the religious dimensions of the conflict at an earlier stage, and now the damage to religious harmony and political stability in CAR and the wider region is unlikely to be undone for years to come, if ever.
Some will ask: how do we know when political conflict is religious? How could we have been sure that CAR’s growing tension and division had authentically religious dimensions? Here’s a good rule of thumb. If it looks like a duck, quacks like a duck, and walks like a duck, it’s a duck. When the important parties to a conflict talk as if a conflict is religious, that’s a pretty good sign that the conflict is religious. When the important parties to a conflict act as if a conflict is religious, that’s an even better sign that the conflict is religious. By that simple analytic standard, it was clear many months ago—if not years ago—that CAR was witnessing a dangerous rise in religious conflict. Yet in our sophisticated eagerness to avoid imposing a “simplistic” religious construction on the situation, we failed to see that obvious fact. In our fear of “crying wolf,” we failed to see the wolf staring us in the face.

Notes


9 Ibid.


11 Djadi, “OIC Letter.”


The Ever-Changing CNDD-FDD and Prospects for the Future of Burundi: 2015 and Beyond

By Dr. Cara E. Jones, Assistant Professor, Mary Baldwin College, cjones@mbc.edu

Introduction

Burundi, a tiny Central African nation nestled in the heart of sub-Saharan Africa, might not seem to matter to geostrategic politics, but unfolding events both within the country and in the region could potentially ignite the region in another conflict similar to those of the early 1990s. Although a majority of the citizens are of Hutu origin (85 percent), the Tutsi ethnic group (14 percent) historically ruled over both the Hutu and the tiny minority Twa people (1 percent) there, with majoritarian
democracy only coming after the “third wave” of democratization in the early 1990s. A civil war in Burundi (1993–2009) sparked the Rwandan genocide of 1994 and fanned the flames of the First and Second Congo Wars (1996–1997 and 1998–2006, respectively). Thus, it is important to understand how this country, roughly the size of Maryland, influences and shapes regional and world politics.

**History**

One of the only naturally existing pre-colonial kingdoms on the African continent, Burundi before colonization consisted of a consociational system of governance under a Mwami (king) divided between the major clans of the Ganwa, or princely, social class. Ganwa were neither Hutu nor Tutsi, and enjoyed decentralized power over both, as well as over the small minority of Twa, a pygmoid-like people usually at the bottom of society. Falling prey to the scramble for Africa in 1884–1885, Burundi was amalgamated as a colonial possession with its northerly neighbor into Ruanda-Urundi under German control. Never really establishing a presence beyond the capital, the Germans lost the territory following their defeat in World War I, with the colonial possession going to Belgium. Belgium, in contrast to Germany, established immediate political organs in the kingdom, using the Mwami to reinforce Belgian law and practices. It was during this time that ethnicity in Burundi became fixed, with the Tutsi and Ganwa classes becoming one and the Hutu another, through the use of identity cards and phrenology. Tutsi were seen as natural leaders by Belgian colonial administrators, who seized on existing state-like structures within the kingdom to establish Tutsi dominance and political power. Whereas shared rule had benefited both Hutu and Tutsi before, by 1945 very few administrators were Hutu, and narratives emerged that rewrote Burundian history in favor of an eliteness of Tutsi over the “paysan” (peasant) Hutu. These political structures favored Tutsi until Independence (July 1, 1962), when spates of political violence broke out, due not only to political contestation as a result of the power vacuum left by the Belgians, but also because of the regional context. The so-called Hutu Revolution in neighboring Rwanda in 1959 had violently shifted power from the Tutsi, who historically ruled Rwanda as well, to the majority Hutu. Scholars generally agree on four periods of civil war since Independence: 1965–1966, 1972, 1988, and 1993–2005, although within these periods there have been other types of political violence including assassinations, riots, and mass killings.

Violence in Burundi carried an ethnic dimension, and the focus in the study of sub-Saharan Africa more generally has been on ethnicity as a means to an end. In the Great Lakes, this end has typically been the gaining or retaining of state power. Part and parcel to the gaining and maintenance of state power in Burundi was the answer to the question about the nature of the ethnic group–state relationship, most frequently determined by contesting and rewriting history, with competing versions and narratives emerging out of political disgruntlements. This culminated in the worst of ethnically motivated violence: long before the Rwandan genocide devastated the region in 1994, the government of Michael Micombero (1966–1976) enacted a so-called “selective” genocide against Hutu men and boys in retaliation for an abortive coup attempt by Hutu soldiers in the armed forces in 1972. This genocide killed an estimated 300,000 and sent another 2 million fleeing into refugee camps and towns in neighboring Zaire (DRC) and western Tanzania. The genocide utterly destabilized a generation of Hutu, removing any vestige of political and social leadership (and thus ability to protest the increasingly discriminatory government), and keeping Hutu out of economically and socially beneficial positions. The genocide also laid the foundation for the fledgling Hutu rebel groups, who began to form in 1980. Palipehutu (in French, Parti pour la libération du peuple Hutu), formed by Remy Gahutu in the Tanzanian refugee camp of Tabora, sought the restoration of the Hutu majority, through violence if necessary. The rebel group began conducting raids and assaults on villages along the border regions in the late 1980s, including massacres at Ntega and Marangara in 1988. These events had clear ethnic targeting, and gave the Tutsi government, having recently undergone a coup transferring power from Jean-Baptiste Bagaza (1976–1987) to Pierre Buyoya (1987–1993, 1996–2003), ample leverage to continue discrimination, arrests, and political violence against Hutu civilians. This set the stage for the 1993 elections, which were dictated by conditionalities imposed from abroad to ensure multi-party representative democracy.
The Civil War

In 1993, the tide seemed to be changing for Burundians. The Constitution had been written and accepted, relatively smooth elections had taken place over the summer, and Hutu Melchoir Ndadaye's government was seen as full of promise for Burundi to avoid the ethnic clashes plaguing Rwanda as a result of the 1990 invasion of the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), a Tutsi rebel group there. However, this vision remained short-lived: mere months after the election, Ndadaye was assassinated by a group of Tutsi army officers who were fearful of violent reprisals against Tutsi by the new Hutu government and intent on another military coup. Hutu civilians responded in turn with their own expressions of violence. Scholars estimate that over 50,000 Tutsi died at this time. How many Hutu died over the span of the war remains unclear, but massacres of Hutu also happened in concurrence with the massacres of Tutsi at this time. Estimates range from 100,000 to 200,000 Hutu civilians dead, both internally and externally. In short, the war meant that “the dramatization of the [ethnic] cleavage, with its all-or-nothing stakes, has been carried out through systematic mass violence.”

The conflict and attacks on Hutu civilians galvanized Hutu leaders and politicians at home and abroad to form the CNDD-FDD (Conseil National Pour la Défense de la Démocratie–Forces pour la Défense de la Démocratie). The CNDD-FDD was first launched as an urban guerrilla movement. The armed resistance began in the peri-urban populous neighborhoods north of Bujumbura, Kamenge, and Kinama. These neighborhoods were largely Hutu in ethnic makeup and working class, allowing for a cauldron of cross-cutting cleavages ripe for explosion. The resistance organized itself as a response to increasing insecurity posed by military action, led by the mostly Tutsi armed forces. Some of the principal objectives of the CNDD were to restore the legal and democratic institutions issued from the elections of June 1993, and the creation of a new army that would ensure security for institutions and the Burundian population as a whole. Although the CNDD—and, before that, FRODEBU (Front pour la Démocratie au Burundi)—was dominated by Hutu, its leadership included some Tutsis. Therefore, its struggle was seen as an action aimed at restoring democracy, and not simply “Hutu Power.”

Talks led by regional players began almost immediately after the outbreak of conflict in 1996, but settlement between rival rebel groups—the CNDD-FDD and the Palipehutu-FNL (Forces Nationales de Libération)—and the Buyoya government did not arrive until late 2003. Although the CNDD-FDD was never able to militarily rout the Buyoya army, it did control some territory, gained the support of civilians, and operated rear bases in both Zaire (DRC) and Tanzania. Its most formidable weapon was civilian support, which was to prove important in the post-conflict era. Further complicating peace was the return to the bush by several rebel groups, mostly notably the Palipehutu-FNL, over the following decade. By 2005, however, the bulk of the conflict was over, and post-conflict elections, bolstered by a new constitution and laws written under the Arusha Accord and Pretoria agreements for ceasefire, commenced.

The Post-War Era and Prospects for the Future

Because of civilian support and legitimacy gained through the war, the CNDD-FDD handily won the 2005 elections, first winning parliamentary control and then through legislative election, selecting the leader of CNDD-FDD, Pierre (Peter) Nkurunziza, as president. In the beginning, civilians were very happy with life under the new regime; although the Palipehutu-FNL was not fully reintegrated as a political party until 2009, for the most part civilians felt more secure, more politically free, and more at peace than they had in decades. This tranquil time was short-lived, however, and by 2007, the CNDD-FDD had resorted to intimidation tactics by its youth wing, the Imbonerakure (“those who stand together,” in Kirundi). In 2008, the city of Bujumbura and the surrounding province of Bujumbura-Rurale were both scenes of intense violence between the FNL and CNDD-FDD: grenade attacks were common between villages in the rural areas, and bombings of the city by the surrounding FNL occurred in early May 2008. FNL/CNDD-FDD tensions have run very high since the demobilization of the group in late in 2009–early 2010, and many political assassinations carried out by both sides, especially in the FNL-dominated province of Bujumbura-Rurale and the northern parts of Bujumbura city, Kinama and Kamenge. The regime is especially heavy-handed with dissidents and opposition party members. It is commonly understood that the
regime carries out attacks against FNL members, especially at the lower levels and in contested areas of Bujumbura city (Kinama, Kamenge, and Cibitoke), as well as in rural provinces. The chairman of MSD (Mouvement pour la Solidarité et la Démocratie), Alexis Sinduhije, and the chairman of FNL, Agathon Rwasa, were arrested multiple times in the lead-up to the 2010 elections, before eventually seeking exile in the Netherlands and Congo respectively. Interviews with both have cited fear for their safety and that of their family. Rwasa also stated that he was threatened by CNDD-FDD agents of the security forces while in exile in Eastern Congo. In addition to political figures, prominent journalists, religious figures, and civil society leaders have been assassinated or threatened. Although Nkurunziza won the 2010 election, which was deemed free and fair by international observers, political violence has continued, hitting a high in 2011 with the Gatumba massacre, an attack on a CNDD-FDD–friendly bar in Kinama, Bujumbura City that was suspected of being an internal frame-up to shore up waning support for the political party. Today, intimidation, assaults, extrajudicial arrests, and assassinations continue, largely due to the Imbonerakure. Draconian laws have been enacted to reduce political participation, including the prevention of sports groups from running in the capital (groups of people are suspect), as well as clashes between protestors and government forces.

Conclusion

Current developments leave Burundi in a precarious political circumstance. If next year’s elections do not go well, or fledgling rebel movements associated with both Palipehutu-FNL and MSD gain strength, the country could easily slip back into war. Civilians have grown tired of the political manipulation and intimidation of the CNDD-FDD, and any good will associated with the 1993–2005 civil war has evaporated. Furthermore, if conflict in Burundi breaks out, regional dynamics could be greatly affected. As the proverb goes, “When Burundi sneezes, Rwanda catches the cold.” The RPF regime, in place in Rwanda since the 1994 genocide, currently stands accused of political terrorization and repression. A conflict in one would almost certainly spill over into the other. On Burundi’s western border, the ongoing crisis in Eastern Congo could also be greatly influenced by a return to war. If Burundian rebels use the DRC as a conduit and rear base, local conflicts there become quickly engulfed in larger dynamics. More research, careful monitoring, and international focus on conflict prevention in Burundi are necessary to prevent another catastrophe.

Notes

1 I use “social class” here, instead of “ethnic group,” because Hutu, Tutsi, and Ganwa are divisions of society, incredibly porous and not ethnicity-based.
7 Human Rights Watch, We’ll tie you up and Shoot You: Lack of Accountability for Political Violence in Burundi (HRW: New York, 2010).
Looming Disaster in Nigeria? Violent Extremism, Regional Conflict, and the 2015 Elections

By Dr. Brandon Kendhammer, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Ohio University, kendhamm@ohio.edu

For Nigerians, 2014 has already been a momentous year. For one, it marks the country’s centennial, dating to the controversial amalgamation of the Northern and Southern Nigerian Protectorates into a single colony by British authorities. For another, it signals the country’s emergence as the largest economy in Africa. A long overdue rebasing of the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP) calculation in April led to a near doubling of the economy’s calculated value—now nearly $510 billion annually.

But despite this good news, pessimism reigns. Boko Haram, the radical Islamist group that has been a powerful disruptive force since its 2009 emergence into the national spotlight, staged a pair of its most audacious attacks in April, killing (according to official sources) more than 70 by bombing a suburban Abuja bus stop on the 14th, and kidnapping over 200 schoolgirls from the town of Chibok in Borno State the next day. On April 16, Governor Murtala Nyako of Adamawa State (one of the three northeastern states declared as “states of emergency” for the past year) submitted a letter to the Northern Governors’ Forum accusing the administration of President Goodluck Jonathan of orchestrating an “ethno-religious campaign[n] of hate” against the northern Muslim community under cover of the Boko Haram insurgency, and declaring that the president’s ultimate goal was to deny Muslims in the northeast their right to vote in the upcoming 2015 presidential election.

As inflammatory (and entirely unverifiable) as they were, Governor Nyako’s statements reflect an uncomfortable truth about Nigerian politics. In a country where demographics and ethno-religious identity have long played a key role in determining access to the oil-fueled largess of the national state, both the continued violence in the northeast and the government’s stilted, ineffectual response to it are inseparable from the broader dynamics of political competition, and both are likely to play major roles in shaping the 2015 election cycle. In particular, the Boko Haram crisis and growing northern anger toward the Jonathan administration’s policies fit neatly into longstanding national narratives about the need to “balance” or “rotate” power between northern and southern interests, and their primacy is likely to further tilt an already polarizing political discourse toward ethnically and religiously tinged anger.

As Nigeria enters this new, uncertain phase of its political cycle, it is important to understand the key drivers of political conflict in the country, as well as possible strategies for mitigation. Although violence and sectarian conflict are not inevitable, the current political climate is primed for disruptions to the democratic process. Nigerian national unity is not so impossible as some critics have suggested, but given the stakes for both the governing Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) and the upstart All Progressives Congress (APC), the 2015 elections are likely to trigger a potentially violent debate over the distribution of national power and its incumbent financial benefits along regional, ethnic, and religious lines.

The Political Origins of Nigeria’s Sectarian Violence

What are the major sources of conflict and instability in Nigeria? As nearly all competent political analyses note, the core driver of sectarian conflict is the dependence of most of the country’s elite on access to state revenues, resources, and rents. Whether through the outright siphoning of public funds, the use of political connections to forge rent-seeking opportunities, or political mobilization at the state or grassroots level to capture political offices and the federal revenue allocations that accompany them, the state remains a primary vehicle for attaining wealth and upward mobility.

Recognizing that the underrepresentation of particular communities in government service could generate dangerous tensions, since the mid-1970s Nigeria has adopted a wide range of institutional mechanisms to “balance” access to appointments and revenue allocations in line with the country’s “federal character.” In electoral terms, this means that parties seek to strike a careful balance in their distribution of leadership positions, with particular attention to the “rotation” of executive power between north and south. Bureaucratically, the Federal Character Commission (FCC) is charged with ensuring that hundreds of thousands of jobs in the federal and state civil services are equally distributed to employees...
from all of the country’s 36 states and six “geo-political zones.” But despite the Nigerian government’s formal talk of balance in geographic and federal terms, these practices are clearly understood in ethnic and religious terms by most Nigerians. Local control over the ethnic and religious communities deemed as “indigenous” to particular constituencies for federal character purposes has not only been a major source of violence in some of the country’s most divided states (Plateau, in particular), but also generally serves to reinforce sectarian identities at the expense of national unity.

How do these often problematic power-sharing norms interact with the politics around the Boko Haram insurgency? Although the oft-used descriptions of a “Muslim North” and “Christian South” have obvious analytic limitations, they do reflect the growing significance of the country’s religious cleavage. Nigeria is the only large nation in the world with a population divided in roughly even proportions between two world religions, and, as recent Afrobarometer survey data suggests, more than 90 percent of Nigerians view their religious identity as “very important” to them personally. Religious tensions began their rise in the 1980s, but beginning with the decisions of 12 democratically elected northern state governments to implement Islamic law (sharia) in their state criminal courts from 1999 to 2003, the public discourse between the two communities has become increasingly toxic and fear-driven.

In this, political conflict over the “rotation” of power has played a major role. Following the untimely death of President Umaru Yar’Adua in 2010 (only three years into his first term), the succession of then-Vice President Jonathan set up a major challenge to the PDP’s formal and informal commitment to the regional and religious balance of power. For many northern PDP members, their “wing” of the party (and half of the country) was still “owed” another turn in power, balancing out the Christian Olusegun Obasanjo’s eight years in office from 1999 to 2003, the public discourse between the two communities has become increasingly toxic and fear-driven.

To be clear, this political polarization of religious identities hardly represents the views of all Nigerian attitudes. Leading public figures from both communities—Sa’ad Abubakar III, Sultan of Sokoto, and Bishop Matthew Hassan Kukah are two prominent examples—have sought to promote dialogue and mutual engagement, and the available survey evidence suggests that most Nigerians view the relationship between religious communities as largely positive. Similarly, my own research on the politics of the sharia implementation controversy finds that for most Muslims, demand for Islamic legal reform was driven by its potential to improve governance, eliminate corruption, and hold political elites accountable—not by growing radicalism. However, given the increased intensity of Boko Haram’s attacks on Christians since 2011 (although fellow Muslims remain primary targets as well), the Jonathan administration’s response to the crisis has become irretrievably embroiled in this divisive logic.

Boko Haram and the Politics of Counterinsurgency

How do Nigerians see both Boko Haram and the federal government’s response to it? As a 2013 poll by NOI Polls Ltd. (a national public opinion survey organization) suggests, the vast majority of citizens outside the North East and North Central “zones” report little effect of the Boko Haram insurgency on their movement, business, and daily lives. Not surprisingly, these differences of experience have sometimes driven significant differences of opinion over both the causes of the conflict and the best strategy to end it.

In the north, the rise of Boko Haram is often discussed in terms of the persistent problems of poverty, lack of economic opportunity, and inadequate state infrastructure that have long plagued the region, widely regarded as Nigeria’s poorest. Many point specifically to the plight of the almajirai, young Quranic students who often subsist...
on alms and itinerant labor across the northern region (some estimates suggest their number may be as high as 9 million) as a primary target of Boko Haram recruitment, although, as Hannah Hoechner convincingly argues, there is little evidence that this has actually happened. Similarly, despite President Jonathan’s appointment of a prominent northerner (and son of a former sultan), Colonel Sambo Dasuki, as his national security advisor (NSA), popular opinion among many northern Muslims often depicts the current campaign against Boko Haram as an enterprise waged primarily by outsiders unsympathetic to local needs and concerns. Not surprisingly then, it is northern voices who have most loudly condemned the actions of federal military and security services who have, as numerous international human rights groups have documented, engaged in significant (and often illegal) violence against civilians in their persecution of the “ground war” against the insurgency.

In the south, many prominent voices focus instead on Boko Haram’s religious orientation, emphasizing their attacks on Christian communities and blaming northern Muslim leaders for the failure of the federal government’s response. In the Nigerian public sphere, this concern is reflected by the persistent rumors and accusations that high-level Muslim officials (the most recent name bandied about is Sanusi Lamido Sanusi, the internationally respected former Central Bank director suspended by the Jonathan administration in February) are somehow involved in “sponsoring” Boko Haram and other terrorist and criminal enterprises. In a nation where political and particularly economic power is often exercised through channels invisible to ordinary citizens, such claims of “secret” alliances between the powerful and the violent are hardly surprising, but they are also largely unverifiable, and often (as in the case of Sanusi) clearly politically motivated. Similarly, southern opinion leaders have often seemed more supportive of the use of military force, even when the civilian costs are high. For many, particularly PDP leaders from Jonathan’s own South-South region, attacks on Jonathan’s leadership on the Boko Haram problem are seen as attacks on the “federal character” rights of his own community, which naturally include a second full term.

Clearly, these summaries paint the opinions of 170 million Nigerians with a broad brush, and there is significant diversity of opinion on these issues. Increasingly, as NOI also finds, popular attitudes are shifting nationally away from support for a military solution and toward negotiation, amnesty for Boko Haram fighters (in the style of similar programs offered in the late 2000s for militants in the Delta region), and even development and governance reforms. In March, NSA Dasuki unveiled a new strategy precisely along these lines, echoing the “Countering Violent Extremism” (CVE) template promoted by USAID and other international actors. Dasuki called for concerted efforts to “de-radicalize” militants and an “economic revitalization programme” for the northeast, as well as increased cooperation with local nongovernmental organizations (NGO) and faith organizations in the affected communities. Clearly, these new policies would go a long way toward repairing the Nigerian military’s tarnished international reputation for excessive violence against civilians, a problem that has already led to the denial of some U.S. military aid on Leahy Law grounds. It remains to be seen to what extent these recommendations will be carried out, however, particularly in the wake of the April 15 kidnappings, which have already generated calls for a return to muscular military action in some quarters.

Moving Forward?

What does this story suggest for Nigeria’s immediate and near-term political future? On paper, the 2015 elections are poised to be the most contentious since the 1999 democratic transition. The Jonathan administration’s supporters in the PDP can draw on significant organizational and political resources (many entirely legal, and some less so) during the election cycle, and are likely to frame the Boko Haram conflict in terms that downplay its danger to the state. In a recent interview, Minister of Finance Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala used precisely these terms, implying that the recent upswing in Boko Haram activity is intended to influence the results of the upcoming elections, and blaming the group’s external supporters in Chad, Cameroon, and Niger rather than the government’s own policies for their ability to operate with seeming impunity? The APC, on the other hand, will face the problem of providing meaningful policy alternatives beyond “power shift” to a northern president, especially given that any shift of federal revenues or resources to the North in order to combat the underlying social drivers of violence (the so-called “Marshall Plan” approach) would likely be challenged by southern interests.
The best short-term solution, of course, is to begin preparing well in advance of the elections to address potential security concerns—chief among them being how to manage the voting exercise in communities where Boko Haram poses an immediate danger—as other key legal and technical matters. Appearances matter, both internationally and domestically, and it is not clear that either the Independent National Election Commission (INEC) or the Jonathan administration has a clear set of plans in place with respect to how to ensure that the North East’s votes are counted if there is an election-time surge in violence. If international security assistance is eventually to be provided, this should be a major priority. Similarly, most previous election and post-election violence in Nigeria has been perpetrated not by organized terrorist groups, but by frustrated local actors. Here, local power-sharing institutions—many of which have a long, successful track record of keeping the peace in divided communities—must be cultivated and reinforced. Neglecting these actors at election time in favor of simply intensifying the anti–Boko Haram military response is likely to backfire spectacularly, with dire consequences for the nation as a whole.

Notes


The South Sudan Crisis in Perspective: A Primer for the U.S. Intelligence Community

By Mr. Paul Nantulya, communications specialist at the Africa Center for Strategic Studies (ACSS), National Defense University, paul.nantulya@ndu.edu

I. Introduction

On December 14, 2013, South Sudan faced significant risks to its security and the potential of drawing its neighbors into the crises. An intense power struggle between the two leaders at the center of the crisis—President Salva Kiir and former Vice President Dr. Riek Machar—spun out of control shortly after a meeting of the ruling Sudan People’s Liberation Movement and Army (SPLM/SPLA).1 Within hours the Tiger Battalion, which doubles as a presidential guard, split into two: a Nuer faction (presumably loyal to Machar) and a Dinka one (presumably loyal to the president). By the following day, the fighting spread to the State House, where Tiger Battalion elements fired rockets into the president’s residence before being neutralized. In response, opposing elements used tank and artillery fire to destroy the vice president’s residence and residences belonging to other leaders.2 By evening, fighting broke out in the Army Command Center and Bilpam Military Barracks.3 Embattled, Kiir announced the following day that an attempted coup by Machar had been thwarted and several high-ranking SPLM leaders were arrested. By the third week, three full-strength SPLA divisions defected to the rebels, taking control of three strategic states: Jonglei, Unity, and Upper Nile (the latter two being South Sudan’s only
oil-producing states, which account for 98 percent of national revenues). Machar announced on December 21, 2013 that he was leading the rebellion.4 Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni, who has strong links to elements in the South Sudan government and in the SPLM opposition, deployed the Uganda People's Defense Force (UPDF) to fight alongside the government, helping it win back the three states. Machar, on February 21, 2014, regained control of Unity state—the country's largest oil-producing state—only to lose it again to the government on March 20, 2014. Peace talks have been taking place in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, since early January. The ceasefire signed on January 23 has been violated several times by both sides. A meeting between Machar and Kiir, brokered under the threat of more U.S. sanctions, took place on May 9, following which the two leaders authorized their representatives to negotiate details of a transitional government. Significant differences, however, remain, not the least of which includes whether the two leaders, each of whom might be culpable for war crimes committed by fighters under their direct command, are eligible to participate in the transitional process. On May 6, the United States imposed targeted financial sanctions on Marial Chanuong, the commander of the Tiger Battalion, and Peter Gadet, the overall commander of forces loyal to Machar, for leading attacks against civilians.

This article was prepared for the U.S. Intelligence Community (IC) to (1) analyze the crisis from a historical perspective, (2) identify key factors that led to the crisis, and (3) discuss indicators and collection priorities that warrant the IC’s attention and guide future intelligence tasking and all-source analysis.

II. Historical Overview and Current Trends

The formative years

Internal tensions have plaguing the SPLM/SPLA since its founding in 1983. The late Dr. John Garang—the movement’s first leader and an economics graduate of Grinnell College and Iowa State University, and trained in infantry tactics and maneuver at Fort Benning—championed a “new, united, democratic and secular Sudan.”5 By contrast, most of his colleagues favored outright independence for South Sudan. Because the Sudanese state was strictly Arab-Islamic, to the exclusion of other racial, ethnic, and religious identities, southerners have historically championed independence as an overarching objective.6 These ideological disagreements caused violent infighting in 1983 between “unionists” and “separatists,” but Garang remained firm: he molded the SPLM/SPLA into a unionist movement under the “New Sudan” ideology, which is based on the twin concepts of “unity in diversity” and “one country, two systems.”7 These concepts were enshrined in the 2005 American-sponsored Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the SPLM/SPLA and Khartoum—providing the governance framework for the 6-year interim period.8

The 1991 split in the SPLM/SPLA

In 1991, pro-independence elements, in a bloody showdown, attempted to oust Garang. Terming a coup, and led by then-senior commander Machar, the incident caused deep resentment and factional fighting between Machar’s Nuer followers and Garang’s Dinka. Machar’s forces at the time were accused of killing scores of Dinka civilians in what is now termed the “1991 Bor Massacre”—an incident for which he later publicly apologized.9 In 1992, Machar defected to Khartoum, after talks with Garang initiated by the U.S. Congress failed.10 He formed a Khartoum-sponsored militia that fought SPLM/SPLA until 2002, when he rejoined the movement. These events constitute pivotal moments in the national memory of the South. Many southerners have not forgotten what they consider to be Machar’s betrayal, as 1991 continues to be both a pejorative term and a rallying cry. Ironically, Machar, by leading remnants of forces he led in 1991 and that are now alleged to be committing similar atrocities, has opened up old wounds, possibly damaged his future leadership prospects, and reignited the consciousness and spirit with which South Sudan was established. President Kiir has invoked these events in several press releases, interviews, and national addresses since the crisis erupted.11

Political upheavals post-1991

The SPLM/SPLA suffered defections following the split; some joined Khartoum-sponsored militias, others the Sudanese army, and still others started their own insurgencies. With declining numbers and morale, the SPLA suffered several operational setbacks until 1998, when, with the help of Ugandan troops, it regained control of the Equatoria region (comprising the present eastern,
western, and central Equatoria states). By this time, a group of younger, rising officers had become close to Garang, eventually running the movement’s day-to-day affairs, causing Kiir, then second in command, to feel increasingly marginalized.12 Eleven senior leaders from this group were detained by Kiir on coup allegations; seven were released in February and are participating in the Addis talks as a third, “independent SPLM bloc” that is neither aligned to Kiir nor to Machar, a move Kiir accepted reluctantly and Machar called “unhelpful.”13 The remaining four were released in late April, following the government’s decision to drop treason charges against them, a move that was prompted by intense international (including U.S.) pressure and domestic calculations: the government’s star witness and head of military intelligence, Gen. Mac Paul Kuol, refuted the president’s allegation of a coup plot, effectively collapsing the case. Shortly after his testimony, Kuol and army chief of staff Gen. Hoth Mai were dismissed.14

Comprehensive Peace Agreement—era conflicts

In 2002, in an effort to reunify the movement, Garang appointed Machar as number three in the presidential line of succession—bypassing several more senior leaders. Although not openly challenged at the time, this decision created grievances that shaped many of the SPLM’s conflicts. Key among these was a disruption in the movement’s line of succession, and with it the inclusion of fighters and politicians deemed undeserving of leadership positions because of their perceived treachery in 1991.15

In 2004, rumors that Kiir would be arrested and replaced almost caused a split between Garang and Kiir. A stormy meeting in Rumbek contained it and paved the way for the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in 2005.16 Two groups, respectively loyal to Garang and Kiir, emerged in the wake of Rumbek. After Garang’s death, the relationship between Kiir and the pro-Garang group became increasingly strained, and persists as such to date.17

Current power dynamics for political control

Three distinct divisions were evident in the SPLM and SPLA during the interim period: (1) Kiir and his group; (2) Garang’s followers, who are euphemistically referred to by South Sudanese as “Garang’s orphans;” and derivatively by the Khartoum elite as “Garang boys;” and (3) Machar’s group. Ironically, the differences between Machar’s followers and the leaders historically associated with Garang are more intense and deeply rooted than those between this cohort of leaders and Kiir, but the two groups managed to forge an uneasy, if not temporary, alliance around their dissatisfaction with the president. On joining the Addis talks in February, Garang’s followers, calling themselves the “SPLM Independent Bloc,” explicitly distanced themselves from Machar’s rebellion, but voiced continued opposition to Kiir, a decision that reflects a fault line that had existed in Machar’s coalition from the outset, but which was overshadowed by the conflict between the former vice president and Kiir.18 Early on in the conflict, Mrs. Rebecca Garang, John Garang’s widow and a senior member of the “SPLM Independent Bloc,” refused to show up in Addis as leader of Machar’s negotiating team, sending instead her eldest son, Mabior Garang, much to Machar’s annoyance, according to sources familiar with discussions she had with the Ugandan president a few days before peace negotiations opened in Addis.19 Upon his release from detention, former SPLM Secretary General Pagan Amum, the presumed leader of the “SPLM Independent Bloc,” reiterated the decision of his group to remain non-aligned and to pursue political objectives. Given these sets of issues, the ongoing leadership contest in the SPLM is likely to be between three groups: Kiir and his supporters; the “SPLM in Opposition,” led by Machar; and the “SPLM Independent Bloc,” with all three claiming legitimacy as the “true SPLM.”

Future power realignments and dynamics

Machar has said that he will contest the presidency, as has Kiir. Pagan Amum is the most serious contender among the independents. The former SPLM Secretary General, in an April 2013 party meeting, declared his interest in the post of party chairman as an alternative to Kiir and Machar.20 Mrs. Garang likewise declared her interest, but with the caveat that she would be prepared to stand as deputy—a move widely understood to mean that she might consider deputizing Amum. Amum was very close to Garang and at one time was considered his successor. The SPLM National Convention will be a crucial milestone, beyond peace talks, because whoever wins will have a sure path to the presidency. Going
forward, two factors are likely to weigh heavily on all parties: first, the “SPLM Independents” could be an obstacle to both Machar and Kiir winning the National Convention; second, some observers close to the process argue that the “SPLM Independents” might be a credible alternative to Kiir and Machar. Determined to counter this, the government has publicly discredited this group by insisting that its leaders have cases to answer, and their release is merely in the “interest of reconciliation.” Additionally, senior government leaders are suspicious that the international community might put its support behind this group. These indicators suggest that the struggle for leadership is far from over, and may well ignite more conflicts. Agreements on a step-by-step roadmap of reforms—with guarantors at each stage—might therefore be necessary to foster a transparent and fair competition, as part of a broader reform package.

III. Conflict Indicators

The drivers of violence are grouped into three categories: security; politics and governance; and reconciliation and social and economic justice.

Security

Key Point: The SPLA is not national in character and lacks cohesion in command, control, culture, and operations.

(1) Raising Militias. The practice of raising militias has undermined the SPLA’s chain of command. President Kiir, according to media reports, admitted to forming a private militia at a February 17, 2014 gathering of high-ranking officials, saying the intention was to establish a reserve force. Other leaders who also controlled militias outside the chain of command include former presidential advisor Sultan Abdel Bagi Ayii, former SPLA deputy commander in chief, Gen Paulino Matip, and former 8th Division commander, Gen Peter Gadet, who defected to the rebels with his division two weeks after the crisis erupted. Machar himself is commanding the tribally based Nuer militia, the White Army, alongside forces loyal to him.

(2) Integrating Militias and Challenges. The integration in 2006 of over 60,000 rival militias was poorly executed, further undermining military cohesion. Many former militias—known as other armed groups, or OAGs—were spread throughout the SPLA’s 10 divisions, but attempts to split the middle and senior ranks mostly failed: some refused to move and were absorbed in the closest military unit, others refused to be mixed with SPLA units, and still others went AWOL. The resultant conflicting loyalties and chains of command explain the speed at which the army came apart when fighting broke out on December 14, 2013.

(3) Mistrust. There is mistrust between former OAGs and SPLA colleagues (the divisions that defected in December are all led by OAGs). In 2010, 20 OAG brigadiers were promoted to major general, and 145 colonels to brigadier; these were elevations that angered SPLA officers who perceive themselves as senior to those elevated. Officer promotion in the SPLA is dependent on when officers were commissioned, or when they attended the “Shield” officer courses during the liberation war. (For example, attendees of the first officer course in 1984, Shield 1, include the current Army Chief of Staff and his three Deputy Chiefs of Staff.) The integration process disrupted this system: according to a senior SPLA officer with knowledge of the issues, the haphazard integration upset the “Shield” system by creating disparities in promotion and seniority that make it impossible to control the force.

Politics and governance

Key Point: South Sudan’s institutions are structured and managed in ways that exacerbate violence.

(1) Reform. Several important reform processes—constitution-making, national reconciliation, and SPLM restructuring—remain stalled. The Political Bureau (PB), the SPLM’s highest policymaking organ, and the National Liberation Council (NLC) were both dissolved by Kiir in November 2013, leaving the party with no decisionmaking framework and effectively transferring decision-making to Kiir. The SPLM National Convention, which elects the party leadership and sets overall strategy and tactics every five years, has been
overdue since May 2013. In addition, the party’s basic documents (constitution, new manifesto, rules and regulations, and code of conduct) have not been adopted, fueling suspicion that Kiir has stifled the party’s few mechanisms in order to reduce competition against him in the delayed SPLM National Convention.

(2) Dissolving Structures. President Kiir dissolved these party mechanisms, saying that they were outdated and that the only functioning office was the Office of the Chairman, which he currently holds. According to Kiir, this office cannot be dissolved, and it retains the power to establish new structures from the grassroots.

The above developments are likely to cause more infighting, which may spread to the SPLA as happened in December 2013. A key point that intelligence analysts should take into account is that the SPLM is deeply rooted in the military, and its internal disputes reflect powerful constituencies and interests in the army. Lack of meaningful party and institutional reforms will therefore likely create more instability in the SPLA.

Reconciliation and social and economic justice

Key Point: The underlying historical and social grievances remain unaddressed.

(1) Role of Religious Leaders. South Sudanese churches, despite their reputation and experience in peacemaking, have not succeeded in forging a workable peace with key power brokers. The government, after making some headway with what it termed the “South-South Dialogue,” has not fared better. The South Sudan Peace Commission (SSPC) was established with American assistance in 2006, but disagreements between the Offices of the President and Vice President, according to several sources, rendered it ineffective. The two offices clashed again over the design of the 2012 national reconciliation process.

(2) Resources. Resource allocation remains inequitable. Oil exports account for 98 percent of revenues, 38 percent of which go to the security apparatus, 10 percent to infrastructure, and 7 percent to education. Misappropriation of revenues has resulted in grievances that continue to exacerbate conflict and tensions in the country.

IV. Conclusion

The current crisis in South Sudan is essentially a political struggle. Ethnicity per se is not the dividing issue; it is the manipulation of ethnicity by political leaders that escalated it. Additionally, the state building process is fraught with difficulties. Other African countries at independence had some basic institutions and infrastructure to build on; South Sudan, by contrast, had none. The country, the size of Texas, has less than 190 miles of paved road, almost no industrial production, and an almost nonexistent private sector. It relies on food imports from neighboring countries despite its agricultural potential, and is dependent on aid to deliver basic social services despite its oil wealth. Its oil infrastructure is based in (North) Sudan, whose economy is heavily dependent on transit fees to get South Sudan’s oil to international markets.

This state of affairs is unsustainable, and exacerbated by the structural issues discussed in this paper. This is not to suggest that South Sudanese were not aware of these challenges: Garang and his colleagues long ago concluded that the African post-colonial state was defective, and set about crafting alternative models for future use. Some of these include the 1994 Chukudum Modalities, the 1996 Civil Authority for New Sudan (CANS), the 2000 Peace Through Development Framework (PTDF), and the seminal 2004 Strategic Framework from War to Peace Transition. The solutions to the problems that the South Sudanese are trying to resolve today might in fact be contained in the ambitious and highly original documents that they themselves crafted. The parties, however, should be under no illusion about the difficulties that lie ahead; conflict resolution takes time and the foundations for state building in South Sudan are weak, and in several areas are nonexistent.

The United States, as a historically close friend and champion of the South Sudanese, has urged them to address four issues: making institutions more inclusive; reviving political, institutional, and constitutional reforms; expanding service delivery and peace dividends; and addressing historical grievances. To these should be added: military reform, transformation of the national economy, and national reconciliation.
Notes
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6 Garang, during a meeting with the author in May 1997, said that southerners, by “locking themselves in one corner” of the country while the oppressive system in the rest of the country remained intact, would be a recipe for future conflict even in the event of the creation of two independent states.


8 The CPA provided a six-year interim period during which both parties would “make unity an attractive option,” with the provision for a referendum on self-determination for southerners. Dr. Cirino Hiteng, a senior SPLM leader, in a meeting with the author in 2008 in Cape Town, South Africa, explained that the SPLM at the time viewed the referendum provision as an instrument to motivate Khartoum to make unity attractive during the six-year interim period, so as to
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22 These militias tend to be fluid, and are generally grounded in political and ethnic affiliations and the desire on the part of those controlling them to gain access to resources or political power.


24 Gadet, an ethnic Nuer, was integrated into SPLA in 2006 from the South Sudan Defense Forces (SSDF), a Khartoum-sponsored militia. In April 2011, he emerged as leader of the South Sudan Liberation Army (SSLA), a new militia demanding a more broadly based government. In August 2011, he declared a ceasefire and became 8th Division Commander. When the latest crisis broke out in December 2013, he mutinied again, and his mainly Nuer militia gained control of Bor. Machar installed him as military governor of Jonglei state.


26 The militias previously fought under the banner of the South Sudan Defense Forces (SSDF), the largest of Khartoum’s sponsored armed groups in South Sudan. For an excellent insight, see Matthew B. Arnold, “The South Sudan Defence Force: Patriots, Collaborators or Spoilers?” The Journal of Modern African Studies 4, No. 45, December 2007.

27 Ibid.


29 The training was initially done in Bonga, Ethiopia, during the early years, and later moved to South Sudan after the Mengistu regime was overthrown in 1991.

30 Author discussion with former Commander of the SPLA Joint Integrated Units (JIU) Division in Juba, South Sudan, June 2007.


32 Ibid.

33 In 2010, the Sudan Council of Churches (SCC) and Government of South Sudan held the historic “Kejiko II” Summit, crafting a vision for the new country and a framework to address the challenges facing the nation. It was a follow-up to the 1997 Kejiko Conference between
the SPLM/SPLA and churches working in the liberated areas. The author was a facilitator in the 2010 Summit.

34 Author discussions with staff in the South Sudan Peace Commission (SSPC) and Ministry of Peace and CPA Implementation. Between 2007 and 2011, the author provided technical assistance and advice to these two institutions. Paralysis caused by clashes between the offices of the president and vice president were a source of considerable frustration for SSPC staff. A draft national peace policy framework document, drafted by the SSPC with considerable input from the author, was not adopted by the cabinet due to these differences.


37 These documents were the product of several years of debate and experimentation. Many of the SPLM’s current leaders were involved in debating and drafting them. The Strategic Framework from War to Peace Transition was produced by the SPLM Inter Departmental Strategic Coordination Team (ISCOORT), a body created in 2003 to prepare the movement for formal governance. The ISCOORT process was supported by, among others, the United States, South Africa, and the United Nations. The United States, through the 1997 Sudan Transitional Assistance for Rehabilitation (STAR), supported the vision and modalities outlined in the Chukudum Proposals and the Civil Authority for New Sudan (CANS). Other processes include the 2002 Abyei People’s Convention, which developed a comprehensive post-CPA governance framework for the area. Similar conventions carried in other regions of South Sudan during peace talks.

Africa’s emerging strategic importance is also the result of positive developments on the continent. Seven of the world’s ten fastest-growing economies are located there, and many African security forces have made significant strides in their ability to respond to crises and support multinational peacekeeping efforts. Today, more than 65,000 African troops are deployed globally on United Nations and African Union missions, representing nearly 70 percent of all peacekeepers in the world.

The leaders who shape U.S. policy in Africa face a wide array of challenges and opportunities, and a vast continent with nearly a billion inhabitants speaking over two thousand languages and spread over an area larger than the continental United States, China, India, and Western Europe combined. These leaders will depend on engagement between the Intelligence Community and academic institutions like the National Intelligence University that drives innovative research on conflict in Africa.
Research Corner: Open Source Conflict Data and Research Projects

There are a number of open source datasets and research projects available to analysts working on conflict in Africa. Some of the databases are very general and may be used for a variety of analyses in Africa and beyond, while others are more specific in the scope of geography and/or topic. Units of analysis vary: for most datasets, the unit of analysis is country-year, whereas for others the unit is the actual event, actor, or other sub-national unit. The resources below include both quantitative and qualitative research efforts.

The following list provides databases and datasets that are commonly used in scholarly research and that are relatively up-to-date. Most are free for public use; a few require a license to access. Before purchasing an individual user license, please check with the John T. Hughes Library at the Defense Intelligence Agency, or your University’s library, to see if your institution subscribes. The list also provides research projects that are relevant to the topic of conflict in Africa (e.g. IARPA initiatives).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Available at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCDP Georeferenced Event Dataset (GED), Uppsala University</td>
<td>Provides geolocated data on organized violence, including armed conflict.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/datasets/ucdp_ged/">http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/datasets/ucdp_ged/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDP Non-State Conflict Dataset, Uppsala University</td>
<td>Provides data on non-state actors involved in armed conflict. Unit of analysis is country-year.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/datasets/ucdp_non-state_conflict_dataset_">http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/datasets/ucdp_non-state_conflict_dataset_</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Conflict Location &amp; Event Data Project (ACLED), The Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Provides continuous data collection on political violence in Africa, including dates and places of conflict events, types of events (e.g., battles, killings, riots, and recruitment activity), actors involved in the conflict (e.g., rebels, civilians, government), changes in territorial control, and reported fatalities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acleddata.com/">http://www.acleddata.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlates of War (COW), Dr. Zeev Maoz</td>
<td>Provides a number of datasets on violent conflict, peacemaking, and international relations. Includes The Issue Correlates of War (ICOW), which covers international relations topics such as territorial, maritime, and river claims.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.correlatesofwar.org/">http://www.correlatesofwar.org/</a> <a href="http://www.paulhensel.org/icow.html">http://www.paulhensel.org/icow.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Available at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Conflict in Africa Database (SCAD), The Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Focuses on social conflict, such as protests, riots, inter-communal conflict, and government violence against civilians.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.strausscenter.org/ccaps/research/about-social-conflict.html">https://www.strausscenter.org/ccaps/research/about-social-conflict.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data on Armed Conflict and Security (DACS), Dr. Sven Chojnacki</td>
<td>Provides data on private security (e.g., private military and security companies), event data on armed conflict and security, and a consolidated list of wars.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.conflict-data.org/">http://www.conflict-data.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Instability Task Force, Center for Global Policy, George Mason University</td>
<td>Provides datasets on genocide and politicide, ethnic wars, adverse regime changes, and revolutionary wars.</td>
<td><a href="http://globalpolicy.gmu.edu/political-instability-task-force-home/">http://globalpolicy.gmu.edu/political-instability-task-force-home/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, Political, and Economic Event Database (SPEED), Cline Center for Democracy, University of Illinois</td>
<td>Provides data on destabilizing events and coup events around the world.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.clinecenter.illinois.edu/data/speed/">http://www.clinecenter.illinois.edu/data/speed/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Terrorism Database, National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, University of Maryland</td>
<td>Provides annual, geolocated updates of domestic, transnational, and international terrorist activity across the globe.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/">http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change and African Political Stability (CCAPS), The Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Provides data on climate change vulnerability in Africa and examines the impact of climate change on political stability and violent conflict. Website includes mapping tools and user dashboards for those interested in exploring the impact of climate change in Africa.</td>
<td><a href="https://strausscenter.org/ccaps/">https://strausscenter.org/ccaps/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Violence in Armed Conflict Dataset, Harvard Kennedy School/Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO)</td>
<td>Tracks sexual violence used in armed conflict by conflict-year. Includes perpetrators, victims, prevalence, locations, types, and timing. Data were recently released, but coverage ends in 2009.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sexualviolencedata.org/">http://www.sexualviolencedata.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid Work in Danger — Security in Numbers Database (SiND), Insecurity Insight</td>
<td>Synthesizes data from open source and aid agency reports on violent incidents experienced by aid workers.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.insecurityinsight.org/projectshumanitarian.html">http://www.insecurityinsight.org/projectshumanitarian.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Conflict Database (ACD), International Institute for Strategic Studies</td>
<td>Provides data on fatalities, refugee flows, non-state armed groups and more. Does not cover all African countries, but it does provide sub-national conflict coverage for some countries (e.g., fatalities in the Niger Delta, Nigeria, in 2005).</td>
<td><a href="https://acd.iiss.org/en">https://acd.iiss.org/en</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Available at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Source Indicators (OSI), Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity</td>
<td>Ongoing research endeavor to develop models that use open source information (such as Twitter) to anticipate a host of activity, such as civil unrest, disease outbreaks, and election outcomes.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iarpa.gov/index.php/research-programs/osi">http://www.iarpa.gov/index.php/research-programs/osi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregative Contingent Estimation (ACE), Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity</td>
<td>Ongoing research endeavor to develop prediction markets that respond to anticipatory questions posed by the Intelligence Community.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iarpa.gov/index.php/research-programs/ace">http://www.iarpa.gov/index.php/research-programs/ace</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Early Warning &amp; Assessment Program, Fund for Peace</td>
<td>In addition to the annual Failed State Index, Fund for Peace provides ongoing analysis of conflict trends in select African countries.</td>
<td><a href="http://global.fundforpeace.org/cewa">http://global.fundforpeace.org/cewa</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-National Time-Series Data Archive, State University of New York (Binghamton)</td>
<td>An annual archive of several event variables across the globe. Requires a user license, which is usually available through a library.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.databanksinternational.com/32.html">http://www.databanksinternational.com/32.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Narrative &amp; Conflict Resolution (CNCR), George Mason University</td>
<td>Multiple research projects aimed at advancing theory, practice, and analysis of using narratives in conflict research.</td>
<td><a href="http://cnr.gmu.edu/">http://cnr.gmu.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Agreements Database, United Nations (UN) Peacemaker</td>
<td>A global database of peace agreements, UN mediation support services, and other guidance material.</td>
<td><a href="http://peacemaker.un.org/">http://peacemaker.un.org/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other databases that are outdated, but may be useful for analysts wishing to do more historical analysis, include:

- **Minorities at Risk (MAR):** Offers both quantitative and qualitative data and analysis on conflicts in Africa until 2006.
- **Kansas Event Data System (KEDS):** Data covers some African countries but stops in late 1990s.
- **Conflict and Peace Data Bank (COPDAB):** Data coverage is from 1948–1978 and does not include all African countries.
- **International Crisis Behavior (ICB):** Data coverage ends in 2007, but the unit of analysis is crisis (e.g., Eritrean-Ethiopian war) rather than nation-state, which may be useful for some analyses; provides actor-decision data as well.

Other general event data that may be useful include:

- **Open Event Data Alliance,** available at http://openeventdata.org/.
- **The Dataverse Network Project, The Institute for Qualitative Social Science, Harvard University,** available at http://thedata.harvard.edu/dvn/.
John T. Hughes Library Selected Bibliography

Starting Points for Conflict in Africa
This is a single-volume overview of conflict in Africa. It consolidates a range of viewpoints and expertise, creating a cohesive and coherent message across all contributed chapters. The introduction lays a practical framework for political analysis of violent conflict. Part One outlines theories and causes of conflict in Africa, and Part Two addresses responses to conflict. The scope of this work makes it an ideal starting place for Africa analysts and researchers.

This fifth edition focuses on present-day Africa and provides any researcher with a timely and layered understanding of the context within which conflict occurs across Africa. The book features a helpful section on the present-day impact of the colonial period and the role of this history in modern African politics and social issues. It also covers politics as a whole, economics, governance, and public health topics. Attention is paid to natural resources conflict, ethnic conflict, and conflict resolution in Africa.

As an excellent overview of security- and conflict-related topics in Africa, this handbook provides readers with a thorough understanding of major issues, synthesizing historical background information with current events and relevant updates. Sections include “The African Security Predicament in the Twenty-First Century,” “Understanding Conflict in Africa,” “Regionalism and Africa,” and “External Influences.” This is a good starting point for new researchers and a valuable refresher for those with experience in the topic.

This book discusses the role of informal political and economic networks in African conflict areas. The introduction provides an important overview of the concept of Big Men—informal political or economic actors in a power network—in African network governance and ongoing conflicts. The book introduces 10 case studies, organized thematically and by country. Topics include military entrepreneurialism, illicit drugs, international criminal justice, bargaining, Big Man networks, and conflict resources. Country case studies feature Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Côte d’Ivoire, and Mali.

Williams assesses Africa’s deadliest conflicts, focusing on three major facets: context, which compares conflicts and provides an overview of the landscape of conflict across the continent; ingredients, which examines factors contributing to conflicts, such as post-colonialism, natural resources, and ethnicity; and responses, which outlines international responses to deadly conflict. This book is a recommended starting point for analysts and researchers whose responsibilities include Africa.
Further Reading on Conflict in Africa


Recent Articles on Conflict in Africa


**Current Events, Magazines, and Research Journals**

Information on conflict studies and on Africa is published in a wide variety of academic journals. For assistance in locating additional journals, newspapers, and research materials on the region, contact the John T. Hughes Library.

* African Affairs Journal  
* African Armed Forces Journal  
* African Business  
* Africa Confidential  
* African Conflict & Peacebuilding Review  
* The Africa Report  
* Africa Research Bulletin: Political, Social & Cultural Series  
* African Studies Review  
* Africa Today  
* BBC Focus on Africa  
* Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict  
* International Journal of Conflict Management  
* International Peacekeeping  
* Jeune Afrique  
* Journal of East African Studies  
* Journal of Conflict Resolution  
* Journal of Contemporary African Studies  
* Journal of Peace Research  
* Media, War, and Conflict  
* New African  
* Review of African Political Economy  

**Research and News Databases for Conflict Studies**

* Armed Conflicts Database  
This International Institute for Strategic Studies database includes summaries of conflicts around the globe, with background information, analysis of military and security factors, human security issues, and the latest timelines.

* Columbia International Affairs Online  
Published by Columbia University, CIAO is a comprehensive source for working papers, proceedings, journals, and policy briefs. Contributing organizations include Africa Center for Strategic Studies, Africa Policy Information Center, International Crisis Group, and numerous others.

* Praeger Security International  
Praeger Security International includes books, book chapters, journal articles, documents, commentary, and other resources on international security, with significant content in conflict studies and conflict resolution.
Open Access Resources for Research on Africa

The Nordic Africa Institute—Nordiska Afrikainstitutet—http://www.nai.uu.se/
Based in Sweden, the Nordic Africa Institute is a leading organization for research on Africa that publishes information through DiVA Portal, an open-access repository of publications. Of note is a well-developed guide to research on Africa:


The Fund for Peace—Washington, DC—http://www.fundforpeace.org
The Fund for Peace works to prevent violent conflict. FFP produces the Failed States Index, and Country Profiles with detailed state-level conflict assessment. The Conflict Assessment Software Tool (CAST) analyzes news and reporting to track changes in conflict indicators, such as demographic pressures, group grievances, and security activities.

Ploughshares Project—http://ploughshares.ca/
The Ploughshares Project is based in Canada, and provides research and analysis to prevent war and violent conflict. Publications include the Ploughshares Monitor, Armed Conflict Reports, and the ACR Interactive Map, located at http://ploughshares.ca/programs/armed-conflict/acr-interactive-map/.

Additional Research on Conflict in Africa


JTHL Research Consultation Service

Have a question? Need research assistance? The John T. Hughes Library offers a Research Consultation Service for researchers, analysts, and students. To make an appointment with one of our Research Librarians, contact the JTHL at JTH_Library@dodiis.mil.
Director’s Note

By Dr. Michael B. Petersen, Director, Center for Strategic Intelligence Research, National Intelligence University, Michael.petersen@dodiis.mil

Greetings, and thanks for reading the inaugural edition of NIU’s Africa Research Initiative newsletter! I am very proud of this new publication and of the extraordinary effort that Dr. Kris Inman, our Chief Africa Researcher, has put in to make it happen. It is a model of an outstanding collaborative effort between academia and the Intelligence Community that we will continue to pursue.

Although there is sometimes an understandable distrust between the academic and intelligence communities, I believe that the two have much to offer each other. In many ways, their goals are similar: to gather, analyze, interpret, and arrange seemingly disparate and unrelated pieces of data and evidence into a coherent whole, and then to publish the results to a broader community of interest in a professionally accepted outlet. For scholars involved in national, regional, and global security research, the links are even more obvious.

We hope to develop and extend this mutual interest in NIU’s Center for Strategic Intelligence Research (CSIR). Our research center is founded upon the idea of putting the best practices of scholarly research and writing at the service of the U.S. Intelligence Community. These include incorporating the highest standards of research design and methodology, adhering to all human subjects protections for the purposes of research, engaging and participating in communities of scholarly interest, and employing peer review for our original research as much as possible to preserve the maximum standards of scholarly integrity and publication.

CSIR runs two primary research programs. The first is a series of strategic research initiatives. Currently, our center manages initiatives on sub-Saharan Africa, the Western Hemisphere (focusing on Latin America), and science and technology. Each one of these initiatives applies itself to issues that the broader Intelligence Community is unable to address, given time and resource constraints or the press of current events, but that are still critical to meeting U.S. security interests. They are headed up by personnel who hold Ph.D.s in a relevant field, possess academic research and publishing experience, and are familiar with the defense and intelligence communities. They network with analytic leadership in the Intelligence Community to develop a research agenda, and then either conduct the research themselves or work with a network of academics to support intelligence research needs. The newsletter you are reading right now is one product of that excellent collaborative relationship.

The second research program in CSIR is the ODNI Exceptional Analyst/NIU Research Fellowship. Each year, CSIR hosts a group of cleared, qualified U.S. Government employees and mentors them on the research projects of their choice. The projects can range from the internal business practices of individual organizations to broader examinations of regional and global trends and activities. What unites them, however, is that they all adhere to the highest standards of scholarly research, from research design, to methodology, to writing.

But CSIR is not alone in its endeavors. Indeed, it could not succeed in its mission without its partners within the National Intelligence University’s Office of Research. In addition to our research center, the Office of Research houses NIU’s John T. Hughes Library, as well as the National Intelligence Press. The collections within the library are, of course, essential to enable successful
research and the National Intelligence Press provides a perfect outlet for the Intelligence Community’s academic publishing related to global security issues. Taken together, the Office of Research serves as a think tank for the U.S. Intelligence Community. Its mission is to encourage and facilitate the production, publication, and presentation of cutting-edge research on global security issues.

In short, our goal is to reimagine ways to capitalize on the mutual interests of the academic and intelligence communities by drawing out the best traditions of both. By incorporating cutting-edge scholarly research on regional and global security issues into the daily practice of intelligence analysis, official decisionmaking can become more well-informed, and improved national security is the result.
Africa Research Initiative Report

By Dr. Kris Inman, Chief Africa Researcher, Center for Strategic Intelligence Research, National Intelligence University, Kristie.inman@dodiis.mil

Overview: The Africa Research Initiative (ARI) began in April 2013. Housed in the Office of Research at the National Intelligence University, the ARI responds to Intelligence Community (IC) agencies’ strategic research needs pertaining to sub-Saharan Africa. ARI’s primary intent is to address those needs pertaining to second- and third-tier priorities that the IC is unable to address, given its own resource constraints, but that are nonetheless critical to national security interests. The ARI networks with analytic cadres and analytic leadership to develop collaborative and/or independent scholarly research projects using existing areas of knowledge and expertise. It does not conduct bench research, which may be misconstrued as collection operations. It does not conduct finished intelligence analysis. The ARI is blessed to have the excellent research assistance of Ms. Phuong Hoang, a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Maryland (degree expected in 2014). Together, we have produced a number of research projects and have provided professional services to the IC and academic communities within the ARI network.

Our first year was busy. We spent considerable effort socializing our new initiative to the senior leadership within the IC, and to scholars and researchers who specialize in Africa. We also worked within the U.S. government to develop partnerships with offices and centers in order to maximize our efforts and impact. Two partnerships over the past year were essential to ARI’s successful inaugural year. First, we forged a symbiotic relationship with the Africa Advisor for the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) Regional Expertise and Culture branch (REC), Ms. Brittany Bland. Together, we have hosted a number of seminars on critical topics in Africa, such as political succession, conflict resolution, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) Force Intervention Brigade, and many more (see Ms. Bland’s REC Report in this newsletter for more information). Second, we had the opportunity to partner with Ms. April Gregory-MacDicken, a tradecraft methodologist in the DIA Research Director’s Office, to execute the first-ever Defense Analytics Explorations (DAE) project. The purpose of the DAE program is to bring together analysts from across the community to work on a topic that poses an endemic challenge to the analytic cadre, which they cannot tackle within the confines of executing their day jobs. The topic we addressed in the pilot DAE was early conflict warning in Africa, which the National Intelligence Officer identified as an enduring challenge.

Past Research Efforts: In addition to networking, in 2013, the ARI produced one finished research project that compared African public opinion toward the United States and China. While there is ample research on anti-Americanism in other regions, there is a dearth of research on Africans’ attitudes toward the United States. On the other hand, while there are several case studies on Africans’ attitudes toward China, there are almost no cross-national studies. No existing studies compare African attitudes to both China and the United States. The purpose of this research is thus to begin filling these gaps. Using a multi-level statistical model that nests Afrobarometer Round 4 survey data and country-level factors, this study provides a systematic and comprehensive examination of African public opinion toward China and the United States. Findings suggest that Africans react to what China and the United States do, both in Africa and across the globe, but in sometimes unexpected ways. The findings indicate where U.S. and Chinese efforts in Africa are succeeding and where they are not. Most importantly, the best-known
pillars of Chinese and American engagement in Africa do not appear to impact African attitudes toward either country. For example, infrastructure development has no effect on African attitudes toward the Chinese, and improved access to health care through the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) yields no impact on how Africans feel about America. This research was presented at the Africa Studies Program at the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University (Washington, DC); the Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association (Baltimore, MD); and the State Department (Washington, DC). An abridged research note was published through the Center for Strategic Intelligence Research (CSIR) in March 2014; the full manuscript is currently under review for academic publication.

**Current Research Efforts:** We have a robust research agenda for 2014. In January, I kicked off research on political succession in Africa that is projected to be a multi-year project. I presented very preliminary research at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association (Chicago, IL) in April 2014, and have another CSIR research note pending publication. Using the Archigos leadership data, this preliminary research provides descriptive statistics on political leadership and succession in Africa from Independence to present. The next phase will begin testing some of the existing theories about political succession, such as the theory that coups d'état lead to more coups d'état, that irregular succession leads to instability, and so on. Meanwhile, I am writing a third CSIR research note that uses the most recent available data to illustrate the extent to which technology is penetrating the African continent. This summer, I plan to begin a project on the psychological effects of organized violence in Africa, in conjunction with my doctoral students at the Chicago School of Professional Psychology.

Ms. Hoang is leading a research series that provides meta-studies of academic literature on key topics in Africa. The first meta-study examines the academic literature on how technology is transforming the African context, including conflict, politics, health, economics, and more. The second meta-study in progress examines the existing literature on security sector reform in Africa.
National Intelligence University Faculty Report

By Ambassador Cindy Courville

In 2011, Ambassador Cindy Courville, the first U.S. ambassador to the African Union and Chair of the Department of Strategic Intelligence at the National Intelligence University (NIU), launched the graduate Certificate in Intelligence Studies (CIS) in Africa: Strategic Intelligence Studies program with 22 students. The Africa certificate program faculty includes Maj Jana Nyerges, USAF, and Col Joseph Martinelli, USAF (ret.).

Maj Nyerges has a Master of Arts (with honors) in National Security Affairs/Sub-Saharan Africa from the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, CA. She has a distinguished career with extensive Africa experience. She was deployed and served from April 2012 to May 2013 as the Senior Analyst with the Joint Intelligence Cell as part of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), Goma. From 2006 to 2009, she served as the East–South Africa Branch Chief and as the North–Trans Regional Africa Branch Chief of the Intelligence and Knowledge Directorate in the Joint Analysis Center at Molesworth, United Kingdom. In 2008, Maj Nyerges deployed as a liaison officer to J2/Horn of Africa with U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) at Camp Lemmonier, Djibouti.

Col Martinelli, USAF (ret.), is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Oklahoma and has a Master of Arts in Strategic Intelligence from NIU. He was on the Defense Intelligence Agency’s (DIA) analytical team that assisted in setting up U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) from 2007 to 2009. Col Martinelli served as the DIA’s Air Attaché in Ethiopia from 2003 to 2007, and was the first U.S. European Command (USEUCOM) senior military liaison and military advisor to the African Union (AU) from 2004 to 2007. He was the U.S. military representative to the AU Darfur Integrated Task Force (DITF) from 2005 to 2006. In 2006, he served with the AU as the U.S. intelligence advisor to the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) peacekeeping force in El Fasher, Sudan.

The objective of the Africa CIS program is to provide a greater understanding of the strategic importance of the African continent for U.S. foreign policy, and the role that strategic intelligence plays in the global perspective and development of U.S. engagement in Africa. The program comprises four courses: MSI 671, Africa: Geostrategic Intelligence Issues; MSI 572, Africa: Intelligence and National Security Strategy; MSI 573, Conflicts in Africa; and MSI 574, Africa: Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement. The graduate certificate is designed to prepare students to critically identify and analyze the factors that shape U.S. Africa policy choices, and to understand the role that intelligence plays in predicting, forecasting, and developing warning patterns and trends of conflict and conflict management in Africa. The Africa CIS students include policymakers, career diplomats, congressional staffers, and intelligence professionals from a broad spectrum of agencies throughout the Intelligence Community and the federal government.
Regional Expertise and Culture Program, Africa Report

By Ms. Brittany Bland, Africa Advisor, Regional Expertise and Culture Program, Brittany.bland@dodiis.mil

The Defense Intelligence Agency’s Regional Expertise and Culture Branch (REC) provides powerful, innovative, and dynamic learning solutions to meet ongoing Department of Defense (DoD) and Intelligence Community (IC) global mission requirements. REC, as part of the Academy for Defense Intelligence Mission Enabler Training Department, offers a variety of flexible, responsive, and agile educational programs that are created to best suit the workforce’s critical needs. Five regional advisors—Africa, Americas, Asia-Pacific, Europe/Eurasia, and Middle East—develop these educational programs in coordination with the Defense Intelligence Office, the Regional Centers, Combatant Commands, and IC stakeholders. These programs include Geostategic Intelligence Seminars (GIS), Regional Seminars (RS), Regional Symposiums, Cross-Cultural Competence (3C) Training, and the Guest Speaker/Roundtable Program. Topics are focused on critical regional and cultural issues along four major pillars: culture, governance, development, and security, which serve as the framework for all REC products and initiatives.

The GIS and RS programs are conducted at the graduate level and are designed as collaborative learning environments, integrating critical thinking on important issues affecting a region or country. The instruction is geared toward providing the participants with multiple perspectives, and incorporates a wide range of speakers from both within and outside the IC, including experts from academia, think tanks, and private industry, as well as foreign nationals. An event can span anywhere from a half-day to five days, depending on the topic and customer requirements. All are open to all members of the IC. In addition, all GIS and RS programs are available via virtual teleconference (VTC) for those not able to attend in person.

The Africa REC program has served an important role in bringing together experts to focus on the increasing challenges facing the continent. The Africa REC program consistently partners with academia—the National Intelligence University, the National Defense University, and the U.S. Army War College, plus other academic institutions—and IC and USG agencies to provide a tailored and unique learning environment and structure. Examples of previous seminar topics include conflict in Africa, technology in Africa, Islam in Africa, and a two-part series on the history of North Africa. GIS: Conflict in Africa (January 2014) was a three-day event that brought in members from across the IC to discuss different methods for developing warning indicators of crisis and conflict in Africa. The course, while focused broadly on Africa, used four major case studies (Nigeria, Central African Republic, Sudan, and South Sudan) to provide the opportunity to examine the issues on a more detailed level.

The REC Africa program has a two-year training plan to provide Africa-related training to meet customer objectives and mission requirements. In addition to the continued GIS and RS programs, we are developing a self-paced curriculum guide for those wanting to further their knowledge and understanding of Africa and Africa-related issues. Those interested in learning more about the REC Africa program and other initiatives may link to our Intellipedia site: https://intellipedia.intelink.gov/wiki/DIA_Regional_Expertise_and_Culture_(REC). Those who would like to be added to the distribution list for upcoming events should send an e-mail to ~RECAFRICA@DODIIS.mil. Those with an interest in
training for other regions may feel free to contact the e-mail addresses listed below.

Americas: ~RECAmericas@dodiis.mil
Asia Pacific: ~RECEastSoutheast@dodiis.mil
Europe/Eurasia: ~RECEurope-Eurasia@dodiis.mil
Middle East: ~RECMiddleEast@dodiis.mil
South Asia: ~RECSouthAsia@dodiis.mil

---

### Africa REC Event Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Month</th>
<th>Planned Date</th>
<th>Country/Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>7–9 January</td>
<td>Africa Three-Day: Indicators of Crisis/Conflict (Warning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15–16 January</td>
<td>Africa/Asia Two-Day: The Tenth Parallel: Future Flashpoint or Alarmist Fallacy (Islam in Africa and Southeast Asia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>18 February</td>
<td>Africa One-Day: History of North Africa (Part I—Libya and Tunisia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>Africa One-Day: Technology in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 March</td>
<td>Africa One-Day: History of North Africa (Part II—Morocco and Algeria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>3 April</td>
<td>Africa ½ Day: Gulf of Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>Africa One-Day: Conflict in Africa (Rwanda, Burundi, and DRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 April</td>
<td>Africa ½ Day: History of Apartheid in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>19 May</td>
<td>Africa ½ Day: Berber Politics in North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>24 June</td>
<td>Africa ½ Day: Collective Security in the Sahel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>15–16 July</td>
<td>Africa Two-Day: Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Africa One-Day: Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Africa ½ Day: Urbanization and Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Africa ½ Day: ECOWAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>