**JOURNAL OF GOVERNANCE
AND DEVELOPMENT**
https://e-journal.uum.edu.my/index.php/jgd

AFRICA AND PAX-AFRICANA IN THE AGE OF INTERVENTIONISM

[1]Adeniyi S. Basiru & [2]Olusesan A. Osunkoya
[1]Department of Political Science and International Studies,
Crescent University, Abeokuta, Nigeria
[2]Department of History and Diplomatic Studies, Tai Solarin
University of Education, Ijagun, Ijebu-Ode, Ogun State, Nigeria

[1]Corresponding author: asbash2000@gmail.com.

ABSTRACT

This article, drawing data from library and online sources, examines and engages issues in Africa's quest for pax-Africana in the age of interventionism. It notes that Africa's quest for pax-Africana in the age of interventionism is undercut by many factors, chief among which is the dependency and weaknesses of African states which always predispose extra-African powers to intervene in matters that should exclusively be handled by Africans. It concludes that as long as Africa remains trapped in dependent relations and the climate of disunity persists among African statesmen, its quest for pax-Africana would remain daunting.

Keywords: Africa, pan-Africanism, pax-Africana, interventionism.

INTRODUCTORY BACKGROUND

External interventions in the affairs of Africa economically, culturally, politically and militarily courtesy of slave trade and colonialism, aside from depersonalizing the people, also generated a legion of ideologies. One of such is the ideology of Pan-Africanism which *ab initio* aimed to reclaim the identity and dignity of Africans both within and outside the continent. Classically enunciated by Sylvester Williams, W.E B Du bois, Marcus Garvey and many others in the diaspora in the early part of the 20th century, the ideology was the rallying point for anti-colonial struggles in Africa, during dying face of colonialism in the 1950s. Again, as noted by Jinadu (2009:18), upon the independence of many erstwhile colonies, rather being relegating to the background, it became the ideological driving force behind the continent's peace and security agenda.

Although, there was no consensus among the immediate post-independence leaders on how the continent's unification and peace agenda was to be operationalized, but there would appear to be a unity of purpose, that Africa needed to redefine its role in the comity of nations. Perhaps, it was in line with this broad consensus that the Organization of African Unity (OAU) emerged on the continent's diplomatic scene in May 1963 (Basiru et al., 2018:104). By its extant mandate, the continental outfit was to be the primary platform not only for promoting solidarity among Africans, but also the navigator of the continent's journey towards sustainable peace in the foreseeable future.

However, unfortunately and disappointingly too, after almost three decades of UAU's existence and in spite of the various initiatives to move the continent out of underdevelopment and strife, the continent was still beset with gargantuan challenges, chief among which was intra-state conflicts. As Tekena (1991:10) notes, "the end of the cold war has witnessed an upsurge in intra-state conflicts in Africa with very low incidence of inter-state conflicts". Most worrisome, especially in the aftermath of the Cold War was the reality that Africa and Africans were abandoned to their fate by the major powers, as demonstrated during the Somalian and Rwandan crises (Albert, 2011:19). OAU's failure in effectively resolving the myriads of security challenges assailing the continent, coupled with the demands of a globalizing world, would appear to have made its transformation inevitable (see

Kufuor, 2005). Indeed, not only was the organization transformed functionally and structurally to meet the demands of the 21st century in the year 2000, but also that African leaders resonated, with greater vitality, the pan-Africanist idea of pax-Africana.

This article therefore examines Africa's quest to actualize the pan-Africanist ideal of pax-Africana in the age of interventionism. No doubt, an avalanche of scholarly works exists on Africa's quest for pan-Africanism via integration and pax-Africana, since the advent of the AU in 2000 (see Musifiky, 2004, 2006, 2009). However, studies that frame the challenges of operationalizing the ideal of pax-Africana, through the lens of interventionism are virtually non-existent. It is against the background of this observed gap in scholarship, coupled with the need to further deepen the discourse on external interventions in intra-African affairs that animated this article.

In order to achieve the central objective of this study, the article has been organized into seven thematic sections. Following this introduction is the conceptual clarification. The section that follows teases out the theoretical framework that undergirds the study. Section four undertakes two tasks. One, it x-rays African leaders' initiatives, through the auspices of the OAU, towards operationalizing the ideal of pax-Africana. Two, it discusses the background issues that prompted the transformation of the OAU into AU and why the issue of pax Africana resonated, with greater vitality. The next highlights the AU's pax-Africana agenda within the context of the AU's normative and institutional frameworks. The sixth section, with an illustrative case, attempts to frame the core challenge of pax Africana through the prism of interventionism. Section seven conclude the article.

Conceptual Clarification

Before delving into the intricacies of the subject of concern in this article, it is apposite to conceptualize the terms "external intervention", "pan-Africanism" and "pax-Africana". This is crucial to gain a better understanding of their meanings, in the context of the issues being discussed. However, suffice to stress that these concepts are essentially contested (Gallie, 1962:160). Given this reality, the methodology adopted, for the purpose of clearing the undergrowths beneath these concepts, is to frame and operationalize them, based on what are deducible from literatures.

The concept of "intervention", despite its age-long affinities with the idea of sovereignty in international relations theory, cannot be still be pinned down to one definition. Added to this is the fact that the concept could assume legal or moral personality (Sellers, 2014:1). Notwithstanding, its meaning is best appreciated, within the conceptual domain of sovereignty. Put differently, it is best understood when situated, within the context of the jurisdictional autonomy of nation-states. This clearly implies that each nation-state is free and independent in all those things that concern its domestic affairs (Akinboye & Basiru, 2014:77). To enjoy this right therefore, other nation-states must not interfere in its internal affairs. Perhaps, it is in this context that Sellers (2014:1) conceive an intervention as "any activity by one state or its agents that influences the actions or attitudes of another state but particularly the threat or use of force". However, beyond involving deployment of the instrument of coercion, external intervention could also involve non-coercive activities (for instance, other states' criticisms of the domestic policies of another state). However, it suffice to aver that coercive intervention, that used to be considered as unlawful acts under international law, is now regarded as legal. This is hinged on the *proviso* that it is collectively sanctioned by the United Nations and also aimed at achieving humanitarian objectives (see ICISS, 2001). From the foregoing and framed in the context of this discourse, intervention and by extension interventionism would suggest actions taken by actors, state or non-state, in intra-state conflict, intended not only to resolve a conflict but also aim at achieving humanitarian objectives.

On Pan-Africanism and Pax Africana

The concepts of "pan-Africanism" and "pax-Africana", in spite of their popular appeal to many African policymakers and intellectuals, for decades, have divergent interpretations. However, it has to be stressed that the latter would better be understood, after grasping the ontology of the former. According to Legum (1962:42), pan-Africanism expresses a sense of unity and solidarity among uprooted Africans in the diaspora who felt homeless and were subjected to alien cultures. At another level, Thompson (1969:18) conceives it as a struggle in which Africans and people of African descent have been engaged since their first contact with modern Europeans. In his contribution, Janis (2008:33) posits that Pan-Africanism acts as an umbrella term for a range of intellectual and political practices that

seek to politically unify and to address the cultural issues of Africa and the diasporas, including African Personality, Negritude, the Pan-African Congresses, Afrocentrism, and Africana cultural theory.

For Esedebe (1980:14), it is a political and cultural phenomenon that characterizes Africa, Africans, and people of African descent abroad as one unit, and it aims to regenerate and unify Africa, as well as to promote a feeling of solidarity among people of the African world. In a similar vein, Okeke and Eme (2011:94) contends that Pan-Africanism represents the totality of the historical, cultural, spiritual, artistic, and scientific worldviews of Africans, from the past to the present in order to preserve African civilizations and to actively resist slavery, racism, colonialism, and neocolonialism. What is clear from the foregoing discussions is that pan-Africanism symbolizes an ideology that seeks to re-position Africa and Africans in the international scheme of things, especially in the post-colonial era. Most fundamentally, it seeks to safeguard Africa's autonomy, promotes self-determination and engineers endogenous solution to African problems. Perhaps, it is in this context that the concept of pax-Africana may have been framed (Albert, 2011:2). That is, African solution to African problems. As Solomon Derso (2012:2) puts it, "Pax Africana is very much associated with and is given expression through the pan-African political ideal of 'African solutions to African problems".

Indeed, in the contention of the first Ghanaian president, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, what pan Africanism symbolized was that Africa dealing with her problems, including the issue of peace. According to him, "we must find an African solution to our problems" (Nkrumah, 1961:xi). However, while the foregoing views are no doubt illuminating, Ali Mazrui's perspective on pan-Africanism, promoted via pax-Africana, is apt and serves the purpose of this article. To be sure, in the 1960s when African nationalists and intelligentsia were searching for a globally acceptable concept to capture Africa's uniqueness, Mazrui responded, by inventing the concept of pax-Africana. He defined it as a peace to be assured by the exertions of Africans themselves (Mazrui, 1967:203).

More specifically, the scholar posited that Africa in the course of contributing her quota to international affairs, following their exit from colonialism, must attempt to create peace on her continent, act as her own gendarme and contribute like other regions to securing

other parts of the world. In this wise, he contended that intervention by African states in each other's conflicts is legitimate than outsiders. Put differently, he canvassed a sort of continental jurisdiction in which outsiders stay off African disputes and allowed Africans to handle their disputes (see Adebajo, 2017). From the foregoing, Pax-Africana would suggest Africa states taken ownership and control over the management of conflicts emanating within Africa. Multilaterally, it suggests the responsibilities of the AU and other regional bodies to craft "local" solutions to African security problems (Albert, 2011:25).

Theoretical Framework

Informed by the objective of understanding the undercurrents and forces that have underwritten Africa's quest for pax-Africana in age of interventionism*,* it is apt to anchor this study on a solid theoretical foundation. This study therefore appropriates two theories as its theoretical compasses vis: realist and dependency theories. Realist theory of International Relations attempts to explain the central driver of actions of nation-states and statesmen in international Affairs (Akinboye & Basiru, 2014:55). Broadly, the theory posits that actions of nation-states and those of statesmen that act on their behalf are driven by struggles for power, defined in terms of national interests (see Wight, 1946; Kennan, 1951; Morgenthau, 1978; Claude, 1962; Waltz, 1979). What makes this reality inevitable, this theory further posits, is the anarchic nature of the international system (Dougherty & Pfaltzgraft Jr, 1996:58). That is, a hobessian society in which actors, in the absence of Leviathan or an overarching authority, relies on their means for survival. In the words of Akinboye and Basiru (2014:57), "the anarchic nature of the system compels states to rely on their own means to ensure their survival since there is no higher legal authority above them".

In this self-help system, every state is bent on pursuing its national interests, chief among which is its security, either by armament or by alliances. To be sure, in pursuit of national interests, all means and weapons are morally justifiable and legitimate, since what matters is for the concerned state to have its way. Put differently, in the quest for its security and other interests that are tied to a state's survival, morality and ethics have no meaning to statesman, acting on behalf of a state. What matters is the ethics of survival, defined in terms of ends to be achieved and not judged by the means adopted. As one

of the pioneers of the theory, Hans Morgenthau, avers, "acting on behalf of state interests, the political leader necessarily embodies a standard of conduct substantially different from that of individuals within a civilized political unit" (cited in Dougherty & Pfaltzgraft Jr., 1996: 65). As the theory contends further, states tend to conform to international moral norms, provided it is in their interest to do so. From the foregoing, what the realist theoretical framework would seem to posit is that at the heart and soul of inter-state relations is states' interests. Thus, when framed within the context of the present study, it would appear to provide a valuable theoretical framework, for explaining the undercurrents of the politics of interventionism in the post-Cold War era.

Developed within the theoretical purview of Marxist class perspective, dependency theory (Dependencia), as expounded by radical political economists of Latin America and the Third World, does only attempt to explain structural dependence of some countries and regions on others but also puts forward how such dependence incepted in the first place (Basiru & Ogunwa, 2016:115). Specifically, the theory explains the process of the integration of the backward nations and regions into the global capitalist system, in an unfavourable and unfair manner (Caporaso, 1978:2). Its main thrust is that centuries of exploitation, plunder, pillage and exploitation of the resources of some regions had impacted and continue to impact on their contemporary socio-political and economic situations (see Dos Santos, 1976; Cardoso & E. Faletto, 1979, 1984). Frank (1972), in his contribution to this school of thought, contends that Latin America, Asia and Africa were never underdeveloped in the beginning of their existence. They became so as a result of their forceful integration by the western capitalist nations. In other words, the theorist posits that the global apartheid that has characterized the post-WWII world was a product of the incorporation of the African, Asian and Latin American sub-systems into the capitalist-oriented global system.

Given these historical fact, the relations between these two entities cannot be characterized as mutual interdependency but rather economic dependency, which has organically shaded off into other forms of dependency and vulnerabilities (see Onimode, 2000). From the foregoing *expose,* dependency theory offers plausible explanatory perspective towards understanding the dependency nature of Africa's politics and diplomacy.

Africa, OAU and Pax-Africana: Navigating the Trajectories

In the early 1960s, African leaders, as remarked earlier, were of the belief that independence would be meaningless, except in the context of wider continental project, concretized through a multi-lateral platform (Basiru et al., 2018:111). Indeed, to Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, the first president of Ghana, genuine African unity could only be achieved via a union government, in which the existing states united the military resources of Africa in order to achieve the continent's independence (Franke, 2006:4). However, as progressive as Nkrumah's proposal was, it did not receive the support of most of his colleagues who, by then, were smarting in the euphoria of independence. As a matter of fact, it polarized the emerging state leaders into two ideological blocs. In the first bloc-the Casablanca bloc-are Dr. Nkrumah and the leaders of Guinea, Mali, Morocco, Libya and Egypt. These leaders advocated for the establishment of an African High Command (AHC). The outfit was to be charged with the responsibility of defending the territorial integrity of the African states and also to intervene in internal conflicts albeit subject to invitation of the host state (Legum, 1962).

The second bloc-the Monrovia bloc-had Nigeria's Prime Minister, Alhaji Tafawa Balewa and other leaders that rejected the union government. They objected to the idea of African High Command, but rather favoured a functional, state-centric approach to African unity (Franke, 2006: 4). To be sure, the latter considered the constitution of union government, with all its institutional edifices, including AHC, as premature and could jeopardize the hard won sovereignties of the new states. Really, it was these contradictory and incompatible positions that shaped the debates that heralded the formation of the OAU in 1963. However, the spirited efforts, by Dr. Nkrumah and other members of the Casablanca bloc to have the AHC provided in the structural architecture of the OAU, proved abortive. Rather, a loose structure that mirrored the desires of members of the Casablanca bloc was provided for in the Charter that established the OAU (Aneme, 2008:2). As Franke (2006:4) notes, "despite his passionate plea Nkrumah failed to get the idea entrenched in the OAU Charter and a far less authoritative Defence Commission was created in its stead as one of the organization's five specialized commissions".

In the aftermath of the 1963 Addis Ababa's meeting, what thus emerged to concretize the pax-Africana ideal of pan-Africanism was

a structure that sought to preserve the sovereignties of states. Put differently, a framework that sought to secure the territorial integrity of states, in line with principle of non-interference, as enshrined in the OAU Charter. To be sure, the mandate of the Defence Commission, created by virtue of the Charter, was to work out a formula for co-ordinating the defence policies of members states, in order to enable the OAU to execute its defense role (Bowen, 1994:107). The point here is that the idea of a centralized Standby Force, as canvassed by Dr. Nkrumah, was rejected and in its stead, an ad-hoc structure was favoured. Indeed, subsequent moves, to railroad the AHC agenda into the meetings of the Defence Commission, were rejected. For instance, a moderate proposal calling for the floating of an African Defence Organization (ADO), by the Sierra Leonean delegates at the 1965 meeting of the Defence Commission in Freetown, was rejected by majority of the delegates. At the meeting, most vociferous were the Nigerian delegates, who insisted that the proposal was a ploy to smuggle the AHC project, through the back door (Franke, 2006:4). Even in the midst of monumental security challenges that confronted some of the member states, the idea of AHC was still vehemently opposed (Aluko, 1976:137). The only attempt to put together an African interventionist force to deal with crisis in a member State, the Chadian intervention mission in 1981, ended in a fiasco (Sesay, 1991:20).

What could be gleaned from the foregoing discussions is that the concern of the OAU, in the first three decades of its existence, was not to float an African Standby Force (ASF), as the vanguard of pax-Africana. Rather, it was concerned about resolving conflicts within and between member states through mediation, conciliation and arbitration. Indeed, prior to the 1990s when regional peace-keeping initiatives, such ECOWAS Peace Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), were institutionalized, the idea of rapid intervention force in the internal affairs of member states was frown at by the OAU and its members (Franke, 2006:9). However, in the 1990s, there was a paradigm shift as the OAU and African leaders began to see the issue of African insecurity beyond safeguarding state sovereignty (see Muyangwa & Vogt, 2000). To this end, starting with the 1991 All African Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Co-operation held in Kampala, Uganda, various initiatives aimed at re-crafting the continent's security architecture was imitated (Franke, 2006:10).

Still further, in a Report submitted to the OAU Summit meeting in 1992 and titled, "Proposal for Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution", the Secretary General, Dr. Salim Ahmed Salim, made some radical recommendations. Chief among which was the replacement of the OAU's ad-hoc, ineffective conflict management approach, within an institutionalized framework (Franke, 2006:10). Interestingly, the recommendations of this Report, which was accepted by the leaders, formed the basis for the establishment of the 1992 OAU's first ever Comprehensive Security Framework since its existence. This was the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution (Echezons & Duru, 2005). To be sure, it was this new framework that may have unlocked a series of activities that heralded the transformation of OAU into a new Organization. The new organization (the African Union) prioritizes human security and interventionism above state sovereignty in 2000 (Derso, 2012:28).

From Non-Interference to Non-Indifference: AU and Pax-Africana Agenda

Upon its Emergence in the year 2000, by virtue of the Constitutive Act, AU, in contrast to its precursor, adopts a different approach to engendering the ideal of pax-Africana. Encapsulated as African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA), the new agenda, it has to be stressed, does not only re-define security but also the idea of interventionism as it relates to internal conflicts. Unlike its precursor that abhorred non-interference in the internal affairs of member States, AU invests itself with the right to intervene (Aneme, 2008:3). The reason for this can be explained. While the Cold War lasted, issues of human rights were regarded as falling within the jurisdiction of internal affairs of member states. Thus, violations of human rights by African autocratic regimes were not usually frowned at by the OAU and its members because of the extant non-interference principle (Leininger, 2014: 5). As Basiru and Osunkoya (2020:50) note, "while authoritarianism and its associated antimonies supplanted liberal constitutionalism in many states across the continent, the organization, perhaps, due to extant principles guiding it, adopted a policy of avoidance". However, in the aftermath of the Cold War, a new international regime, that attempted to balance value of human rights and state sovereignty, emerged with greater impetus. To be sure, the then UN Secretary General, Dr. Boutros Boutros Ghali, in *An Agenda for Peace*, canvassed the need for the international community to rethink the nexus between

sovereignty and defence of human rights (see Boutros-Ghali, 1992). Interestingly, Dr. Ghali's call for a re-definition of sovereignty during the 1990s heralded the ideal of "responsibility to protect", which establishes the right of the international community to intervene in domestic conflicts, when the extant regime can longer guarantee rights to lives (Mahadew, 2011:14)

It was this emerging thinking in international humanitarian law that the AU keyed into when it supplanted the OAU. According to Article 4 (h) of its Constitutive Act, AU has the right to: "intervene in a member state 'pursuant to a decision of the Assembly in respect of grave circumstances, namely: war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity" (AU, 2000). Indeed, this provision did not only create the legal rationale for intervention in African conflicts, but also imposes obligation on the AU to stop a perpetuation of humanitarian crime (Derso, 2012:28). The argument here is that the transformation of OAU into AU led to the re-calibration of pax-Africana agenda, through the instrumentality of a new international humanitarian regime. Suffice to aver however that this was framed within the AU's general policy framework-APSA.

According to Derso (2012:28), this framework has two components: the normative and institutional dimensions. The former encapsulates the principle that seeks to advance the ideal of pax Africana, within the AU's legal architecture. Nomenclatured as normative frameworks, these principles re-define sovereignty and interventionism, earlier hinted, and also teases out a new security regime. The new security regime is anchored on human rights and democracy promotion in AU member States (Basiru & Osunkoya, 2020:54). Specifically, the new peace and security regime-the Common African Defence and Security Policy (CADSP)-when carefully studied would appear to have framed security outside state centric lense (Derso, 2012:30).

According to its base document, security is viewed as entailing "both the traditional, state-centric, notion of the survival of the state and its protection by military means from external aggression, as well as the non-military notion which is informed by the new international environment and the high incidence of intra-state conflict". The point being made here is that threats to democracy and human rights are now framed as constituting threats to security of African States. To this end, the normative framework of APSA sought to promote these ideals (AU, 2002).

The institutional dimension of APSA is anchored on the Peace and Security Council (PSC), established by the 2002 PSC Protocol. Like the UNSC, PSC is the permanent authority for dealing with conflicts on the continent (AU, 2002). It is created as a "collective security and early-warning arrangement to facilitate timely and efficient response to conflict and crisis situations in Africa" (Article 2, AU, 2002). To be sure, with supporting institutions like the AU Commission, Panel of the Wise, Continental Early Warning System (CEWS), African Standby Force (ASF) and Special Fund, the AU, through the PSC, manages conflicts in Africa. In terms of preventive diplomacy, PSC is invested by the PSC Protocol to prevent conflicts from snowballing into crises.

Respectively, Articles 7.1 (a), 7.1 (b) and 7.1(c) of the Protocol invest it with the powers to:

a. anticipate and prevent dispute;
b. undertake peace-keeping and peace-building; and
c. authorize the mounting and deployment of peace support missions (AU, 2002)

Still further, Article 7.1 (e) invests it with the power to recommend to the AU Assembly to intervene in internal conflicts (AU, 2002). In terms of democracy and human rights promotion in member States, PSC is empowered by the PSC Protocol to:

a. institute sanctions whenever an unconstitutional change of government takes place in a member State;
b. follow up the progress towards the promotion of democratic practices, good governance the rule of law, protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for the sanctity of human life and international humanitarian law by member states. (AU, 2002)

Again, PSC is empowered via Article 7.1 (l) to develop initiatives and policies that require external actions in African conflicts to act within the framework of the AU's agenda (AU, 2002). Also worthy to be highlighted is Article 13 of the PSC Protocol which provides for the establishment of the African Standby Force (ASF), with the mandate to intervene in internal conflicts (AU, 2002). From the foregoing, it is clear that African leaders, through the AU in the last one decade,

have evolved robust normative and institutional frameworks towards engendering the ideal of Pax-Africana, within the broad agenda of pan Africanism.

AU, Pax-Africana and "New" Interventionism

Since the coming into force of the PSC Protocol and the various policy frameworks that sought to promote African solutions to African conflicts, PSC and other relevant institutions, within the AU, have attempted to address a legion of conflicts (Derso, 2012:34). These include: violent armed conflicts in Sudan, South Sudan, Somalia, DRC; violence arising from unconstitutional changes of governments in Mali, Guinea, Mauritania, Togo; and post-electoral dispute and violence in Kenya, Cote-D'Ivorie and The Gambia Yet, its moves are often undermined or foreshadowed by the regime of "new interventionism" spear-headed external powers. One case-the 2011 Libyan crisis-best illustrates this challenge to the continent's quest for pax-Africana, in the context of interventionism.

The Libyan Crisis

As a fall out of the Arab Spring that began in Tunisia and Egypt in January 2011 (Basiru, 2013), the Libyan crisis incepted on 15 February, 2011 in Benghazi, with a mass protests of citizens (World Threats, 2011). Expectedly, the police and other para-military agencies used non-lethal weapons to disperse the protesters. Perhaps, realizing that the protesters were adamant, the police changed tactics on 17 February, 2011, by resorting to the use of live ammunitions, in which hundreds of protesters lost their lives (Derso, 2012:37). As the intensity of repression by the police and other security forces escalated, the conflict assumed the character of an armed conflict in which the opposition groups, the organizer of the protest, took on the security forces.

On 23 February, the Libyan leader, Mamman Ghadaffi, issued a statement in which he vowed to deal with the dissidents whom he labeled as "cockroaches" and "traitors" (Derso, 2012:37). At this stage, PSC, like it is customary with it, at the initial stage of intra-state conflicts, issued a statement. Specifically, it expresses "deep concern" over killing of defenceless citizens (AU, 2011). As the conflict further escalated and descended into a civil war, the highest level of decision-

making within the PSC structure, the body of Heads of State and Government, on 10 March, 2011, took some steps to stem the conflict. In the aftermath, PSC initiated four strategies to deal with the Libyan debacle vis:

1. the immediate cessation of all hostilities;
2. the cooperation of the competent Libyan authorities to facilitate the timely delivery of humanitarian assistance to the needy populations;
3. the protection of foreign nationals, including the African migrants living in Libya, and
4. the adoption and implementation of the political reforms necessary for the elimination of the causes of the current crisis (AU, 2011)

Suffice to stress that while condemning the deployment maximum force by the Libyan forces, AU reiterated on the mediatory solution to the conflict. To be sure, the AU's four-pronged peace plan later evolved into the roadmap to resolving the conflict (Mahadew, 2011:30). Interestingly, while the AU was developing the roadmap and putting the implementation stricture together, events were degenerating so fast in Libya. By middle of March 2011, the government forces had turned the table against the opposition. By this time, the government forces, in order to completely annihilate the opposition, resorted to heavy artillery and air power leading to heavy casualties (Derso, 2012:29)

Perhaps, fearing that these may degenerate into genocide, the UNSC stepped in by adopting Resolution 1973. Invoking Chapter VII of the UN Charter, it authorized member states to: "take all necessary measures in order to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack in Libya, while excluding a foreign occupation force of any form on any part of Libyan territory" (Mahadew, 2011:31). In addition, it established a "no-fly zone", banned all flights in Libyan airspace and authorized member states to take all necessary actions (Derso, 2012:40). Within this same period, the High-level ad-hoc Committee set up by the AU Assembly of Heads of State and Government initiated various moves to resolve the dispute in line with its mandate.

However, while this was on, NATO, at the behest of US, France and UK, initiated a military intervention and by so doing, undermining

the AU's position on the Libyan crisis. By this move, not only was the AU's roadmap for peace jettisoned, the no-fly zone was also set aside by NATO (UNSC, 2011). Indeed, regime change became the new agenda of the military intervener. Even when Col. Gadaffi's acquiesced to the AU's peace plan, NATO stepped up its bombing of government forces. This was the situation till when the operation ended in Libya on 31 October 2011, following the death of Ghadaffi (Derso, 2012:41).

AU, Pax Africana and the Political Economy of External Interventionism

What is clearly deducible from the illustration, in the preceding section, is that interventionism, driven by the interests of major powers, pose a great challenge to Africa's quest for pax-Africana. This raise two posers that are addressed soonest vis: what often predisposes extra-African powers to interfere in African conflicts, even when Africa has the capacities to resolve such conflicts; and why do African statesmen often crave-in to the positions of these powers? In this article, answers to these posers are framed within the purview of the theoretical framework of this study.

In the first place and in terms of real-politik, these external actors' motivations are driven by their strategic interests (Rights Monitoring, 2011). Framed this way and as regards the intervention in the 2011 Libyan crisis, the humanitarian intervention argument would have just been a smokescreen to disguise the real intentions of the bankrollers of the NATO intervention. The point being made here is that NATO, acting at the behest of US, France and UK and claiming to be enforcing Resolution 1973, acted to promote the interests of the alliance partners. Indeed, a pointer to that effect was the swiftness in changing the mission of the NATO operation (Politicsweb, 2011). A regime change in Libya, aside the fact that it was not contemplated by the AU, was not intended either by UNSC by the time Resolution 1973 was adopted (Derso, 2012: 41). However, as the tide of war was moving against the sitting regime in Tripoli, which along had complied with the "no fly zone" agreement; NATO stepped up its bombing. Strategically, this would appear to have been aimed to weaken the government forces, in order to pave way for the opposition forces to effortlessly enter Tripoli to take over the seat of government (see Rights Monitoring, 2011).

Again, why was ousting the Ghadaffi regime of interest to these actors? Until few years earlier when Ghadaffi regime undertook a rapprochement with the US and her allies, diplomatic relations between Tripoli and these allies were characterized by brinkmanship. The regime in Tripoli was severally perceived by the US and her allies as adversary in the Middle East, first as an ally of Moscow and then as a supporter of transnational terrorism (The Guardian, 2011a). Even after the rapprochement, the regime in Tripoli would appear to have continued to be related to with suspicions. Perhaps, the civil war of 2011 might have given these actors the opportunity of getting their main adversary in the Middle East out of the scene, with active collaboration of dissidents (The Guardian, 2011b). It may thus be theorized that in the pursuit of such goal, all other interests, including those of the AU, became secondary.

Linked to the foregoing thesis is the fact that the AU member states themselves did not harmonize their interests in the course of the conflict. Again, driven by their national interests, some African leaders would appear to have toed the line of NATO and by so doing undermining then AU's position. For instance, while the leadership in Pretoria openly supported the AU's position and even spoke against the NATO bombing, the position of Abuja was not clear (Okoampa, 2011). Thus, the absence of commonality of interests among member States of the AU would seem to have made the intervention a *fait accompli*. Beyond the force of real-politik, the dependency positions of the member states of the AU also predispose them to toeing the line of these extra-African powers on major international issues. Framed this way, their attitudes towards the NATO intervention in the Libyan crisis would be better comprehended.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Like other regions of the world that exited colonialism at a point in their history, Africa since the 1960s have attempted to re-assert itself by fashioning various mechanisms for solving its myriads of challenges which, centuries of exploitation, have wrought on her. One of such which this article reflected on was the attempt to Africanize and indigenize conflict management. Presented as pax-Africana agenda, Africa, through its multi-lateral platform-the OAU/AU-has sought to engender peace assured by Africans themselves. However,

as we have shown in this article in the first three decades following years of Africa's independence, the agenda was more of rhetoric. This is unconnected to African statesmen' predilections with safeguarding their states' sovereignties. By the first decade of the 21ˢᵗ century, following the transformation of the OAU into the AU, the agenda, courtesy of the ascendancy of the R2P, resonated with greater vitality. In spite of this attitudinal change, operationalizing the ideal of pax-Africana remains daunting, courtesy of politics of interventionism. As we have shown in this article, with an empirical illustration of the 2011 Libyan crisis, Africa's quest for pax-Africana is undercut by many factors, chief among which is the dependency and weaknesses of African States which always predispose extra-African powers to intervene in matters that should exclusively be handled by Africans. Flowing from this, it concludes that as long as Africa remained trapped in dependent relations and the climate of disunity persists among African statesmen, its quest for pax-Africana would remain daunting.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Adebajo, A. (2017, November 2). *Opinion: The golden jubilee of pax africana*. University of Johannesburg. https://www.uj.ac.za/news/opinion-the-golden-jubilee-of-pax-africana/

Akinboye, S. O., & Basiru, A. S. (2014). *Foreign policy analysis: Conceptual and theoretical logic.* Texas/Lagos: Wit Publishing Limited.

Albert, O. (2011). *Pinched, ditched or jinxed? The mantra of African Solutions to African Problems*, an inaugural lecture delivered at the University of Ibadan. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Aluko, O. (1976). *Ghana and Nigeria 1957-70: A study in inter-African discord*. London: Rex Collings.

Amin, S. (1976). *Unequal Development.* Sussex: Harvester Press.

Aneme, *G. A.* (2008). The African Standby Force: Major issues under 'Mission Scenario Six", *Political Perspectives,* Vol 2, no1.

AU. (2000). *Constitutive Act of the African Union*. Lome: AU.

AU. (2011). Communiqué on the situation in Libya (10 March 2011), para. 7. AU Doc. PSC/PR/COMM.2 (CCLXV). Addis Ababa: AU

AU. (2011). Communiqué on the situation in Libya (23 February 2011). AU Doc. PSC/PR/COMM (CCLXI). Addis Ababa: AU.

AU. (2002). Optional protocol relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union, http://www. africa-union.org/root/au/Documents/Treaties/Text/ Protocol_ peace_and_security.pdf.

Basiru, A., & Osunkoya, O. (2020). Between the Rock and a Hard Place: The Africa Union and Democracy Promotion in Africa. *Journal of Governance and Development,* Vol. 16, Issue 1, June.

Basiru, A. (2013). Why the Arab Spring was late in Coming?. *Nigerian Forum,* volume 34, No 1-4, January-April.

Basiru, A. S., & Ogunwa, S. A. (2016). Towards Nigeria's 20:2020: Revisiting the debates on decentralized developmental strategy, *Osun Sociological Review*, Vol.3, no1.

Basiru, A.S et al. (2018) "Radical Pan-Africanism and Africa's Integration: A Retrospective Exploration and Prospective Prognosis," *Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies*, Vol. 40, Issue 3.

Boutros Ghali, B. (1992) *Agenda for Peace*. New York: United Nations.

Bowen, J. S. (1994). Power and Authority in the African Context: Why Somalia did Not Have to Starve-The Organization of African Unity (OAU) as an Example of the Constitutive Process", *National Black Law Journal*, 14, 1.

Caporaso, J. (1978). Dependence and Dependency in the Global System, *International Organization*, 12, Winter.

Cardoso, F. H., & Faletto, E. (1979). *Dependency and Development in Latin America.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Claude, I. (1962). *Power and International Relations*. Random House.

Derso, S. (2012). The quest for Pax Africana: The case of the African Union's peace and security regime. *African Journal on Conflict Resolution,* 12(2).

Dos Santos, T. (1970). The Structure of Dependency, *American Economic Review*, 60, 21.

Dougherty, J., & Pfaltzgraft, Jr. R. (1996). *Contending theories of international relations: A comprehensive survey*. Longman.

Echezons, N., & Duru, E. (2005) "Conflict prevention, management and resolution: Establishing a regional force for Africa. *European Journal of Scientific Research,* 8, 3.

Esedebe, P. O. (1980). The Growth of the Pan-African Movement. *Tarikh,* 6, no.3.

Esmenjaud, R., & Franke*,* B. (2009). *Who owns African ownership? The Africanisation of security and its limits*, Working Papers in International History and Politics, Department of International History and Politics, No.1. Geneva: Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies.

Forbes, D. K. (1984). *The Geography of Underdevelopment*. London/ Sydney: Croom Helm.

Frank, A. G. (1972). The Development of Underdevelopment in Cockcroft J. et al (eds.) *Dependence and Underdevelopment in Latin America.* London: Anchor Books.

Franke, B. (2006). A Pan-African army: The evolution of an idea and its eventual realization in the African Standby Force", *African Security Review*, 15, no. 4, 4.

Gallie, W. (1962). Essentially contested concepts. In Black, M. ed. *The Importance of Language*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Press.

ICISS. (2001). International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. *2001. The Responsibility to Protect.* IDRC: Ottawa. *http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-9436-201-1-DO_TOPIC. html.* (accessed 02/09/2020).

Janis, M. (2008). *Africa after Modernism: Transition in Literature, Media and Philosophy.* London: Taylor and Francis Group.

Jinadu, A. (2009). Nkrumah, Pan-Africanism and the future of Africa" In S. Adejumobi & A.Olukoshi (eds.). *The African Union and the New Strategies for Development in Africa*. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Kennan, G. (1951). *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Kufuor, K. O. (2005). The Collapse of the Organization of African Unity: Lessons from Economics and History. *Journal of African Law,* Vol. 4.

Legum, C. (1962). *Pan-Africanism: A Short Political Guide.* Praeger.

Leininger, J. (2014). *A Strong Norm for Democratic Governance in Africa*. Stockholm: International IDEA.

Mahadew, R. (2011). *The African Union's responsibility to protect in the Libyan crisis 2011* (LLM Dissertation, Centre for Human Rights, University of University of Pretoria.

Mazrui, A. (1967). *Towards a Pax Africana: A Study in Ideology and Ambition.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1978). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Muyangwa, M., & Vogt, M. (2000). *An assessment of the OAU Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, 1993-2000*. New York: International Peace Academy Report.

Mwanasali, M. (2004). *Emerging security architecture in Africa*. Johannesburg: Centre for Policy Studies.

Mwanasali, M. (2006). Africa's Responsibility to Protect In Adebajo, A. & Scanlon, H. (eds.). *A Dialogue of the Deaf Essays on Africa and the United Nations*. Johannesburg: The Centre for Conflict Resolution.

Nkrumah, K. (1961). *I Speak of Freedom: A Statement of African Ideology.* London: William Heinemann Ltd.

Okeke, V. O. S., & Eme, O. (2011). Pan-Africanism and Pan-Arabism in Africa: The Thesis, The-Anti Thesis and Imperative for Synthesis. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review* 1, no.1.

Okoampa, K. (2011). On Libya, African Union does not get it' available at http://www.modernghana.com/news/341364/1/on-libya-african-union-does-not-get-it.html (accessed 25th August 2011).

Onimode, B. (2000). *African in the World of the 21st Century*. Ibadan University Press.

Politicsweb. (2011). NATO war of aggression in Libya should end immediately-Mbeki & Co' available at <http://www.politicsweb.co.za/politicsweb/view/politicsweb/en/page71656?oid=252537&sn=Detail&pid=71656> (accessed 12 July 2020)

Rights Monitoring. (2011). Why the West wants the fall of Qaddafi' available at http://www.rightsmonitoring.org/2011/04/why-the-west-wants-the-fall-of-gaddafi-an-analysis-in-defense-of-the-libyanrais/ (accessed 08 October 2011).

Sellers, M. N. S. (2014). Intervention under International Law. *Maryland Journal of International Law,* Vol. 29, Issue 1.

Sesay, A. (1991). The Limits of peace-keeping by a regional organization: The OAU Peace-keeping Force in Chad" *Conflict Quarterly*, 20.

Tandon, Y. (1972). The Organization of African Unity: A Forum for African International Relations," *The Roundtable,* no.246, April.

Tekena, *T.* (1991). *Peace and Violence in Nigeria.* Ibadan: History Project.

The Guardian. (2011a). The end of Qaddafi is welcome' available a http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/aug/23/gaddafi-downfall-britain-intervention (accessed 07 August 2020).

The Guardian (2011b) 'Libya: A new breed of military intervention' available at http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/aug/25/libya-military-intervention (accessed 07 June 2020).

Thompson, V.B. (1969). *Africa and Unity: The Evolution of Pan-Africanism.* London: Longman.

UNSC. (2011). 'UN SC Resolution 1973 in favour of a no-fly zone in Libya' available at http://www.voltairenet.org/UN-security-council-resolution (accessed 15 August 2011).

Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of International Politics.* Reading, M.A: Addison Wesley

Wight, M. (1946). *Power Politics.* Leicester University Press.

World Threats. (2011). Protests in Libya starts early' 15 February 2011. Available http://www.worldthreats.com/?p=6291 (accessed 25th August 2020).