

The Interplay of Regionalism and Statism in Conflict Transformation of the Great Lakes of Africa: A Critical Look at Kenya



Thomas Otieno Juma^{1*} and George Mugisha Barenzi²

¹Public Administration, University of Kabianga, Kericho, Kenya

²International Relations and Diplomacy, Nkumba University, Uganda

Submission: June 26, 2020; Published: September 11, 2020

*Corresponding author: Thomas Otieno Juma, Public Administration, University of Kabianga, Kericho, Kenya

Abstract

The work sought to find Kenya's peacebuilding in the Great Lakes Region (GLR) by comparing her participation through Statism or Regionalism approaches. It further found out why after independence and at the height of cold war, conflicts in the GLR of Africa increased significantly. The research looked at why Kenya had to engage in peacebuilding in the GLR in the period 1985 to 2005 in the countries Uganda 1986- 1989, Sudan upto 2005, and Somali after 1991 state failure. The theoretical framework explored the opinions of the realists and neo-liberalists on Statism and Regionalism approaches who suggest that both approaches in the end tend to give credence to state as the credited authority to engage in peacebuilding. Further they suggest that whether in cooperation as in Regionalism or via Statism the objective is survival of the entities. A conceptual framework was developed by the researcher interlinking the variables in the topic. Research objectives systematically uncovered what different scholars attribute to the two approaches. The research adopted a qualitative design because of the historical nature of the research and quantitative design due to intent of applying cross-sectional survey to enrich data collected from the many written sources. The findings, analysis, and interpretations were based on responses from the interviewees and Literature which were done thematically and on content basis. Finally, the research critically found that both approaches have been used in GLR conflicts resolution and that Kenya had her own unique reasons that prompted it to use Statism. Many respondents despite structural inadequacies and internal complexities of Regionalism justify its use in peacebuilding to Statism.

Keywords: Regionalism; Statism; Peacebuilding; Conflict Transformation; Great Lakes Region; Kenya; Foreign Policy

Introduction and Background to the Study

Kenya is one of the five countries making East Africa this is due to the acceptance of Rwanda and Burundi into the East African Community (EAC, 2007). Kenya maintains a neutral profile in global politics. It has excellent relations with China, India, Russia, and Brazil. Its relations with Western countries are generally friendly, although current political and economic instabilities are often blamed on Western activities (e.g. colonialism, paternalistic engagement, and post-colonial resource exploitation). Kenya has maintained good relations with its northern neighbours - despite internal tensions in Sudan and Ethiopia. Recent relations with Uganda and Tanzania have improved greatly as the three countries work for mutual economic benefit. Kenya serves as a major host for refugees from Somalia and Sudan and currently has troops in three United Nations peacekeeping operations. Most of her neighbours save for Tanzania have experienced conflicts and internal wars between the periods 1985 and 2005. Despite several instances of socio-eco-political strife within her borders, Kenya has been relatively peaceful. The G.L.R. where Kenya is also

belongs geographically has since 1985- 2005 experienced several multi-dimensional conflicts from one country to another. "The conflicts in the GLR is multi-dimensional and compounded by diverse sources of conflict. While most conflicts in the great lakes begin within the borders of countries, the actor within a particular conflict are rarely confined within state. Indeed, conflicts tend to link diverse actors' interests and issues and these linkages broaden local, regional and international economies and political contexts" [1].

The post-independence events within the G.L.R. in the period of study leave many gaps for scholars to continue probing. What Pan-Africanism built as a point of unity (the colonial common enemy) quickly phased out and the leaders of the young states changed or were made to change their focus to internal enemies and suspicions across the borders. The existence of such companies became the basis of early Regionalism in Africa. Regionalism can be viewed as an alternative to colonialism, making emphasis upon size of the territory for eco-political gain and control. This method

got linked to violence by Western states to replace national sovereignty by regional arrangements. Initial Regionalism in Africa encouraged proxy conflicts between the colonial powers in search of resources through their companies. This continued to manifest in many parts of Africa including the GLR during the post-independence era. These wars were externally supported and generated but fought within leading to millions of lost lives, lost years of economic development, unstable and spoilt political structures.

The period 1985 to 2005 is significant because it is the time within which the region was experiencing a climax of post-independence conflicts and Kenya was relatively peaceful. This made Kenya an automatic and choice participant and host in most of the peace buildings by the warring parties and other interested actors in the region's eco-political events. Most international organizations and foreign countries which hitherto operated in some of the conflict areas shifted their bases to Nairobi, Kenya's capital city [2].

These notable conflicts of the GLR have put several upcoming and a few stable states to make attempts at peace building process which have been either designed along Statism or Regionalism. Failures have been experienced alongside successes by use of either of the above approaches. In looking at Kenya's contribution to peace building in the GLR it is, therefore, a pre-emptive study that will unravel the clear understanding of Statism *vis a viz* Regionalism in peace building.

The fact that states have structures and institutions that can be used for external relations somehow proves it is paramount to recognize their abilities in matters of conflicts' resolution. Therefore, it can be argued on one hand that there is no way regional arrangements can be so harmonious if the states themselves are not. Even though Regionalism has also played very pivotal role in the region's peace building still it is important to ask whether poverty can be eradicated at regional level when states are striving for a takeoff. The Great Lakes Region cannot be looked at in isolation from the rest of African countries. Similar experiences have also been felt in Liberia during its infancy periods. "a number of African Americans... tried to encourage often reluctant administrations to adopt policies toward Africa in keeping with their views of the nature of American national interests as well as what they thought would be helpful to Africa and its peoples. Very much aware that the events unrolling at Berlin spelled disaster for the still independent African states and their people, John H. Smith in Liberia agonized over what he could do ... the British took advantage of Liberia's poor relations with its aboriginal population to stimulate rebellions and wars" [3].

It is true that the 1880s Berlin conference demarcated spheres of influence which depicted regionalism in the African continent. This contributed much to the scramble for and partition of Africa.

In essence, this exercise interfered with the existing nation- states (cohesive groups of indigenous people) by people who were advancing their own interests thus a possible recipe for chaos and conflicts in Africa in the later years. In Gelfand [4], it is said, "we pointed out that the country that had been discovered by Dr. Livingstone, was then occupied by our company, which at its own risk and cost was engaged in desperate struggle in defending British interests". Western dominant states- Britain, France, Germany, and later USA in advancing their interests have since used Regionalism as a process of empire building against Statism. This limits Africa's young nations of their self-determination and territorial control. With the intruding work of missionaries, imposition of colonial economy to Africa came about. This is because they (missionaries) acted as their government consuls (representatives). Their activities introduced creation of companies like Imperial British East Africa Company (IBEACo.), German East Africa Co., etc., alongside church missionary organizations. The result of such companies was majorly exercising a regional territorial control.

The existence of such companies became the basis of Regionalism in Africa. Regionalism can be viewed as an alternative to colonialism, making emphasis upon size of the territory for eco- political gain and control. This method got linked to violence by Western states to replace national sovereignty by regional arrangements. Initial Regionalism in Africa encouraged proxy conflicts between the colonial powers in search of resources through their companies. This continued to manifest in many parts of Africa including the GLR during the post-independence era. These wars were externally supported and generated but fought within leading to millions of lost lives, lost years of economic development, unstable and spoilt political structures. Prompted by instabilities around and relative peace the country enjoyed, Kenya found herself a player in several peacebuilding initiatives as a host and mediator. Peace building is generally a process of conflict transformation which deals with the drivers (factors) that expose conflicting circumstances because all societies are always at war. Peace building is one of the strategies through which major security crises can be resolved. On the other hand, peacemaking involves actions towards conflicts transformation. Thus, peace building encompasses peacemaking. In the book *An Agenda for Peace* [5], peace building "is a process that facilitates the establishment of durable peace and tries to prevent the recurrence of violence by addressing root causes and effects of conflict through reconciliation, institution building, and political as well as economic transformation. It becomes evident that peacebuilding comes more often after collision, conflict, and wars. Peacebuilding as it were including peacemaking and peacekeeping which are immediate responses to violence".

Peace building in the end tries to fix the core problems that underlie many conflicts. In peacebuilding there is always a diplomatic effort to end violence between conflicting parties

by making them to non-violent dialogue (peacemaking). All these processes involve negotiated settlement which is done through mediation. For Kenya, the mediator in most cases has always been the President, Foreign Affairs Minister, and other Officials granted such authority/appointment by the President. The researchers underscore in their literature review that both methods, Statism and Regionalism are two approaches that cannot be underestimated in peacebuilding processes in the GLR as elsewhere.

Study Methodology

The study scopes adopted were subject, geographical, time, and interviewee because of their relevance. Data was gathered by way of sourcing literature from diverse sources and libraries on the basis of research questions and objectives. Reviews were done accordingly as a way of creating generalizations to the topic. In the end it was found that both approaches have been quite used in solving conflicts of the GLR with notable successes and failures. The research adopted a qualitative design because of the historical nature of the research and quantitative design due to intent of applying cross-sectional survey to enrich data collected from the many written sources. The findings, analysis, and interpretations were based on responses from the interviewees and Literature which were done thematically and on content basis and where possible those data that required group analysis, processing used simple percentage as data display tool to relate findings. A special regard was given to ethical norm of confidentiality in displaying the response of interviewees.

Theoretical Framework

In undertaking this research some assumptions have been used to form the basis of the theoretical framework. As different theories are studied closely, it becomes clearer that Modern Realists back statism whereas Neo-liberalists support regionalism. The question whether identities of states change due to cooperation is an issue. Identities of states as actors/entities in international relations may or may not change due to collectivism. Wendt 1994 suggests one assumption that individuals and states are self-interested egoists whose identities are exogenously given and constant. This would therefore mean that objectives of states notwithstanding their association with other states remain an important element of their behaviour. At best states will act in line with their national goals.

Though with evolutions, as Wendt puts in the second assumption, identities and interests are endogenous and potentially changeable. This latter assumption emerges through social and international learning process (cognitive evolution). "At any point in time and place of a historical process, institutional or social facts may be socially constructed by collective understanding of the physical and social world that are subject to political selection process and thus to evolutionary change" [6].

On the other hand, in trying to focus on Regionalism, Alexander Wendt goes further to develop a concept of anarchy. This continued perceived anarchy explains why states may always want to keep cooperating. Wendt claims that; "there have been three cultures of anarchy: Hobbesian, Lockean, and Kantian. Overall, he maintains that 'anarchy is what states make of it': states have different conceptions of anarchy and of their relations in successive periods. As Ruggie outlined, Westphalia was the cornerstone, which marked a division between the medieval and modern international systems with regard to states' acknowledgement of each other's sovereignty [7]." With this reasoning, Wendt implies that in rivalry, enmity, war of all against all, there is collective identity which describes interstate relations (Regionalism).

Whichever of the two assumptions adopted will determine whether problemsolving through diplomacy is possible and what level of diplomacy should be applied. Diplomacy can be seen as actions of states under the norms governing international relations either at state level or at the regional front. Without accepting the notion of changing identities, behavioural cooperation is possible among states. Peace building in conflict environment / situations is a necessary objective for all states/ nations within their neighborhood and widely within the international system for the sake of mankind's survival and progress. For as long as countries continue to experience conflicts, other nations should always find it morally justifiable to participate through peace initiatives. East Africa has had a decade of civil wars which impaired human lives to a great deal. The four-decade conflicts in East Africa and the Great Lakes Region started far back during the era of colonialism under disguise of pseudo – peace initiatives signed with the then African systems of government.

Realists and Neo – Liberalists Perspective on Statism and Regionalism

By observing realists and neo-liberalists' perspectives on Statism and regionalism, it stands out that these schools of thought centre their arguments on transformation of the world from conflict and war to peace. Whereas realists and neo-realist's major explanatory variable is on the concept of power of nation state, the neo-liberalists looks at state power amidst a group of other states i.e. in a wider world perspective. All these views have their pros and cons. A modern realist Morgenthau [8] explains that international politics is a struggle for power. According to his political realism, "...national power consists of stable and unstable or changing element that include geography, population, national character, national morale, quality of a nation's diplomacy, and quality of government." It should be noted that apart from differences between states as far as quality of government is concerned, national character and morale differ a great deal. And these impact on a nation's diplomacy through national interest.

The neo-liberalists though argue that self-interested individuals and nation states can cooperate to mutually agreed

rules. "They argue that the world can cooperate and transform to more peaceful era through the institutional factors such as international institutions, law, and the spread of democracy." [9]. While Keohane disregards uneven power among cooperating states, Morgenthau neither puts clear the fact that the changing elements of national power from time to time depends on the leadership. What Keohane fails to acknowledge however is the fact that such institutional factors are ever in conflict themselves as to be questionable the extent to which they can transform the world to a peaceful era. Two ideas are constant in these arguments above, the notion of national power whether in cooperation or as a single state remain an objective of states. It is natural for anarchy to reign in international system therefore rules tying cooperations can be loosened. This explains why both Statism and Regionalism remain a realistic 'whole' approach in international peacebuilding.

Conceptual Framework: Explanatory Model

The linkage between Statism and Regionalism in peacebuilding has been a great subject of study and discussion by several scholars either as realists or neoliberalists. These approaches have their limitations as well. "As we have noted many times, the nature of anarchical international system creates a setting in which self-interested actors pursue their diplomatic goals by, if necessary, using power to ensure that their goals prevail over the goals of others. When a number of countries have similar interests, often in opposition to the interest of one or more other countries, then coalition diplomacy which is part of a diplomatic environment theory of setting becomes a significant aspect of international activity" Rourke and Boyer [10].

Outside the Statism and Regionalism (independent variables) approaches lie intervening variables including International Laws, International Institutions (World Bank, IMF, UN, and other bodies), National Interest, and Intergovernmental and Non-governmental Organizations all of which determine the direction peacebuilding can take. The fundamental reason of the two methods and peacebuilding in any country is that of transformation from conflict to a peaceful era. Behind every action whether as nation states or multi-lateralism (regionalism) as neo-liberalists call it, is survival and power.

It seems to be communicated by modern realists (backers of Statism) that by use of states the world can be transformed into a peaceful era because the conflicts within it are not complex in nature while on the other hand with struggle for power alone, co operations are weakened. Though neoliberalists (supporters of Regionalism) believe that cooperation can fashion the world from conflict to peace [8,9]. For Regionalism, conflicts between states in cooperation occur due to different and ever-changing leadership, citizens making the different countries, constitutions, etc. and conflicts pitting cooperating entities with and within international law and international institutions. Whereas for Statism, conflicts

arise from internal institutions and internal struggles. As opposed to Regionalism there can be a clear cut in defining national interest when Statism is used. "The issue of national interest is primary in defining international behaviour of states" [11]. Unpredictability of top leadership is another issue that brings conflicts between states within the international system.

Regionalism and Statism in Conflict Transformation

1.1. Statism in peace building vis a vis Regionalism in peace making

Statism as used in this research refers to state as a sovereign entity in the international system. In Halliday [12], "a state in a sense used in this book, is a territorial association of people recognized for purpose of law and diplomacy as a legally equal member of the system of states. It is in reality a means of organizing people for the purpose of their participation in the international system". Goldstein *ibid* on states writes, "foreign policies are strategies used by governments to guide their actions in the international arena (various alternative definitions have been proposed). Foreign policies spell out objectives state leaders have decided to pursue in a given relationship or situations as well as the general means by which they intend to pursue those objectives". From the foreign policies, the objectives of any state is spelt. Halliday *ibid* states; "for example, a state may appropriate territory, go to war, or pursue an arms control agreement to gain domestic advantage, while it may promote industrialization, introduce educational change, raise taxes, or treat an ethnic minority better, in order to achieve international goals. Conducted successfully, these two front policies may work to the benefit of the state...".

The existence of states still remains undisputed in the world arena. In the article, by Ghali *ibid*, "once again new states are taking their seats in the general assembly. Their arrival reconfirms the importance and indispensability of the sovereign state as the fundamental entity of the international community". It is also imperative that, "this wider mission of the world organization will demand the concerted attention and effort of individual states, of regional and non-governmental organizations and of all the UN system, with each of the principle organs functioning in the balance and harmony that the charter requires. The Security Council has been assigned by all member states the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security under the charter... the foundation stone of this work, is and must remain

the state. Respect for its fundamental sovereignty and integrity are crucial to any common international progress" [12].

It seems "globalization is weakening state structures, especially in relation to their capacity to promote global public goods, their traditional function of enhancing the quality of life within the boundaries of the state and their most recent role of assisting and protecting the vulnerable within their borders. Such trends,

in turn, encourage disruptive ethnic and exclusivist identities that subvert modernist secular and territorial commitments to tolerance and moderation” Falk [13]. Globalization is also unsightly nurturing transactional social forces, and encourages the reconceptualization of democracy a long cosmopolitan line.

Falk *ibid* also observes “additionally, as the next sector argues, to the extent that geopolitics is being deterritorialized and the state internationalized in response to economic globalization, the indulgence of genocidal politics is likely to persist unless particular instance of its occurrence are regarded by policy makers as seriously detrimental to the interest of global market forces or to other strategic concerns, or unless countervailing political pressures emerge to challenge the economist priorities of governing elites”. From his argument (Falk) it is observable that economic globalization, then, weakens the overall capacity of governments to address human wrongs either within their own society or elsewhere. Further, by understanding the basis for supporting most categories of global public goods, economic globalization also weakens the resource base of international institutions with a mandate to alleviate human suffering. Without global discipline on capital, it would seem appropriate to link economic globalization with the existing threshold of tolerance the wrongs to humanity which have experienced an upsurge trend in the periods of third world conflicts.

It is worth noting that other states have also taken part in peace initiatives in the Great Lakes Region. “The Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement equally set out a joint verification mechanism between Rwanda and DRC. It was followed by the Pretoria Agreement which equally called disarmament (Para 8.1 and 8.3) the withdrawal of Rwandan forces and the disarmament of Interahamwe by the DRC.” [14]. The efforts of South Africa and Zambia as single states to take leading roles in peace are evidenced. On the Kigali conflicts, “the Arusha ‘peace’ negotiations continued, but in a climate of increasing tension. Part of the problem came from the fact that the presidential faction felt that they were not represented in Arusha”. Tanzania as a state overlooked an important fact like any other mediator” Prunier 1995. Tanzania have also exercised mediation due to their stability on Burundi instabilities before Nelson Mandela took charge and passed on the process to the South African leaders (mediators) to bring Burundi to where it is.

In the GLR a number of conflict resolution measures have and continue to be carried out. For instance “in 1993, peace negotiations were carried out in Arusha between the Government of Habyarimana and the RPF rebels in order to end the civil war in Rwanda that began in 1990” [9]. The negotiations were mediated by the Tanzania Government through Ambassador A. Mpungwe. A peace agreement was signed in August 1993. However, implementation of the agreement had been difficult resulting into the Rwanda genocide of 1994. Another initiative by a state towards peacebuilding was seen in DRC situation by the efforts of H.E. Muamar Gaddafi who “From November 1998 to June 1999 the

efforts of the SADC as an organization came to be supplemented by the initiatives of President Muamar Gaddafi of Libya. Gaddafi had been holding talks at different times with Presidents Kabila of the DRC, Museveni of Uganda and Kagame of Rwanda. Gaddafi insisted that fighting parties should agree on a ceasefire to be followed by withdrawal of foreign troops from the DRC” [15]. In the extract from Mpangala *ibid* and as other scholars observe, “regional efforts more often come later after state initiatives have set some steps forward in conflict resolution.”

Just as states have been involved in peace building so regionalism (a collection of states) has made attempts. In normal design of international relations and according to international law, countries (states) are able structures internally and externally in dealing with security issues. Actions in favour of Regionalism means individual state failure coupled with lack of capacity to operate and deliberate disturbance of world order by superpower ego in managing world politics. Regionalism exists to fill this gap through globalization, empire building, superpower making, hegemony, internationalization, selfishness, and or conquest. It is real, that Regionalism means loss of individual state sovereignty to a new central authority where existing states become secondary entities. Antonio and Juan [16] equate globalization as “the contemporary process of internationalization of capitalization... it is recorded that this process dates back to the Middle Ages during the emergence of capitalism, a period marked by high degree of capital and labour mobility”. This book suggests that globalization has undergone three stages.

- a) 1870 – 1913 which was characterized by high capital and labour mobility, and trade boom, which ended in the First World War.
- b) 1945 – 1973 a period marked by disintegrations of macroeconomic regulation regime engineered by Bretton Woods in 1944.
- c) After 1973, the final stage began with the spread of free trade.

Because the process of internationalization tends to bring states together under a regime of commerce (trade), it therefore also marks the cultivation of the ideology regionalism as a back up to this process. “I have argued [17] in favour of regional cooperation in terms of the creation and institutionalization of a multilateral East Asian security framework, and there is no doubt that the necessity for this will increase in future. With recent regional financial and currency crisis, however, we find the emergence of a pattern where countries hit by the crisis are caught between United States and the IMF on the one hand and China, which has so far refrained from devaluing its currency, on the other. This pattern suggests a regional international structure for the twenty first century that has the United States and China forming two economic, as well as security, poles”.

In this framework of thought by Sakamoto, regional cooperation or regional internationalization structures are depicted to mean Regionalism. In relation to regionalism's performance to the exercise of peace building, different authors have argued differently. Ghali [12] comments about the unfolding trend as, "we have entered a time of global transition marked by uniquely contradictory trends regional and continental associations of states are evolving ways to deepen cooperation and case some of the contentious characteristic of sovereign and nationalistic rivalries .. decision of states to yield some sovereign prerogatives to larger, common political associations".

Issues regarding regionalism have their origins in the period after World War II when USA became the leader of the "free world". "The economic arrangements set up after World War II were all based on Washington's Leadership. The US had a rather clear cut economic objective, that had to do with strengthening of economic multilateralism and under this heading, the promotion of free trade

a) Through IMF and bilateral diplomacy, it helped maintain the international structure of exchange rates.

b) US dominated the WB, as it did the IMF, through economically weighted voting arrangements and other ways.

c) America served as lender of last resort in financial and economic crisis. For example, USD 13 billion to Western Europe under Marshall plan. All served with strings attached which varied but tended to strengthen Washington's influence.

d) US provided a market for distress goods from political friends or supplied such itself.

e) Washington was the leader in coordinating international macroeconomic policies, particularly trade policies.

f) US dominated the international property regime" [18].

Mazrui [19] suggests, "the attempt by the economic community of west Africa states (ECOWAS) to deal with the civil war in Liberia was an effort towards Pax Africana although it was bogged down because of inexperience and politico - military stalemate. Somalia in a sense suffered because of the stalemate in Liberia. If African states could not successfully deal with the civil war in Liberia, what chance did they stand with the anarchy in Somalia that began in 1991? Just as nothing succeeds like success, nothing fails like failure. The West African in conclusive effort in Liberia discouraged any meaningful Pan- African initiative in Somalia... had there been an African initiative for Somalia, should Eastern African states not have taken the lead? The sub regionalization of Africa's future peace keeping machinery is certainly one strategy worth considering seriously.

The argument against it is that while neighboring countries understand each other's problems better, they sometimes develop

sub regional tensions among themselves. Ghanaian troops, Ethiopian troops in Somalia may not be neutral". The contradictory intent and interest by which the world powers and groups of states deal with some critical security issues have dealt on some peace processes a big blow. "The war in Southern Sudan was fought for twenty-one years, and claimed more than a million lives, without ever reaching the Security Council. Darfur was raised at the council in May 2004, five months after Mukesh Kapila; the UN's own representative in Khartoum, called it 'the world's greatest Humanitarian crisis'. Kapila's contract was not renewed and many in the UN were happy to see him go ...". [20].

Johnson *ibid*, "The report on OLS (operation life line Sudan) commissioned by the UN Department of Humanitarian Affairs in 1996 concluded: the failure of the UN to assert Humanitarian principles in the Northern sector is a failure at the level of both analysis and management. It is an analytical failure in the sense that the UN has not properly addressed the nature of the underlying political crisis...".

"Within two weeks of the invasion, the first regional summit was held in Arusha on 17th October 1990. Under the auspices of OAU and pressure from EEC, the presidents of Uganda, Tanzania, Zaire, Rwanda and Burundi attended the meeting and so did representative of OAU and RPF. The summit called for a ceasefire and set in motion other meetings and consultations aimed at seeking peaceful resolution to the conflict... the rest of the international community, however, pressurized the two warring groups to stick to the round table negotiations in Arusha". Kamukama *ibid*. "The European (West) have in short, created African Union (AU) and imposed on African countries as European imposed artificial borders on the continent of Africa by the Berlin Treaty (General Acts) of 26 February 1885. This foreign created institution, the AU is nothing but a copy of the EU...". (Lado, Tuesday, 7th November 2006).

Following the above facts, regionalism has resulted into a new trend or recolonialism in Africa with many wars and armed conflicts raging on the continent. A lot of bloodshed, poverty, anger, pain, many interlocking and conflicting regional bodies, millions of displaced and stateless persons have up to now been the result of lack of implementation of proper peace building initiative in GLR. The spillovers of such conflicts have resulted in high increase of refugees into the countries neighboring those with instabilities, Kenya for example hosting many from Sudan, Somalia among many others.

Statism and Regionalism in Peace Building

Hans Morganthau [7] holds that, the conception of a divisible sovereignty is contrary to logic and politically unfeasible and a significant symptom of discrepancy between the actual and pended relations existing between international law and international politics in the modern state system. A state like Kenya has an

implied and natural duty by international law which regionalism does not possess. Palmer & Howard [21], "A question is raised; can sovereignty be divided or limited? According to champions of sovereignty, argued Jacques Maritain, 'the sovereign state, each individual sovereign state is by right above the community of nations and possessed of absolute independence with regard to this community.' Therefore no international law binding that states can be consistently conceived. Furthermore, this absolute independence is inalienable (unrenounceable), because by virtue of its nature a state is a monadic entity which cannot cease to be sovereign without ceasing to be a state".

The states in essence remain the main agent in world politics. Even supporters of the view that transnational actors such as Multinational Corporation have increased in importance, concede this. The 1648 Westphalia treaty modeled the states system culminating into the end of the 30 years inter religious wars. It marked "the signing of a peace treaty ending the thirty years religious wars and thus symbolized emergence of modern European nation state-system" [22]. Questions about peace imply answers about war. When a society defines a party, it can or must make peace with, then by implication it is defining whom it can, or must, make war. Issues of peace often go hand with propensity to declare war on an opponent thus war and peace intertwined as both objectives (means to an end) and an end to states in pursuit of their foreign policy(s). These two interrelated circumstances form the fundamental articles of any foreign policy of a country. Even among allies, espionage is habitually practiced and shifts of alignments are never ruled in the inner circles of statecraft. Thus, peace is never peaceful. It is only the states who have the machinery to war and capacity based on the existing international structure. The international games of big power politics make it all the more difficult for Africa's native elite to establish political legitimacy and to rule their people with a sense of continuity. This is what is affecting the approaches of Statism and Regionalism, where the continuity of the leaders has been shifted to systems with no structures. In the final analysis, the peace and direction of socio-eco-political development stagnates thus a recipe of conflict.

The states as actors in international system have a moral obligation to peace building and the sanction of international law by mere existence and self realization. Ronald Reagan in the book by Lundestad *ibid* reaffirmed again and again "The undeniable truths that America remains the greatest force for peace anywhere in the world today". This belief is held by many states against their peers in terms of military developments. In globalization (New Regionalism); looks prosperity, peace, progress, practice of justice/ human rights yet not to all stakeholders but to the master designers of this continued dominance in socio-eco-political fronts through outpost states (regional governments) for easy governance. These are too new models of Berlinian partitions of 1885.

Summary and Gaps in Literature

The research literature has gathered ideas pertaining to competing views as to whether Regionalism is a better option than Statism in handling security and peace in the G.L.R? It has assessed whether the use of state approach (Statism) better? From a cross section of views it is evident that international relations make states, actors not only in solving their domestic problem but also external issues with likely effects on them as deemed accepted by the norms of international laws. This doesn't make their use the ideal the ideal method but rather an option which can be used among many others.

During the international symposium in Kampala in 2002 on the Great Lakes Region organised by the Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation with the support of the Government of Uganda, the need for socioeconomic development as a means of solving the problem of conflicts and building peace was greatly discussed. It was acknowledged that in all six countries of the Region the economy was characterised by low level of development though with some slight differences.

One of the indicators was that shares of agriculture in total output was still dominant in all the countries. With the exception of Kenya where agriculture accounted for only 19.9 percent of GDP, in all the other five countries agriculture accounted for between 40 and 54 percent [23]. Regional integration has been taken as one of important measures in the fight against conflicts and efforts in building peace. It has been observed that regional integration creates conditions of regionalism which are likely to lower the degree of conflicts [24]. It is very possible to use regionalism for effective peacebuilding but this reality has not been embraced and exploited to its full value.

Critics of regionalism differ in opinions but one commonality is that their ideas make some sense. As a matter of fact Mukesh Kapila and Boutros Ghali have stood to be counted for their critiques. Ghali expressed his belief that the UN Security Council members were more concerned about the problems in developed nations than those in third world countries. He created controversy in July 1992, when he contrasted the Security Council's concern about civil wars in the former Yugoslavia with its alleged indifference to the crisis in Somalia. In November of that year he supported the use of UN troops to impose peace in Somalia. This tendency to be outspoken with the Security Council made him unpopular with some of its members. In 1996 the US vetoed his candidacy for a second term. The OAU system, established to reflect and advance the interests of national leaderships on the continent, seeks to achieve cooperation without further reducing sovereignty and to minimize conflict without resolving fundamental issues. It was very clear that regional body recognized its inability to override on the state objectives and better advance the interest of leaders and stop meddling in matters of sovereignty which are deeply entrenched in international law.

“The contemporary crisis of regional integration in Africa is not however a purely nationalistic in which states are pitted against each other in conflict rather is a reflection of more fundamental problems of distribution of gains between national and multinational corporations (MNC). They could either rely on their individual self-efforts or pool resources with some other states. These range from deciding on universal collective security arrangement, to adopting some bilateral arrangements” [25]. Accordingly, regionalism, retains a strong emotive / symbolic appeal for African leaders (it is surely no accident that the political grouping of African states is the only continental or regional organization whose title include the word ‘unity’). The recent confusion of Somalia peace building where US opened air attacks on implied terrorists when IGAD countries were busy consulting, and as Ethiopians took lead in flashing UIC in favour of TFG are signs of western ingenuity of African peace. With the increased approach by regional bodies like IGAD, IC/GLR, e.t.c. [26, 27] which have been maintaining peace and security as a fundamental objective, it may seem that Statism is losing grip to Regionalism in building peace in the G.L.R. But if so, then why are these structures of Berlin conference (states) all of a sudden are becoming useless, with full financial and technical support of those who drafted them?

Well, the position of states from the literature above imply that states should be the authorized bodies to exercise national interest but it should also be understood that national interest without power to act has no moral authority to be exercised. Lack of this (power) has made several states to keep jumping in co operations which tend to add them strength and at the same time preserving them through efforts of international institutions thus giving pseudo- power. All the same co operations characterized with lots of conflicts do not provide much power needed as each state whether small or big have specific goals identifiable with itself in any grouping of states [28,29].

Of course both the Statism and Regionalism approach have played core roles to peace building, each have their strengths and weaknesses. “The state- centric approach to international political economy is the traditional road that countries have long followed in economic nationalism. While it is true that there has been a considerable movement toward liberalizing international economic relations in recent decades, economic nationalism remains the dominant practice in global economic affairs for two reasons: First, states remain the principal actors on the world stage. Second, these states most often use economic tools to formulate economic policy to benefit themselves, not the global community” [10]. This thought propels the notion of fabricity of states in solving international problems.

Responses on Statism and Regionalism in Peace Building

On the issue as to which approach (Statism or Regionalism) is most appropriate for peace building; twelve of the respondents

were of the view that Statism is the best approach in tackling conflicts thus encouraging peace building by states. Whereas another category of twenty responses backed Regionalism. There are thirteen respondents who believed that there is no way one approach alone can be applied successfully in regards to peace building of sovereign states. However, a respondent commented that “states in Africa had insurmountable weaknesses as at now that makes this approach not very fruitful. Even with the sweeping global trend, no state can stand alone. This is to quote on behalf of those who were of the opinion that Regionalism still stands a better chance in managing conflicts. On the other hand, a respondent while commending the use of states said, “Regional blocks or co operations cannot exist on their own, their primary origin is the state. This makes the state a more stable entity in advancing peace or any foreign policy. It doesn’t matter the size as long as this is within her own backyard region, a state can exercise some pseudo- power in the struggle to survive among equals”.

To capture the comments of another respondent from the Foreign Affairs Institute of Kenya at Karen- Nairobi stated that, a member of the Somali delegation to the Somali peace talks in Eldoret however differed with these two opinions and stated that: “with the complexities surrounding the causes and third world conflicts, no single approach can be used exclusively in peace building where better and long lasting results are expected. In my view there is a tendency of states and leaders in general to want to respect ordinances created to the magnitude of being called international laws therefore this creates some sanity in peace agreements which in essence supplements the use of state approach.”

A peace participant in the Somalia National reconciliation said, “As a frontline state Kenya needed to exercise Statism through bilateralism while not ignoring group of states approach (multi-lateralism).” This view was shared by other respondents who noted that Kenya by virtue of having Diplomatic missions in almost all countries of GLR had to employ state approach though with a mixed trait because of being a small state with several internal challenges, use of Regionalism was equally very appropriate.

Conclusion

Though Regionalism is mostly preferred from the responses, it has a lot of conflicts in itself. In participation in peacebuilding by either Statism or Regionalism, so many reasons underlie such efforts. For proponents of Statism; Issues of national power, economic and political hegemony, and humanitarianism are often major reasons for survival to take place. Similarly, Regionalists believe that through cooperation, there is support of international institutions and international law, being part of cognitive evolutions in order for survival to take place. The need for peace is driven by many collaborating factors as nature of conflicts to the peace building party and interests of the party to peace. These being the fundamental reasons in conflict resolution. The drive for peace is related to the causes of war or conflict. The method

for peace building should try as much as possible to address the causes. The use of either Statism or Regionalism is best if it amicably changes the conflict to peace.

Where Regionalism is used, the cohesiveness of the states poses another obstacle. To add to this are issues like micro challenges brought by co operating states to the union, complexities and conflicts of international law to especially depending states. To the 'third world' countries financing own peace initiatives has been a problem, and where external interests have featured, proxy wars or commercial conflicts have been hard to conclude because underneath are objectives of sponsors being achieved. Since power is an ego of every state, it would be pretence not to imagine that some states can be interested in conflicts within (or with) other states.

The problem of state and nation building in Africa are such a magnitude as to make regional collective actions 'seem beside the point'. Though as Halliday suggests states for the purposes of achieving their objectives fall in the international community which also dictates the nature of their behavior. Even though the move to Regionalism seems unstoppable, it is observable by looking at Kenya's attempt that Statism is still the recognized norm in operations of the international structures. More pronounced is the fact that 'new states' continue to emerge. The system of 'regional state' itself creates major structural and descriptive tendencies which extremely can be good drivers to conflict. Peace building in Africa should free itself from the contradictions by the western world. For example, the Machakos protocol of 20th July 2002 on the Sudan peace was hailed as a major step towards peace because it resolved the issue of self-determination and state religion.

To date Kenya like most GLR states are undergoing weak economies which cannot support their internal subjects' hence regional arrangements requiring financial support may not be entertained though they religiously have commercial willingness to send their troops for joint actions in form of alliances for peace and security. Even though states still remain the determinant and contributory agent to such regional peace keeping forces, these supposed strong entities (states) have not risen above the struggle for minimum basics. In essence it is like the states of Africa exist in the international framework in theory more than practically. Probably the 21st century will see African states take their rightful roles internationally. Regional arrangements in Africa are struggling and cannot manage operations on their own. There is ever need for support and majorly from the developed world. This is a reason why the peace efforts must reflect Western interests in Africa. EC president Jose Barroso on his visit to AU headquarters as in the above article termed Africa's regionalism move 'ambitious plans'. Why should Africa adopt outward looking trends in support of regionalism when they are much in need? With over 80% of regional funds externally generated, AU will

be advancing globalization through 'empire' by invitation. Africa seems extra weaker militarily compared with US alone which can maintain 30,000 own soldiers in Iraq plus assorted assistance of security on their payroll from all over the world.

The West's regionalism is pushed on a 'free trade front' yet the underlying motive is dominance, neo-colonialism and diplomatic advantages. The latter has the ability to ensure benefits desired are attained in the event of severe competition by all means. Despite the differing views in the literature and interviews conducted, this research finds that

a) Both methods Statism and Regionalism complement each other in different issues within the international realms. The state though remains the main structure legally in international law and politics. With emerging globalism, weaker economies are stressing on size which slowly is being thought of in political terms. The question is whether they will work. The modern realists and neo-liberalists both look at the different approaches as having a single goal of conflict transformation as far as peace building is concerned. States response in any action goes with national interest. Probably if Kenya was remote from the same countries in conflict (not sharing borders) her response could have been different.

b) National Interest should be allowed to guide solution to peace either through statism or regionalism in whichever case each is applicable.

c) There is need to consciously adopt a multi- strategic approach in peace building so that one method can supplement the other. This can be applied by using both Statism and Regionalism concurrently.

d) For both methods to work well in peace building, African nations should ensure they have effective budgets for such initiatives because peace building is a costly exercise just like war.

If Regionalism has to be used in peace building then care needs to be taken because of the complexities inherent in it which can act as hindrances to the very objectives it wants to achieve. It is important to note that for regionalism to be of great meaning, then the emerging shift.

References

1. Mbote PK (2005) Environment and Conflict Linkages in the Great Lakes Region. IELRC Working Paper.
2. Kelly KJ (2006) Correspondents New York: Kenya Admired at the United Nations as an 'Honest Broker'. Sunday Nation, 29th Oct.
3. Skinner EP (1992) African Americas and U.S Policy Toward Africa 1850 - 1924 in Defense of Black Nationality. Howard University press Washington D.C.
4. Gelfand M (1957) Livingstone the Doctor. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, London.

5. Ghali Boutros (1992) An agenda for peace: preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, and peace -keeping report. UN New York.
6. Adler E (1991) Cognitive Evolution: A Dynamic approach for the study of international relations and their progress. Adler E, Crawford B (eds), progress in postwar international relations New York: Columbia University Press. pp. 43-88.
7. Wendt A (1999) Social Theory of International Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.).
8. Morgenthau HJ (1993) The politics of nations. McGraw- Hill.
9. Kehoane RM (1984) After hegemony. Princeton University Press. Khan SM 1998, Lesson of Peace - Keeping in Rwanda Paper for Workshop on Learning from Conflict Resolution in Africa held in Arusha, Tanzania.
10. Rourke John T, Boyer Mark A (2004) International Politics on the World Stage. Brief Edition, 4th Ed; Mc Graw Hill, Boston Burr Ridge.
11. Morgenthau Hans J (1992) Politics among nations (Brief Edition). McGraw-Hill/ Humanities/ Social Sciences/ Languages.
12. Halliday F (1994) Rethinking International Relations. Macmillan press Ltd, London.
13. Falk Richard (1999) Human Rights in Global Politics: The Challenges of Genocide and Genocidal Politics in An Era of Globalization. Cambridge university press; London.
14. IC/GLR Concept version 31 October (2005) Regional Program of Action for Peace and Security: Joint Security Management of Common Borders – General Project.
15. Mpangala GP (2000) Leadership, Nationalism and Forty Years of Ethnic Conflicts in Africa. In: Othman, (ed), Reflection on Leadership in Africa: Forty Years After Independence VUB University Press and IDS, Brussels, Dar es Salaam.
16. Antonio JO, Juan Martin (Eds) (2003) Globalization and development a Latin American and Caribbean Perspective. United Nation Economic commission for Latin America and Caribbean Santiago, Chile.
17. Sakamoto Yoshikazu (1997) Sotaika no Jidai (The Age of Relativization). Iwanami Shinsho, Tokyo.
18. Lundestad Geir (1990) The American Empire: Great Powers and Constant Objectives. Norwegian University press Oslo.
19. Mazrui Ali (1995) Towards Containing Conflict in Africa Method, Mechanisms and Values. East Africa journal on peace and Human Rights 2(1).
20. Flint Julie, Alex de Wall (2005) Darfur A short history of a long war. Zed books London.
21. Palmer, Norman D, Howard C Perkins (1957) International Relations: The World Community in Transition (3rd Ed.) Plano JC and Ray Olton (1982) The International Relations Dictionary (3rd Ed.). Carlifonia: ABC-Clio.
22. Holsti KJ (1988) International Politics: A Framework for Analysis. (5th Ed.) Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
23. Wangwe SM (2000) Globalization and Marginalization: Africa's Economic Challenges in the 21st Century. In: Othman (ed.), op.cit.
24. Hettne B (1998) Regional Cooperation for Security and Development in Africa. PADRIGU, Goteborg University.
25. Imobighe Tom (1985) ECOWAS Defense Pact and Regionalism in Africa. The Future of Regionalism in Africa. Ralph 1. Onwuka and Amadu Sesay (Eds): Macmillan publishers Ltd London.
26. IC/GLR version 7:31 October (2005) Regional Program of Action for Peace and Security: Disarmament and Repatriation of all Armed groups in Accordance with the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement.
27. IC/GLR, Revised August (2005) Peace and Security: Project on Transnational Crime and Terrorism.
28. Lamwaka C, Clara H (1998) Civil War and the peace process in Uganda. 1986- 1997; East African Journal on peace and Human rights 4(2).
29. EAC (2017) EAC Publication, Arusha.



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License
DOI: [10.19080/TTSR.2020.04.555634](https://doi.org/10.19080/TTSR.2020.04.555634)

Your next submission with Juniper Publishers will reach you the below assets

- Quality Editorial service
- Swift Peer Review
- Reprints availability
- E-prints Service
- Manuscript Podcast for convenient understanding
- Global attainment for your research
- Manuscript accessibility in different formats
(Pdf, E-pub, Full Text, Audio)
- Unceasing customer service

Track the below URL for one-step submission
<https://juniperpublishers.com/online-submission.php>