



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Causes, rationales and dynamics : exploring the strategic security partnership between the European Union and Africa

Siradag, A.

Citation

Siradag, A. (2012, December 19). *Causes, rationales and dynamics : exploring the strategic security partnership between the European Union and Africa*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20359>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20359>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20359> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Siradag, Abdurrahim

Title: Causes, rationales and dynamics : exploring the strategic security partnership between the European Union and Africa

Issue Date: 2012-12-19

CHAPTER THREE

PERCEPTIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS OF SECURITY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter established part of the theoretical framework for the research, around the concept of strategic partnership, particularly employing relevant theories of International Relations (IR), namely realism, liberalism, and constructivism. Whilst it sought theoretical perspectives on the question of why the EU pursues an SSP with Africa, this chapter completes the framework by exploring the concept of security and the interactions between it and its values, notably freedom, identity, justice, good governance, and development. The concept of security is somewhat ambivalent and has changed over time, particularly as understood by international actors. While the EU has certain approaches towards the concept of security, Africa has others. It is therefore necessary to develop a concept of security that supports and reflects the interests of both in order to establish fair security cooperation. Moreover, the relationship between security and the preservation of traditional values has been a critical one for the twenty-first century. A balance must be struck between peacekeeping and peacemaking on one hand, and freedom, justice, good governance, development and identities on the other.

3.2 CONCEPTUALISING SECURITY

Security plays a very *dynamic*, *sensitive*, and *profound* role in IR, having changed and expanded throughout history. It has been easily influenced by technological, scientific, social, economic, and political developments, and now has social, economic, political, and military dimensions. As two different international actors, the EU and Africa have their own approaches to security, with each looking to safeguard its own political, economic and historical interests.

The concept of security is a Western, mostly American, one that arose in the post-World War II era (Azar & Moon, 1988:1). Traditionally, it rests on the realist school of IR, which accepts that a system that reaches out internationally necessarily involves a wider struggle for power. Azar and Moon stressed that at the end of the previous century the international environment was becoming more complicated, therefore the concept of security had to include economic, technological, intelligence, diplomatic, military and other forms of security. It naturally engenders many complex and hard questions, and hence it is widely contested, with no

universally accepted definition (Buzan, 1991:15-16). As Schultze (1973:429-30) states, “the concept of security does not lend itself to neat and precise formulation. It deals with a wide variety of risks about whose probabilities we have little knowledge and of contingencies whose nature we can only dimly perceive.” The diversity of perspectives in the following definitions substantiates this:

- “The concept of security goes beyond military considerations. It embraces all aspects of the society including economic, political and social dimensions of individual, family, community, local and national life. The security of a nation must be construed in terms of the security of the individual citizen to live in peace with access to basic necessities of life while fully participating in the affairs of his/her society in freedom and enjoying all fundamental human rights” (African Leadership Forum, 1991:23).
- “An instrumental value that enables peoples some opportunity to choose how to live. It is a means by which individuals and collectivities can invent and reinvent different ideas about being human” (Booth, 2005:23).
- “Security is primarily about the fate of human collectivities” (Buzan, 1991:19).
- “Part of government policy having as its objective the creation of national and international political conditions favourable to the protection or extension of vital national values against existing and potential adversaries” (Trager & Simonie, 1973:36).
- “Security itself is a relative freedom from war, coupled with a relatively high expectation that defeat will not be a consequence of any war that should occur” (Bellany 1981:102).
- “The ability to preserve the nation’s physical integrity and territory; to maintain its economic relations with the rest of the world on reasonable terms; to protect its nature, institutions and governance from disruptions from outside; and to control its borders” (Brown, 1983:4).
- “Security–insecurity is defined in relation to vulnerabilities-*both internal and external*-that threaten or have the potential to bring down or weaken state structures, both territorial and institutional, and governing regimes” (Ayoob, 1995:9).

The concept of security has been significantly broadened since the end of the Cold War and the bipolar international system that sustained it. The very restrictive connotation had then included a nuclear threat and international economic crises, such as that in the 1970s

(Mathews, 1989:162). Today, the content of the concept of security has been dramatically transformed from the military to non-military connotations, including international terrorism, transnational organised crime, illegal migration, climate change, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), drug trafficking, conflicts that threaten regional and international peace and security, and global epidemics such as HIV/AIDS and malaria. Buzan (1991:140) states that international threats of today have *diffuse, uncertain, and unorthodox* features. Non-military threats cannot be easily predicted or prevented “objectively.” They can threaten the security of any states at any time or place. Hence, global threats and issues of today have been accepted as unpredictable and subjective by the international community. Wolfers (1962:147) describes the concept of security as an “ambiguous symbol”, while Rothschild (1995:55) places it into four categories:

In the first, the concept of security is extended from the security of nations to the security of groups and individuals: it is extended downwards from nations to individuals. In the second, it is extended from the security of nations to the security of the international system, or of a supranational physical environment: it is extended upwards, from the nation to the biosphere... In the third operation, it is extended horizontally, or to the sorts of security that are in question... the concept of security is extended, therefore, from military to political, economic, social, environmental, or ‘human’ security. In a fourth operation, the political responsibility for ensuring security... is diffused in all directions from national states, including upwards to international institutions, downwards to regional or local government, and sideways to nongovernmental organisations, to public opinion and the press, and to the abstract forces of nature or of the market.

Non-military threats have been mostly ignored by IR scholars, despite being more important than military ones (Ullman, 1995:19). Peoples’ and states’ needs, interests, and concerns have changed over time, as has the concept of security, but of most importance is whether actors can respond to the new threats and issues effectively. Walt (1991:213) points out that non-military threats that weaken the security of states and individuals have been the most dangerous security issues of today. Nevertheless, for Hough (2004:2), there have been both non-military and military threats to the security of states and individuals. Hence, while policymakers and IR scholars pay more attention to the former, they should not ignore the importance of the latter. They are both important.

International actors realised that no single actor could tackle complicated security issues of the twenty-first century on its own, therefore, establishing strategic partnership between different actors has been necessary to resolve effectively the new global threats and challenges. According to the ESS, the EU must cooperate with international organisations to increase its own security and international security. On the other hand, the concept of security varies from

state to state and from continent to continent. In this respect, Africa faces greater security challenges than the EU, through such issues as poverty, HIV/AIDS and malaria, corruption, the legacy of colonialism, refugees, fragile socio-economic and political structures, and conflicts. Since the first EU-Africa summit in Cairo in 2000, security cooperation between the two continents has intensified. In particular, the EU has spent a large sum of money on strengthening this cooperation with Africa.

Buzan (1991:19) and Baldwin (1997:13) have argued for the concept of security to be examined at three levels. Firstly, the individual level is related to protecting security of individuals; secondly, the national (state) level is related to strengthening social and political solidarity within the state; and thirdly, the international level is about sovereignty of the state. Conflicts, economic and political crises threaten the future of the concept of security in Africa. At the same time, the future of the concept of security in Africa depends on Africa's own capacity to implement or maintain it.

The concept of security has been used in a very narrow way in Africa, including in relation to military threats. The concept needs to take on "human security", that is, it should focus on how the living standards of people can be improved. The EU's concept of security towards Africa focuses on good governance, human rights, freedom of the media, social and economic development, and democratisation. In addition, the concepts of dialogue, sanctions, and financial aid have been very important components of the EU's concept of security to resolve security issues in Africa. However, it is debateable whether the EU's concept of security towards Africa has made a difference to peoples' lives in Africa to date.

There is then a marked difference between the EU's concept of security and Africa's. For Ayoob (1995:6-8), Europe regards it as "protection from external threats of the EU's vital interests and core values." Importantly, it has the three prominent components: "its external orientation, its strong links with systemic security, and the correspondence of state security with alliance security." Azar and Moon (1988:8-12) also argue that the concept has three critical dimensions: security environment, hardware, and software. Security environment is vital for eliminating external threats, hardware is related to military power of a state, while, by contrast, security software concentrates on political legitimacy, integration among the states, and reinforcing policy capacity of the states. The security issue does not look like the other issues, but is instead very complicated, risky, and costly. Thus, there is a need to balance the concept of security and its other critical dimensions, such as development, justice, and identity.

3.3 SECURITY AND ITS ELEMENTS AND VALUES

This section scrutinises the importance of security and its values. Security plays a key role in the development of states, as without it there cannot be freedom, justice, good governance, or development. Also, without security, societies cannot keep their values, language, culture, and religions. In the current age, maintaining peace and security has been the most important objective of states and international organisations. On the other hand, it has been difficult for states because it has been related to a wide range of policies, including socio-economic and political developments, both domestic and international. At the same time, establishing a balance between security and its values has been a necessary condition for socio-economic and political progress. Furthermore, the question of how much attention the Africa-EU SSP pays to the interactions between security and its values will be investigated.

3.3.1 Security and freedom

Sustaining security and widening freedoms have ostensibly been the most substantial objectives of the states in the twenty-first century. The notion that “*there cannot be freedom without security*” has been significant in reinforcing the relationship between the two concepts, both of which are considered essential for development. The balance between the two is vital for establishing strong security cooperation between Africa and the EU, as well as the maintenance of international peace and prosperity in the world, but understanding of it varies from country to country. For instance, while the USA and Israel interpret the balance between these values in accordance with terrorism (Donohue, 2008:59-60), it has a different meaning both in the EU and Africa. From the EU perspective, the balance is related to protecting fundamental rights, fighting many kinds of discrimination, removing physical borders between the EU member states, and tackling terrorism, crime and corruption. Importantly, the aim in achieving such a balance is to increase the power of “democracy” in the EU countries. At the same time, it has changed in accordance with global changes and the strategic interests of the EU (Hix, 2005:346-7, 359). From an African perspective, seeking a balance is mostly associated with preventing conflicts, and tackling structural problems and crises, such as wars, corruption, poverty and HIV/AIDS.

Both the EU and Africa have different approaches towards balancing security and freedom, which many states have adopted in terms of terrorism since the 9\11 attacks on the USA. Taking aggressive measures to prevent terrorist attacks is the foremost approach, however, in doing so, many individual rights have been restricted and freedom interpreted according to often ad hoc security issues. The second, seemingly conflicting approach is to expand and

protect individual rights. In this way, the states take measures against terrorist attacks by increasing their own citizens' individual rights (Donohue, 2008:60). According to Goid (2007:45-7), the 9/11 attacks on the USA and the 7 July 2005 attacks on the UK respectively have increased the gap between security and freedom in the world. Particularly, the individual rights of the minority groups living in the USA, the UK and in the West have been highly constricted. In exacerbating fears and mistrust between people, it has immeasurably damaged the delicate balance between security and freedom.

Ferge (1996:14) argues that while it is difficult to establish a balance between security and freedom in underdeveloped societies, it is easier to create it in developed societies. An example of this dichotomy occurred when the USA failed to find a balance between security and freedom during the invasion of Iraq in 2003 (*Christian Science Monitor*, 3 June 2004). Despite a wide range of supposed justifications offered up for the illegal invasion of a sovereign state, the USA could bring neither security nor freedom to the Iraqi people, in many cases widening the imbalance and creating new security threats to the USA itself and to the Middle East. The security of the USA and freedom of Iraqi people are not related, with both countries having different social, economic, and political structures (ibid., 3 June 2004).

According to a report (3:1994) published by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), freedom has three important categories. The first is *freedom from want*; the second is *freedom from fear*; and the third is *freedom to live in peace and dignity*. With some overlapping and ambivalence of conceptual definition, the principle of freedom from fear in large part refers to the prevention of conflicts, wars, crime and what some call "terrorism",⁵ the principle of freedom from want refers to social, economic and political freedom and rights of individuals; and the principle of freedom to live in peace and dignity refers to protecting and strengthening fundamental rights. Both security and freedom are thus invariably bound together. While security is increased by states, freedom should not be restricted. They are supposed to exist together in a peace, thus, security cooperation among Africa and the EU ought to focus on the balance between freedom and security for making it an effective partnership.

⁵ Desmond Tutu (*New Black Magazine*) famously alluded to one man's terrorist being another man's freedom fighter. The highly problematic term is understood here to refer to the killing of civilians by militant groups or individuals whose political and/or religious views, insofar as they are clearly articulated or permitted to be, do not conform to those of the respective hegemonic powers against whom they are waging bloody conflict.

3.3.2 Security and identity

Identities, whether in terms of religion, region, language or values, can play either a negative or positive role on security development (Lerche & Said, 1970:210-11). It is important to consider the security-identity nexus when trying to grasp the EU-Africa SSP. While the same identities may play a positive role in sustaining peace and security, different identities may play a negative role. It is known that the EU and Africa have different and complex identities, not least in terms of region, language, ethnic structure and cultural features. It is thus essential to determine how the EU should take into consideration African identity when it builds security cooperation.

The relationship between security and identity is complex and there can be an asymmetrical power relationship between various identities (Pettman, 2005:168;174). Pettman (2005:171) states that identity can contribute to the enhancement of peace and security, but for Wiberg (1993:107) security and identity issues affect each other negatively. Just as the Cold War era cannot be understood without understanding the identities of the two superpowers and their conflicting identities (Fierke, 2007:80), so the impact of that ideological struggle on African identity in world politics needs to be taken cognisance of. After World War II, Western European states attempted to establish a “common identity” in order to prevent conflicts and wars and to develop social, economic and political relations.

However, the end of the Cold War brought only a brief respite in European conflict. While the Western countries had largely subsumed centuries of strife in the successive federalising agencies of the EU and its forerunner institutions, the Bosnian War (1992-95) saw identities playing a destructive rather than constructive role in the Balkans. When coupled with the notion of “national sovereignty”, identities have two aims, namely, to keep peace and security or to destroy the others (Fierke, 2007:82-3). As the EU continues to negotiate its way through a complex melange of historically formed identities, any constructive role it has in establishing a genuine security cooperation with Africa must also take heed of that continent’s own patchwork of identities.

It is important to note that keeping identity is vital for developing independent policies. The question of who defines African identity is essential if the rationale behind the partnership is to be grasped. As Enloe and Zalewski (1995: 282-287) argued, “Identity determines how you are treated, what is expected of you, and what you expect of yourself.” Security issues also reflect complex identities of the societies. Importantly, identities ask this question “what do we perceive of as threats to us?” (ibid., pp.282-287). For the EU, meanwhile, it would be a

challenging task to establish an SSP with Africa without considering some form of shared African identity.

3.3.3 Security and justice

There is a strong link between security and justice, for without the former there cannot be the latter. Both are necessary for social, economic, and political stability. An effective and fair judicial system in a country is imperative for sustaining peace and security. While insecurity destroys the economic and political structure of a country, it also damages the development of a fair judicial system (Department for International Development, 2009:75). Importantly, the SSP between Africa and the EU is not only about keeping international peace and security in Africa and in Europe, but also about promoting democracy, human rights, and justice. In Africa, conflicts or wars are often accompanied by torture, detention, arbitrary arrests, war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. All these are threats or challenges to fundamental human rights on the continent, hence, security cooperation between Africa and the EU should take into consideration the complementary connection between security and justice.

Today there are still many African countries that have unstable social, economic and political structures that threaten fundamental human rights. Creating an effective and fair judicial system in Africa is indispensable for maintaining peace and security and for establishing genuine strategic partnership with the EU. It is worth noting that states that have a fair justice system can easily and more effectively sustain peace and security as well as contribute to international security. Bassiouni (1996:12) argues that justice plays a key role in attaining peace and security. When people go to work or school they must believe that both security and justice systems are working effectively.

Without security and justice, other services cannot be provided adequately, less so other services, because these are closely connected to socio-economic and political mechanisms of a state. Therefore, building a balance between security and justice is a challenging task in fragile countries. In addition, corruption, mismanagement and poverty weaken development of the relationship between security and justice in Africa. Particularly, as stated by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2007:15), reinforcing the principle of accountability is fundamental for providing effective security and justice services. In addition, good governance contributes to the development of security and justice services. States that do not have a good governance system cannot provide effective security or judicial

services to their citizens. Besides, roles of civil society are critical in improving security and justice services.

In Africa, many states lack capacity-building in terms of delivering good security and judicial services to their citizens, which overshadows the establishment of a balance between security and justice. It is also necessary to emphasise that security and judicial systems cannot be enhanced by outside donations alone, but rather African countries should first mobilise their own resources in this direction. The Africa-EU SSP ought to consider geo-political and geo-economic conditions of the African states to build a good balance between security and justice. The questions of “who actually provides justice and security, and for whom justice and security are being provided” are critical to establishing a complementary relationship between security and justice (OECD, 2007:6).

3.3.4 Security and governance

Security and good governance are essential for social, economic, and political stability. Building a strong relationship between security and governance has been one of the most important preconditions for establishing a genuine strategic partnership between Africa and the EU. Attention to the link between security and governance has dramatically increased in world politics in recent years. International actors such as the UN, the EU, and AU pay a great deal of attention to the significance between these two critical values so as to preserve international peace, security and stability. In particular, good governance plays a key role in maintaining peace and security in conflict-affected countries. Generally, the notion of good governance has been mostly connected with democratisation. In this respect, the principles of transparency, accountability, the rule of law, and the active participation of the citizens in politics are accepted as a core of good governance (Hussein, 2005:28).

Nkiwane (2003:53) emphasises that states that have a good governance system can maintain peace and security more effectively than those that do not. Each African state has a different character in terms of governance and security. Developing a governance system in accordance with the country’s political, social and economic features is highly important to contribute to peace and security in conflict-affected countries. Whether international pressures to strengthen a balance between security and governance in African countries can be an asset is questionable. Recent and current crises in some African states, such as Somalia, Sudan, the DRC, Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya, have also been closely related to the lack of a strong link between security and governance.

There are three main factors affecting the balance between security and governance in Africa. First, the role of international actors, the legacies of colonialism, and the leadership of African statesmen. During the Cold War era, the bipolar international system shaped world politics, including Africa's international affairs and the security and governance of African states. Domestic challenges of African states, such as poverty, corruption, and mismanagement, also weaken the relationship between security and governance. Therefore, establishing a good balance between these two important values has been affected by world politics as well as internal political developments in Africa (Sawyer, 2004:94-95). Importantly, a strong leadership under the umbrella of the AU would play a key role in enhancing the security and governance nexus in the African countries and helping in bringing about the emergence of true security cooperation with the EU.

Regional and sub-regional organisations in Africa have recently paid attention to the significance of this balance by establishing in 2003, within the AU, the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), one of the important objectives of which was to prevent potential conflicts or wars by strengthening the governance system in African states.

3.3.5 Security and development

The interactions between security and development have changed over time. Duffield (2001:35-42) asserts that the relationship between security and development was politicised and marginalised during the Cold War era. The superpowers, then the USA and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR, or 'Soviet Union'), used aid policy to strengthen their strategic positions with their alliances. Moreover, limited actors were engaged in affecting security and development, but today different actors are involved in the development-security nexus, including NGOs, universities, think-tanks, private and government organisations, and military institutions. Hence, the relationship between security and development has become more important in recent years. The content of the notions of security and development is also very important for the development-security nexus. In the past, the two concepts had very specific and narrow meanings, but today their meanings go beyond military operations and economic progress. Therefore, the relationship between security and development touches upon economic, social, military and political progress (ibid., pp.35-42).

The security-development nexus has been connected with hard policies and soft policies of the states. While the former focus on reinforcing the military strength of a state, the latter pay attention to the welfare and security of the citizens. Importantly, militarised countries tend to prefer hard policies to balance security and development, while, on the other hand,

democratised countries tend to use soft policies (ibid., pp.10-3). In addition, fragile countries do not have a clear policy to strengthen a balance between security and development, and states that enjoy a good balance between security and development can play an active role in resolving international issues. A good balance between security and development can have a positive impact on domestic as well as international developments. The question of whether the SSP between Africa and the EU will take into account a balanced relationship between security and development remains controversial. The balance ought rather to focus on the welfare and security of the citizens of both Africa and the EU for making this partnership an effective global initiative.

According to Deger and West (1987:2-16), the roles of international actors influence the development between security and development in LDCs. Furthermore, inequalities and injustice between North and South have also shaped the link between security and development in the world. The former British Prime Minister Tony Blair (*Mail & Guardian*, 7 October 2004) declared that “we know that poverty and instability lead to weak states which can become havens for terrorists and other criminals...”, a point made by Simpson (2006:1-3) in underlining that poverty, fragile or failed states, and violent conflicts threaten the security of the North. At the same time, they destabilise the balance between security and development. It can be said that poverty and mismanagement in Africa weaken security and development. Hence, the SSP should be supported with structural reforms by the African leaders, such as radical social, economic and political adjustments.

3.4 SYNOPSIS

This chapter has provided an overview of approaches to “security” and explained the interactions between security and its elements and values, namely freedom, identity, justice, governance, and development. It argued that constructing a common security concept is necessary for creating a common future and building an SSP between the two continents. The challenge is how Africa and the EU, with their different political and economic features, will establish a common security concept for strategic partnership. There is no universally accepted definition of security, rather it is still viewed as an ambivalent concept. Furthermore, it has a very dynamic meaning within the field of IR, having changed over time. Importantly, concepts also mirror the features of their own time. For example, security was mostly related to the bipolar system during the Cold War era, with a narrow meaning that included a nuclear threat and the security of the state.

With the end of the Cold War era, the international system has changed. A multilateral global system has replaced the bipolar system and new international security threats and challenges have emerged in world politics. The 9\11 attacks and increasing globalisation have also broadened the concept of security. The new, unclear, non-military, and unpredictable security threats, such as international terrorism, climate change, drug trafficking, illegal migration, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), environmental disasters and global pandemics like HIV/AIDS have emerged. In other words, the security threats and challenges of the twenty-first century have been changed. Compared with the Cold War era, when there was a mutually defined and clear security threat, this new complexity has affected the future of security in international affairs and made it very problematic and complex. Today, the concept of security has social, economic, political, diplomatic, technological and environmental dimensions, which this chapter concludes that the Africa-EU SSP should take into consideration.

It is clear that traditional solutions to the security challenges of Africa did not bring any lasting peace and security. On the contrary, they escalated the violent conflicts and wars on the continent of Africa. Trying to understand Africa's security issues with the EU's security concept may be regarded as a waste of time and energy. Africa needs to create its own security concept to find a comprehensive solution to its security threats and challenges. Without creating a concept that reflects Africa's security issues, Africa neither becomes successful in resolving its domestic security challenges nor maintaining the SSP with the EU effectively. In addition, it is important to note that success of the SSP of Africa depends on its successes in resolving its own domestic socio-economic and political challenges. If *status quo* continues in Africa, the EU is likely to strengthen its economic and political interests under the newly evolving SSP.

The Africa-EU strategic partnership on security matters should not only consider security, but also the other matters that affect the security issues. There is a strong link between security and its values, namely freedom, identity, justice, governance, and development. Without security, there cannot be development, justice, freedom or democratic governance. It could be said that if there is a secure environment in a state, the other components of the state could exist peacefully and work effectively. At the same time, it is compulsory to balance between security and its values so as to establish a fair SSP among Africa and the EU. However, the question of how this partnership will construct a balance between security and its values remains unclear.

According to realism, actors do not trust each other whilst setting up a cooperation. Each defines its partnership in terms of its own security concerns and economic benefits, nor is there a possibility to create a fair cooperation between a strong actor and a weak actor because the EU has a tendency to use Africa while building a partnership. The realist view expresses that the concept of security has a narrow meaning and concentrates on the “security of state.” However, a liberalist approach sees the concept of security as focussing on “human security.” Furthermore, it points out that it is likely to make a genuine cooperation between Africa and the EU because both actors are confronted by common challenges and threats. So, both actors need to cooperate in order to combat common challenges. At the same time, collaboration among Africa and the EU in a wide range of activities, can also contribute to peace and security. Common threats such as conflicts, wars, international terrorism, and climate change damage not only economic and political interests of Africa but also the interests of the EU members. Since 2000, the EU has begun to develop new security policies towards Africa. Establishing strategic partnerships in different areas with different actors has been an important foreign and security policy for the EU, to contribute to global peace and security and to keep its political and economic interests. For example, the EU created the APF in 2004, under the leadership of the AU, so as to reinforce conflict prevention, management, and resolution capacities of the African organisations. It funded €740 million for this facility. In addition, the EU allocated €100 million in 2007 to strengthen the APSA. Particularly, the APF has been playing a significant role in consolidating the African organisations’ peace and security mechanisms and creating an SSP with Africa. Also, the EU has contributed to sustaining peace and security in Darfur/Sudan, the Great Lakes Region/DRC, and CAR, as well as in Western Africa. The EU has also conducted 10 peacekeeping operations in conflict areas in Africa since 2003. This supports hypothesis 1, that “mutual interests lead to the emergence of security cooperation between Africa and the EU.”

Constructivism states that common identities, values and norms are an asset for making strategic partnership between different actors. However, it is difficult to establish a cooperation among the states that have different identities and values. According to constructivism, having different identities and values is a disadvantage for the establishment of cooperation in the areas of peace and security between Africa and the EU. For instance, different identities in Europe conflicted with each other and played a negative role in keeping peace and security during the Bosnian War (1992-1995).

Chapter 4 examines the historical background of the EU's foreign and security policy and objectives.