

FUNDING DEFENSE:
CHALLENGES OF BUYING MILITARY
CAPABILITY
IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Daniel W. Henk
Martin Revayi Rupiya

September 2001

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. This report is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 122 Forbes Ave., Carlisle, PA 17013-5244. Copies of this report may be obtained from the Publications Office by calling commercial (717) 245-4133, FAX (717) 245-3820, or via the Internet at Rita.Rummel@carlisle.army.mil.

Most 1993, 1994, and all later Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) monographs are available on the SSI Homepage for electronic dissemination. SSI's Homepage address is: <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/welcome.htm>.

The Strategic Studies Institute publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please let us know by e-mail at outreach@carlisle.army.mil or by calling (717) 245-3133.

ISBN 1-58487-069-9

FOREWORD

The American military, particularly the Army, plays a modest but significant role in helping the nations of Sub-Saharan Africa build regional security systems. Some of the most important U.S. efforts focus on assisting Africans as they improve their civil-military relations, strategic planning methods, and defense budgeting procedures. All of these are interlinked: stable civil-military relations and coherent strategic planning depend on a transparent budgeting process that builds consensus among military and civilian leaders, and ties the allocation of resources to strategic objectives, military missions, and threats.

In this monograph, Martin Rupiya, Director of the University of Zimbabwe's Centre for Defence Studies, and Daniel Henk of the Air War College provide one of the first comprehensive studies of defense budgeting practices in Africa. They assess both the problems with these practices, and fruitful avenues of reform. By doing so, they provide a solid roadmap both for African leaders and for Americans concerned with the development of greater security in the region.

The Strategic Studies Institute is pleased to publish this monograph as a contribution to the analysis of the Army role in regional security.

DOUGLAS C. LOVELACE, JR.
Director
Strategic Studies Institute

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHORS

DANIEL W. HENK serves at the Air War College in the Department of Leadership and Ethics. He was raised in central Africa by missionary parents. Dr. Henk served in the U.S. Army for 29 years, retiring in 1999 at the rank of colonel. His military service included staff and leadership positions at tactical, theater, and national levels. During his military career, he held multiple Africa-related assignments, including service as U.S. Defense Attaché in Zimbabwe with diplomatic accreditation as Army Attaché to Botswana, Zambia, and Tanzania. He taught at the U.S. Military Academy, U.S. Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center, at the Army War College where he served as Director of African Studies, and at the Africa Center for Strategic Studies where he was Chair of the Department of Security Studies. Dr. Henk is a graduate of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College and the U.S. Army War College. He received his Ph.D. in Anthropology from the University of Florida, performing his doctoral research in a mining community in the Democratic Republic of Congo. He has conducted research throughout Africa on security issues, and lectures frequently to government, academic and professional organizations on issues related to Africa and U.S. foreign policy towards Africa. He co-authored the 1997 SSI study *The United States and the Transformation of African Security: The African Crisis Response Initiative and Beyond*.

MARTIN REVAYI RUPIYA is a Senior Lecturer in War and Strategic Studies, Department of History, University of Zimbabwe. He also is the Founding Director of the University's Centre for Defence Studies. Born and raised in Zimbabwe, Dr. Rupiya pursued a military career for 17 years, retiring from the Zimbabwe National Army in 1989 at the rank of lieutenant colonel. Dr. Rupiya was educated at King's College (London) and the University of Zimbabwe,

where his doctoral dissertation addressed the history of the Rhodesian armed forces between 1926 and 1963. In addition to his duties as University Lecturer, he holds a variety of senior administrative and committee appointments at the University of Zimbabwe. He edits a professional journal, a quarterly review, and an occasional paper series for the Centre for Defense Studies and is widely published. Dr. Rupiya also is very active in scholarly and outreach activity on security and conflict resolution issues. He is a visiting lecturer at the Africa University (Mutare, Zimbabwe) and at the University of Witwatersrand (South Africa). He is a research fellow with the Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford (United Kingdom) and the Centre for Defense Studies in London. He sits on the steering committee of the (Danish) DANIDA Project on the Network of Centers for Defense Management and Security in Southern Africa. His role as director has resulted in his invitation to serve with the new, Geneva-based Non-State Actors organization.

SUMMARY

The interests of the United States would be well-served in the emergence of a stable, secure and prosperous Africa, a fact acknowledged in the rhetoric of the current and previous Administrations. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has been increasingly active in efforts to promote political and economic reform in African countries, including programs to democratize African security sectors. While the military (and other security force) establishments in Africa have many problems—and pose challenges to ongoing democratization efforts—few challenges are as potentially significant for good or ill as that of defense sector funding. The ability of African countries to provide the secure environment necessary for social and economic development requires the creation of the right kind of security establishments, legitimized by democratic processes, and empowered with adequate resources. It is very much in the U.S. interest to assist African societies in reform both of the security sector and of security sector financing.

The official data about African defense expenditure is scanty at best, often deliberately concealed and rarely provides the full story. At the same time, African leaders face increasing pressure from external partners and, in some cases, from their own populations, to reduce military forces and military spending. However, with a few egregious exceptions, African countries spend surprisingly little on defense—possibly less than is prudent. Military establishments typically are under-funded for basic military requirements, and spend an overwhelming and crippling proportion of their budgets on salaries and personnel allowances. They tend to be oriented against domestic rather than external threats, and tend to serve regimes in power rather than societies at large. (Though

with over 50 separate countries on the continent, it is dangerous to generalize too broadly.)

What generally is missing in African countries is a transparent process, based upon broad national consensus, for defining security, formulating coherent national security strategy, allocating resources based on that strategy, then effectively overseeing implementation. African countries generally have not established national consensus on the nature of security they desire and the ways and means to achieve that security. This commonly results in defense establishments very poorly suited to any conceivable threat, unaccountable to the society at large and riddled with graft. Decisions on defense funding tend to come out of a small elite of government insiders, or from jockeying by major institutions (including the military) for a share of the national resources. Neither system results in a good return on the investment in defense.

That said, many African countries now are engaged in some process of government—including security sector—reform. These efforts are being assisted by a variety of external partners. There is widespread acknowledgement that reforms will not be quick and certainly will not be easy, but the potential results are well worth the effort. Part of the solution lies in the improvement of institutions and techniques for more efficient planning and more effective oversight of defense expenditure. But a more fundamental issue is the democratization of the whole process of deciding national priorities and allocating resources based on a true national consensus.

The United States is one actor in this critical drama, and the Department of Defense (DoD) is playing a key role. DoD activities include the long-standing International Military Education and Training (IMET) program that trains foreign military personnel in a variety of skills, the Africa Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI), essentially a bilateral, tactical-level peace operations training program, various initiatives by the U.S. European and U.S. Central

Commands and the Africa Center for Strategic Studies (ACSS). The ACSS provides an exceptional forum in which senior African leaders—including those from civil society—can analyze and debate key issues that bear on defense sector reform. Though a relatively new program, ACSS has won wide acceptance and high praise from Africans. This clearly is one program that should be encouraged and enhanced.

A number of other innovative, relatively low-cost programs also could contribute substantial value to reform of defense funding in Africa. These could include targeted employment of contractors with unique expertise and an internship program in the United States for small numbers of African officials involved in defense budgeting.

The United States has a considerable long-term stake in the success of ongoing reform efforts in Africa—including those pertaining to the funding of security. Modest current U.S. investments could yield a substantial future payoff.

FUNDING DEFENSE: CHALLENGES OF BUYING MILITARY CAPABILITY IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Introduction.

U.S. security interests in Sub-Saharan Africa do not require the commitment of military forces in large-scale conventional operations, and are unlikely to do so in the foreseeable future. But the United States does have interests on the continent, including the resolution of ongoing conflict and development of secure, stable, and prosperous societies committed to working as partners with Washington on common problems.¹ These interests can be promoted by assisting African leaders in the revision and reform of their security environment. A key to this end—and an integral part of Africa's movement toward stable governments with popular support—is the reform of civil-military relations. African militaries have often preyed on the citizens of their countries, and typically are much more interested in securing regimes than societies at large. Since the late 1960s, military intervention in politics has been common and effective civilian control of the military rare, features that work against transparent, accountable, effective governance. Africans themselves, along with their external partners, are engaged in a variety of efforts to promote governmental reform, including reform of security sectors. It is very much in the interest of the United States to support such efforts.

Healthy civil-military relations are not easy for any society to achieve or maintain. The relations between a national security sector and a larger public are complex and culturally peculiar, reflecting unique historical antecedents. Even when models of civil-military relations are good in one society, they cannot be easily exported to

others. They always require more than mere restraint on the part of the armed forces. They tend to be improved by coherent and reasonably transparent processes for the development of budgeting that links military funding to missions, that generates public support for defense expenditures, and that leaves the military confident that it is receiving adequate resources. But in Africa, open, coherent procedures for developing defense budgets have been rare. One of the most valuable things that the United States can do to help shape the African security environment is to assist the region's political and military leaders in their efforts to reform defense spending.

Because budgeting for security sectors in Africa has long been an informal and closed process, it is poorly understood. Both African leaders and Americans seeking to assist them must overcome this lack of understanding. The authors address that problem by summarizing some of the challenges faced by African policymakers in determining financial allocations for their security organizations, particularly the uniformed military. The authors consider general patterns in the ways in which policy decisions on security force financing are made and implemented in Africa. The monograph is not intended as an economic treatise; rather, it is about relationships, choices, and the ramifications of those choices.

The authors focus on the armed forces—the military establishment—of the African state. However, given the fact that African political decisionmakers may not always view the armed forces as their most important and relevant security agency, the authors expand the analysis to include (at least in passing) other important state security organs, such as the police and intelligence services.

Patterns in the ways African leaders conceptualize “security” and decide on the security force capabilities they need are of interest. Of equal concern is the way in which leaders choose between what traditionally has been regarded as “security” and other national priorities in

allocating resources, and the degree to which these choices are informed by the wider society. Patterns in the allocation process (including oversight of spending) also are considered. A final question has to do with the result—the output—of security force funding in African contexts. The authors identify particular problems and challenges and offer some suggestions for attenuating them.

Before exploring these issues in more depth, two cautions are offered. First, the act of generalizing about a continent as large and diverse as Africa is fraught with danger. What is true for Sierra Leone cannot be assumed to be true of South Africa; Ethiopia is vastly different than Zambia. Second, despite appearances to the contrary in the professional literature, “countries” are abstractions and cannot decide anything. Sentient beings, not “countries,” make policy decisions. In some African countries, the group that makes such decisions on behalf of the country is very small. While the authors will use the common convention, describing choices that “countries” make in Africa, lingering closely behind the discussion is the question: who really speaks for the “country”?

At the outset, it should be acknowledged that there is no rich body of literature on African defense economics. Individual African scholars and some African organizations are beginning to address this subject, notably in South Africa. However, African researchers face daunting obstacles, ranging from egregious lack of access to official documents and officials in many instances, to the possibility of repercussions from authorities. Even in African countries that receive generally high marks for democratic commitment, officials tend to treat data about defense issues as privileged information and its disclosure as treasonous.² One intention of the authors is to stimulate debate about the subject and about access to data. A longer-term objective is to assist African societies in their efforts to make the processes of funding security more efficient, productive and transparent.

This kind of analysis begs several much more important background questions. At the center of these larger questions is the definition of “security.” For the purposes of this monograph, the authors define it as the protection of what the political decisionmakers consider to be important and valuable. The primary questions here are: “What do you value, and what will you do to protect it?” Or, put a different way, the question is “What is security, and how much of it is enough?” Here, it is important to identify who in a society has the prerogative of defining what is important and valuable. For instance, if the society is ruled by a small, unrepresentative elite, maintaining the political power of a regime may be the most important value. In a society with more democratic structures, protecting the economy and safeguarding economic development programs may receive greater emphasis. Again, if key security decisions exclusively are made by a threatened regime, no degree of “security”—however coercive to the society at large—may be “enough.” This leads to the issue of society’s other priorities, and begs several additional questions: Besides security, what are the society’s basic interests? How are they funded in comparison to “security”? Whose voices are heard in this decision?

The issue of “threat” is related to “security.” The question here is: What threatens the things that society values? Here, too, are a number of subsidiary questions. Who determines the nature and extent of “threat,” and what process is used in this assessment? What proportion of the society’s resources are the policymakers willing to devote to attenuate the threat? Or alternatively, how much risk are they prepared to accept?

In recent years, the definition of “security” has broadened in Africa and elsewhere.³ For instance, it now is common to hear policymakers speak of “economic security,” or “environmental security.”⁴ Since 1993, the international conversation has featured increasing use of the term “human security,” stimulated in great degree by that year’s United Nations Development Program (UNDP) Human

Development report.⁵ The following year's report defined the concept in greater detail, giving it a very broad charter.⁶ It is readily evident that a society's security forces are not suited to all of the tasks specified in these new definitions of "security" and often are inadequate to provide all of the security desired by members of the society. If security is attained, it must include the contributions of public and private sector actors other than simply the security organs of the state.

The questions about financing security in Africa, as elsewhere, are tied to the broader questions of security strategy. Before considering how African countries allocate resources to their security forces, it is very appropriate to ask whether they undergo some process of developing such strategy. A standard approach would begin with identification and prioritization of interests and an assessment of threats to those interests. This would then lead to development of policies that marshal the various instruments of state power—diplomatic, economic, informational, and security force/military—to protect and promote the interests, carefully balancing desired ends with feasible ways and available means. The latter point is especially important: strategy that is not grounded in fiscal reality is meaningless. Budgeting is a necessary component of strategic planning.

Funding Security: African Realities.

According to the best available data, in 1996, the 48 countries of sub-Saharan Africa collectively spent over \$10 billion on their military establishments. For the modal country in the region, this amounted to about 2 percent of gross domestic product (GDP), a reduction from the late 1980s, when the modal country in the region spend more like about 4 percent of its GDP on its armed forces.⁷ This compares to a world-wide average for the mid 1990s of about 5 percent of GDP devoted to defense.⁸ Given the significant security challenges to African states,⁹ levels of defense

spending for most African countries are surprisingly low, both in relative and absolute terms. In fact, given the expense of maintaining professional military establishments anywhere in the world, it may be appropriate to question what military capability a typical African country could expect to purchase with an annual defense budget of \$200 million or less.¹⁰ That said, a very modest defense budget in Africa could be large enough to significantly reduce a state's ability to fund other critical national priorities.

These data are by no means the whole story. Much of the real budgetary data from African countries is shrouded in secrecy and obscurity and should be viewed with a healthy dose of skepticism.¹¹ National leaders in countries like Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Uganda, or Zimbabwe can divert significant resources to security forces in ways that are entirely shielded from public scrutiny and accountability.¹² Funds that contribute directly to the security forces requirements—such as construction of facilities—can be obscured in budgets of otherwise unrelated ministries. For that matter, funds allocated in military budgets can be diverted to nondefense uses, including graft. Some African military establishments are so austere funded that personnel are obliged to rely on petty commerce or farming (often performed by “dependents” of military members) to make ends meet—so, in a sense, depending on the informal economy to “fund” defense needs like salaries. Some African countries operate on “cash budgets” in which ministries of the state are allocated funding on a month-by-month basis, based upon revenues available (which cannot be accurately anticipated).¹³ In short, no one really knows what many African countries spend on defense, including senior officials of the countries themselves. Calculating the amounts spent on the nonmilitary services—particularly the intelligence services—is even more problematic.

That said, it is possible to make “order of magnitude” assessments of spending. If Malawi and Zimbabwe can be

cited as valid examples, in the mid 1990s, African countries tended to spend 4-6 percent of GDP on the security services—the military, police, and intelligence services—designed to provide external and internal security. While not large in absolute terms, security budgets are a significant proportion of public sector economic resources in African states. Hence, while it still is appropriate to ask how much “security” these outlays purchase, it is appropriate to ask if policymakers explored nonmilitary options for protecting security interests. It also is useful to ask if the voice of the average African citizen was heard in making the funding choices. It is even more appropriate to ask what the citizen received for his or her country’s security forces expenditure.

One of the most significant differences between African countries and the established democracies in the West is the degree to which African national policymakers consider their most serious security threats to be internal rather than external to the country’s borders.¹⁴ Internal stability cannot be taken for granted by most African leaders, a fact that has significant ramifications for choices about resource allocation and roles and missions of the security forces. An obvious corollary to the problem of internal stability is that the capability to assure internal security—be it found in intelligence, police, or military communities—may be far more important to political decisionmakers than that dedicated to security from external threats. Another corollary is that the cost of purchasing capabilities for internal security may be significantly different than that for external security.

Whether the topic is internal and external security, military capability, or another interest of the state, most African countries lack the resources for near-term realization of any of their most significant priorities. This imposes excruciating choices on national policymakers under the best of circumstances. But it also has significant implications for internal security. Access to the very limited resources of the state—including, particularly, public sector

employment—can take on such importance that competitors (and those already in power) are tempted to resort to any methods to attain and maintain a privileged position. Losing that position can result in destitution or worse. This is true for military as well as civilian government employees.

Since the late 1980s, external donors increasingly have pressured African governments to reduce funding for the security sector—particularly for the armed forces. This has been expressed in the insistence on the so-called “three Ds”: democratize, demobilize, and downsize. An objective of this pressure has been to increase the resources available for other priorities of African national development. While well-meaning, and sometimes very appropriate, this pressure is not always wise. African development depends to a large degree on an ability to attract capital (and prevent capital flight). This, in turn, requires security from crime, insurgent groups, and environmental threats. Ironically, to provide the security necessary to attract investment—and promote sustainable economic development—African countries may need to invest more, not less, in the security sector. (Significantly, because of an egregious crime threat, South Africa now spends more on its national police than on its military establishment.¹⁵) And there certainly is room for more efficient utilization in Africa of resources already devoted to security.

In the case of defense spending, lack of materiel resources almost inevitably means that African military establishments are under-funded for basic military requirements such as pay and allowances, personnel services (e.g., billeting and medical treatment), training, and acquisition of necessary materiel. A significant deficiency in military funding has obvious implications for military readiness and military capability in general. This is recognized even in the African popular press.¹⁶ Nor are the richer countries exempt from these problems. An audit of the Nigerian military conducted in 2000 found over 75 percent of its Army equipment to be inoperative, and all of

its Air Force fighter jets were grounded. Military training virtually had ceased. And this is a country with a sophisticated military establishment.¹⁷

Severe under-funding for salaries and benefits encourages military personnel to abuse their access to government resources. For example, in some military establishments, senior officers are provided official vehicles that they use for very personal transportation needs. (One author was informed of a mid-level officer in a southern African country who had engaged his army's engineers to build a very nice house for him in an upper-class neighborhood—at government expense. This apparently was not an isolated instance in the country in question.) Other military personnel supplement their income by taking on second jobs—sometimes using military resources. In the worst instances, in countries like Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Mozambique, security force personnel “shake down” hapless citizens on the street or in “security sweeps.”¹⁸ The state in these cases partially has delegated its role of funding defense to the informal economy. It is very important to note here, however, that a number of African armies exhibit a notable discipline and professional demeanor despite great austerity in resources.

Discussion of military spending in Africa frequently results in accusations of corruption and graft. In some cases, these accusations are well-founded. However, suspicions of corruption taint even those transactions that are not corrupt. Part of this is due to a general lack of transparency in use of government funds: insistence on secrecy for secrecy's sake.

An Unfortunate Legacy.

The lack of resources touches a very key problem related to defense spending in Africa. In their present form, some military establishments are far too large or far too small for any viable role in their current security environment. Many

are not well-configured for the kind of conflict—or other roles—national leaders conceivably might want them to play.¹⁹ Virtually all African countries inherited their security establishments from pre-independence regimes or insurgent organizations, neither of which provided a security establishment well-suited to the new environment. Few African countries have had the option of building a national army “from scratch,” and few African countries have had the option of abolishing their military establishments.

This lack of resources also contributes to another characteristic of many African governments: a reluctance to engage in long-range strategic planning. The effects go well beyond the security sector, of course, but they have a very negative impact on organizations that require multi-year planning for even the most basic efficiencies in acquisition and maintenance of sophisticated materiel and training of personnel. There is a very pronounced tendency to rely on “muddling through somehow.” One clear result is considerable waste and inefficiency; another is difficulty achieving the synergy of men and materiel that military operations require.

Security establishments are an important economic/political constituency in many African states. Their members depend for their livelihood on this form of state employment in countries that have limited economic opportunity. They cannot be taken for granted in the distribution of state benefits. Their access to the means of violence gives them a clout well out of proportion to their actual numbers. This limits the options of senior policymakers in making any fundamental change in the nature of the security agencies or in their size and missions.

That said, there are many highly professional African military leaders who desperately want to improve their country's capabilities and have a clear idea of the need. The commander of the army of a large African country explained to one author in the early 1990s that he would have been

extremely happy to cut his 40,000-man army in half if he could find the means to deploy the smaller force rapidly to his country's borders. In the long term, despite the outlay for new military materiel, this would have saved his country an enormous amount of money. However, his country had no short-term ability to acquire the needed mobility, and could not accept the risk of the unguarded frontiers. Though the commander did not mention it, his country's economy could not easily absorb the 20,000 former soldiers released in such a downsizing. Unless very carefully handled, such an act could have been destabilizing for the country and certainly would have been a political liability for the ruling party.

The general lack of resources also bears on African options for acquisition of materiel. Defense industries in Africa—save for those of South Africa and Egypt—are very small. African countries generally have acquired their military materiel from a variety of external sources, some as a legacy from an earlier colonial regime, some from various Cold War patrons, some as donations of surplus equipment from the developed world. Much of this equipment is old, much of it is poorly suited to contemporary roles and missions. Often, equipment from different sources proves incompatible in the field. Spare parts are unavailable or too expensive. Yet replacing the equipment often is beyond the funding capacity of the state. The result is continued piecemeal replacement from different sources, perpetuating the problem. Another result is graveyards of unusable equipment around many African military bases.

Where Does the Money (and other Resources) Come From?

While virtually all African countries struggle to obtain the resources to maintain their security forces, the sources of those resources vary considerably. In general, some proportion of the funding for security services derives from

the normal revenues raised by the state and extracted from citizens and businesses as taxes.

International financial institutions generally do not now provide loans for purchase of African military capability, although some governments (particularly in the former “East Bloc”) seem willing to provide credit on favorable terms for purchases of military materiel. That said, any form of economic assistance to an African country potentially could compensate for state resources diverted to the security sector.

In several cases, African governments enjoy access to foreign exchange revenues from lucrative extractive industries (as in Nigeria or Angola). These provide substantial options not available to other countries, allowing the Angolan government, for example, to purchase significant quantities of sophisticated military materiel from overseas sources.²⁰

The ongoing conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo has featured another source of funding for at least some of the intervening armies since 1998. Uganda may have supported its Congo adventure by trafficking in Congolese gold and diamonds,²¹ while Zimbabwean entrepreneurs connected to senior officials may have obtained lucrative access to Congolese minerals in exchange for Zimbabwe’s backing of the Kabila regime.²² These examples point to a troubling issue: the prospect that African leaders in the future may be tempted to commit military forces to regional conflicts in the expectation of significant financial reward. However, it is worth noting that neither Uganda nor Zimbabwe have been able to fully finance the human and materiel costs of their Congo intervention with Congolese resources.²³ Significantly, in neither case were the citizens of the countries consulted about the political or financial implications of the interventions.

Another source of funding for some African military establishments is the United Nations (U.N.). Several African countries have participated for decades in

international peacekeeping operations conducted by the U.N., notably Egypt, Ghana, Kenya, Morocco, Nigeria, Tunisia, and Senegal. Many other African countries have participated in one or more U.N. peacekeeping operations in the 1990s. Both the individual soldier and the participating government are well-remunerated for participation in U.N. peacekeeping. This includes a monthly payment of over U.S.\$1,000 per soldier to the contributing government, and other allowances paid directly to the soldier on site.²⁴ One knowledgeable observer calls attention to the economic benefit enjoyed by the Ghanaian military because of the consistent, high level of Ghana's participation in U.N. operations.²⁵ However, African states do not necessarily return the U.N. peacekeeping reimbursements to the defense budget, a fact which has generated civil-military friction in some countries.²⁶

During the Cold War era, a number of African countries received quantities of military materiel as grant aid, or purchased through very long-term "soft loans." In the wake of the Cold War, few patrons now are willing to provide African countries much in the way of military grant aid, though there are a few exceptions. In the 1990s, the United States provided light observer aircraft and C-130 transport aircraft to several countries. It also provided quantities of nonlethal excess defense materiel to individual countries and to the West African peacekeeping force in Liberia (ECOMOG).²⁷ Still, since 1990, neither the United States nor any other external patron has donated enough military materiel to substantially enhance the military capability of any Sub-Saharan African country.

In contrast to military materiel, African countries have continued to receive external support for the training of military personnel.²⁸ While this support certainly falls short of the overall need, significant numbers of African military personnel—mainly of officer rank—are invited to training courses offered by countries outside of Africa. Several countries—particularly France, the United Kingdom, and the People's Republic of China—maintain cadres of military

trainers in Africa.²⁹ Denmark has provided funding and military personnel for peacekeeping training—and extensive support in development of a peacekeeping training institute in Zimbabwe.³⁰ This form of external support provides African militaries with a much greater capability to train officers than would be available through national resources alone.

Finally, it is important to note that resources to sustain military establishments in Africa also are derived from the informal economy. Salary costs are defrayed in some instances by allowing the use of government resources—such as vehicles—for personal business, or by turning a blind eye to graft. In other cases, it simply is assumed that military personnel will rely on outside entrepreneurial activity—or family farms—to make ends meet.³¹ Deficiencies in military medical care often require service personnel to seek assistance outside official channels. In many cases, military personnel in the final stages of AIDs simply are sent home to die.

Deciding on the Desired Capability.

How do African countries decide what to spend on their security services? This is related to the question: What are the key determining factors behind the spending decisions? Because of Africa's political diversity, there are no universal answers to these questions.³² South Africa, for example, has a sophisticated methodology similar in many respects to the Western democracies.³³ Nigeria seems to be experimenting with the development of security strategy much like that of the United States. The Democratic Republic of Congo, by contrast, appears to have little or no coherent system for calculating and embarking on defense expenditures other than the ad-hoc decisions of a small group around the Head of State. For the majority of African states, it does not appear that the decisions on levels of defense spending—however made—are tied to any solid analysis of the kinds of capabilities desired of the armed forces.

Again, however, there are exceptions. Angola and Eritrea stood out in the late 1990s for the large proportion of national resources devoted to defense (15.1 percent and 22.8 percent of GDP, respectively, for 1996).³⁴ In both cases, the national leadership clearly had a strong sense of threat and a clear picture of the military capability it required to attenuate that threat. What was not clear in either case is that the national leadership had carefully balanced the need for security against other competing priorities for state resources. Nor, in the case of Angola, does it appear that the citizenry was in any way consulted in national choices about defense spending.

What generally is missing in African countries is a transparent process, based upon broad national consensus, for defining security, formulating national security strategy, and then allocating resources to this strategy. In other words, African societies by and large have not established national consensus on the nature of security they desire and ways and means to achieve that security; nor have they been able to formulate and translate a clear vision into viable policy in regard to security allocations. To be sure, the attentive publics in African countries tend to be smaller than in the Western democracies, and most African states lack a large, educated middle class. Engaging the common citizen in a debate about security priorities may seem fruitlessly difficult even in countries striving to implement democratic reform. But the national leadership of most African countries tends to be reluctant to engage even their communities of intellectuals—interested individuals in academe, the professions and commerce—in such debate. (It is important to note here that South Africa is a notable exception to this generalization.³⁵)

The authors' interviews of African civil servants from a wide range of African countries indicate that decisions on funding priorities tend to be made by one of three processes. In the first case, a small elite of senior government insiders determines the national priorities and makes the fundamental decisions about resource allocation. Perhaps

an extreme of this form was that of the highly personalized, patronage-based Mobutu regime in Zaire,³⁶ although the successor governments seem to preserve much the same decisionmaking style. This methodology of resource allocation is by no means restricted to the Congo. It can be found in much less authoritarian states, and can take some innovative forms. For instance, parliamentary committees charged with oversight of national financing can be stacked with party insiders who loyally do the bidding of senior government policymakers.

In the second case, allocations result from consensus among the senior leaders of the large bureaucracies of the state. In this case, the military establishment is one of the “senior partners” which jockeys for its “fair share” of the resources. In these cases, the previous year’s budget tends to be the base line, and institutional pressures inhibit significant departure from previous practice, whether or not the security environment has significantly changed. Neither this nor the first process lends itself to a careful definition of desired military capabilities nor to a logical allocation of appropriate resources.

A final case includes only a handful of African countries. Here, the national budgeting process is relatively transparent. There is genuine debate about national priorities and resource allocations. The funding for security is subjected to somewhat the same scrutiny as funding for other national priorities. Preeminent in this category is South Africa. However, Botswana, Namibia, Ghana, and (recently) Nigeria seem also to be reasonably close to this categorization.³⁷

However the national policymakers go about the process of deciding what to spend on security, it is worth returning to the issue of the desired output. Here, the question remains: What is the expenditure intended to do? In many cases in Africa, the answer is not self-evident; assuring security sector capabilities may not be a primary purpose of the allocation. Rather, the decisions are rooted in the

economic, political or even personal agenda of the senior national decisionmakers.

On What Is the Money Generally Spent?

Whatever method is used to calculate defense allocations, certain types of expenses are characteristic of military establishments. Different countries have somewhat different ways of describing the categories of this expenditure, but generally reflect some combination of the following:

- Personnel costs, to include recruiting and maintenance of military and civilian personnel.
- Operations, training and maintenance costs, to include the routine peacetime expenses of keeping a large organization running and prepared to perform contingency roles.
- Infrastructure costs, to include construction and repair of bases, firing ranges, and headquarters.
- Procurement/capital costs, involving the acquisition of military materiel and the various programs involved in this activity.
- Contingency costs, involving the additional expenses when forces are deployed in consonance with military missions.

Before attempting to account for ways in which African states allocate defense funds, it is important to recall the difficulty in Africa of obtaining explicit, reliable funding data. With some exceptions, African governments (or military establishments) rarely publish breakdowns of defense expenditures, making it very difficult to establish an empirical baseline for Africa, and there almost certainly is wide variation in detail. In addition, the use of cash budgeting in some African countries and the allocation of “off budget” funding to the security sector in others make

formal budgets suspect. However, several general comments can be made.

In most African militaries, an overwhelming proportion of the budget goes to salaries and personnel allowances.³⁸ (In one 1998 West African example available to the authors, 74 percent was allocated to salaries and about 5 percent was allocated to operations, maintenance, and training. In recent years, Zimbabwe has spent some 68 percent of its defense budget on personnel salaries and allowances. This seems a common pattern.) Typically, very small portions of the military budget are allocated to infrastructure and capital costs. The funds available for contingency operations must generally be taken from other resources available to the state.

The results of these allocations are military establishments which have difficulty funding unit training and which are chronically short of ammunition, fuel, other basic supplies, and spare parts. Infrastructure deteriorates without the resources to maintain it. Work spaces and living quarters are decayed and badly overcrowded.³⁹ Ironically, despite the high proportion of defense resources that typically go to military pay and allowances, personnel reimbursements often do not provide an adequate standard of living, particularly for junior officers and enlisted personnel. Inadequate pay—or delayed pay—for military personnel is a prime motivator of unrest in the military and the basic source of a number of coups d'etat in Africa.⁴⁰

Overseeing Military Spending.

Allocation of defense resources is one thing; overseeing their use is quite another. Here again, African countries reflect considerable difference in approach. Different levels of oversight are important. One level would require the ability to hold senior policymakers accountable for policy choices that resulted in significant defense expenditure. At another level, the ability to deter mid-level officials from fraudulent or wasteful use of resources is important.

In a few countries like South Africa, legislatures have the mandate, interest, and expertise to monitor use of defense resources and to call defense officials to account. Several countries, such as Kenya, Senegal, and South Africa, have robust civilian management in the defense ministries that insists on a relatively high degree of accountability for use of defense funds. Some African countries, among them Nigeria, Uganda, and Zimbabwe, have an independent press that has endeavored to call attention to defense spending, even challenging presidential policy decisions.

In general, however, senior African policymakers are not consistently challenged on major decisions of resource allocation for security force use. Senior leaders hide behind a claim of “state secrets,” especially for paramilitary or intelligence agencies with coercive internal security roles. Mechanisms for preventing waste, fraud, and abuse in security force spending are relatively weak, both in the defense ministries and in the countries generally. Spending can be an important form of patronage for authoritarian leaders, who generally shun public scrutiny. Oversight mechanisms autonomous from the executive branch also would limit the options for use of military force. For instance, Zimbabwe’s Robert Mugabe probably could not have deployed his country’s forces to the Democratic Republic of Congo in late 1997 had he been held accountable for the economic ramifications to Zimbabwe of that deployment. Nigeria’s government probably could not have sustained its participation in ECOMOG operations in Liberia and Sierra Leone in the 1990s had Nigeria’s citizenry been consulted about that involvement.

With some exceptions, African countries lack effective financial management information systems to monitor spending. However, even with structures that should provide some accountability, senior policymakers often have the authority to override them. It is noteworthy that Zimbabwe’s Comptroller and Auditor-General repeatedly have called attention to irregularities in Zimbabwe’s

defense spending, with little indication of government interest in investigating wrongdoing or correcting the abuse.

Weakness in defense resource accountability is particularly pronounced in the realm of materiel procurement. The problem is manifest at various levels. The most basic deficiency is the lack of the kind of planning that includes a realistic assessment of the security environment and a serious effort to match ends, ways, and means to logical procurement decisions.

In many parts of the world, senior policymakers can be prone to squander national resources on expensive weapons not out of military necessity but for their symbolic value, and African countries are no exception. This probably was the case in abortive Zimbabwean negotiations to purchase sophisticated Soviet Mig-29 fighters in the late 1980s, or Ethiopian and Eritrean acquisition of similar aircraft in the late 1990s. Uganda's purchase of a large quantity of 1950s era tanks in the late 1990s may have been similarly motivated. South Africa's purchase of submarines and Swedish jet fighters in 1999—at enormous public expense—bore little discernible relevance to the external threat, a fact debated in the national press.⁴¹

Except for South Africa and Egypt, defense industries in Africa are very small scale. However, they do exist. A number of African countries produce munitions and assemble light weapons with parts from abroad. But even in cases where military materiel could be locally procured, African governments have been slow to take advantage of this opportunity. A notorious recent example was Ugandan purchase of military uniforms from the People's Republic of China, despite a significant textile industry in Uganda. Only the key insiders involved in this purchase know if the Chinese uniforms cost less than locally-made equivalents.

Competitive bidding for military materiel, while it does occur in Africa, is relatively infrequent and rarely transparent. Because of their constrained resources,

African countries are prone to seek donations or particularly favorable terms for weapons, even if the resulting product is of marginal use. (This has made the surplus weaponry and unscrupulous arms merchants of Eastern Europe particularly attractive.) Perhaps more worrisome is a tendency in some African countries to keep military procurement “off-budget.” This lack of transparency makes it difficult hold procurement officials—and senior policymakers—accountable for procurement decisions.

Because of the limited oversight of procurement processes, officials in many African countries have found significant opportunity for graft. One notorious example was the Zimbabwean purchase of a large quantity of Spanish Santana light utility vehicles in the early 1990s, despite the fact that similar vehicles at better prices were available in the region. Soon after this purchase, the Santana Corporation folded. With no available spare parts, most of the vehicles now in Zimbabwe are inoperable. Ironically, Zimbabwe has a relatively sophisticated procurement establishment.

Defense Spending and Military Capability.

As noted earlier, African countries generally struggle to find the resources to fund any of their national priorities, including security.⁴² Few African countries have a transparent, coherent process for developing national security strategy. Given these problems, it is very appropriate to ask if the resources devoted by African countries to “defense” result in a desired outcome. The ultimate “output” of effective security strategy, good policy planning, and adequate budgeting would be some measure of security. But an intermediate output would be a defense establishment of the right size, appropriately equipped, well-led, sufficiently trained, and disciplined to fulfill the expectations of the society.

A simple question is relevant to defense spending anywhere in the world: What capability is being purchased? And this begs the question for policymakers: What do you want your armed forces to be able to do? These questions get at the heart of roles and missions for the military. They are not idle questions. They have profound implications for allocation of very scarce resources.

With the partial exception of the South African National Defense Force, no military establishment in sub-Saharan Africa could conduct the kind of multi-division, joint force power projection that is characteristic of the larger Western nations. Yet it is difficult to imagine a scenario in which that capability would be necessary. Clearly, there are viable military roles that African militaries do play well.⁴³ Individual African countries like Angola, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Nigeria, and Zimbabwe have fielded impressively sophisticated forces that have demonstrated an ability to perform well in conventional military operations. Countries like Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, and Senegal have been cited for excellence in international peacekeeping operations. Botswana has used its military very successfully in environmental security operations. The South African Air Force performed heroically in rescue operations during the flooding in Mozambique in March 2000.

Several sub-Saharan African countries stand out for the competence and professionalism of their armed forces. Among these are Senegal, Ghana, Kenya, Botswana, and South Africa, each of which devotes a relatively modest portion of its GDP to defense spending (1.8 percent, .07 percent, 2.0 percent, 3.1 percent and 1.7 percent, respectively, in 1995). The level of funding devoted to a military establishment in Africa is not in itself a particularly good indicator of general professionalism or proficiency. A variety of historical and social factors seem to bear upon the role and relevance of the defense establishment in each country.⁴⁴

It is abundantly clear, however, that many African military establishments do not provide a good return on the nation's defense investment. As an extreme example, Zaire's former dictator, Mobutu Sese Seko, purchased security for his regime by maintaining a large, poorly-equipped and ill-trained military. However, that military provided little benefit to the society as a whole: it preyed upon Zaire's long-suffering populace and provided no security from external aggression. The army of Mobutu's successors displays many of the same characteristics. In greater or lesser degree, the same holds true for a number of African countries.

Perhaps the most common thread linking the more professional African armed forces is the presence of a well-resourced professional military education system for officers, at least up to Staff College level. (Some countries, like Botswana, have compensated for lack of in-country schools by concerted efforts to send officers abroad for such training.) Judging by the output, investment in professional military education seems to provide a good return on defense spending by African countries.⁴⁵

Ideas for the Future.

A variety of institutions in Africa and abroad are active in encouraging security sector reform. These have included institutions like the South African Institute for Security Studies and Centre for Defense Management (University of Witwatersrand) which provide training programs, publish materials, and organize conferences and exchanges.

They also include such non-African organizations as the (U.S.) Overseas Development Council, involved in a very promising study of ways in which foreign donors can better assist reform. (An ongoing project sponsored by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development has offered considerable insight into requirements for security sector reform in the developing world.⁴⁶)

Issues of defense funding in Africa ultimately boil down to issues of legitimacy and governance. At its heart are three basic questions: First, what is “security” for a given society and who has the prerogative to define it? Second, how does the need for “security” relate to the society’s other priorities, and who has the right to decide that? Third, how are the allocation and expenditure of resources overseen to assure that the society obtains the right amount of security, no more or less, without waste or abuse? These are profound questions that confront all societies, and the answers almost inevitably are complex and ambiguous.

African countries face two particularly challenging problems relating to these decisions: poverty, and weak or absent democratic institutions. Both problems have obvious implications for internal security. Resources are constrained for any national priority—including security. At the same time, African states generally have not achieved the mechanisms for establishing a sound consensus on the nature and degree of security desired by the populace. This significantly undermines the legitimacy of the state—and its security sector—in the eyes of the general population. So the remaining question is not so much, “How much should we spend?” Rather, it is “What, exactly, are we trying to buy?”

Although hardly original to this monograph, it nonetheless is worth observing that an increase in economic strength and economic opportunity in African countries is critically important to attenuating significant internal security threats. At the same time, it is difficult to envision achieving a national consensus on security, threats, and national priorities in the absence of the kinds of consultation typical of democratic government. So in the absence of economic improvement and further democratic transition, security reform continues to be problematical.

That said, a variety of measures exist that could improve the coherence and value of defense spending in Africa. An obvious one would be to better distribute the responsibility

for the armed forces among institutions of government, to prevent the accumulation of too many prerogatives in too few hands. Many African countries feature at least some responsibility on the part of the national legislature for allocation (or oversight) of defense spending. However, parliaments often do not have the expertise, or the independence from the executive branch, to perform this role adequately. Clearly, assistance to parliaments in performing such roles is appropriate.⁴⁷

It is important to establish a dialogue among security force officials, civil society, and those responsible in national governments for the allocation and oversight of resources. This will enable the civilian public servants to better understand the valid concerns of professionals regarding security force needs.⁴⁸ It particularly is important that parliamentarians acquire expertise in oversight and monitoring of defense funding.

However, distribution of responsibility for overseeing security force spending also might be a fruitful area for African innovation. It is conceivable that an African solution to this problem could take the form of independent regulatory commissions of professionals (somewhat like the U.S. Food and Drug Administration) separate from the executive and legislative branches of government, but responsible in some ways to each.

One of the most useful measures would be the institution of a process that created and maintained a national security strategy. This process would identify and prioritize national interests, assess threats to the national interests, and select appropriate policies to attenuate threats and advance interests. It is, of course, more preferable that this occurs prior to an identification of roles and missions for the security services. One result of this process may be to determine that some resources now devoted to the military might be better spent on law enforcement agencies, or vice versa. Another result could be a much better determination of the appropriate roles for national intelligence agencies.

Several African countries are engaged in efforts to develop national security strategies.

Efforts to increase the legitimacy and relevance of the security sector in the eyes of the general public would be a wise investment. For the armed forces themselves, this could involve use of military assets for such roles as medical treatment of civilians, construction of infrastructure in remote areas, and rapid-response disaster assistance.⁴⁹ But there is no substitute for maintenance of a well-trained, well-disciplined professional military establishment, oriented against discernible security threats, whose personnel have a strong commitment to human rights and ethical use of national resources. This is recognized by Africans inside and outside the security sector.⁵⁰

Another important measure would be efforts to make the defense funding, defense allocation, and procurement processes open and transparent. Preferably, this would be accompanied by a very public debate on the roles and missions of the security services. It also would help to assure that the decisions about defense spending follow the same processes—subject to the same rules and oversight—as the funding of other sectors. This would be much facilitated by government efforts to encourage and court the independent press. It also would be helped by a full public sector commitment to anti-corruption efforts.

The transparency and competence of security force expenditures would be enhanced by adoption of sound business management techniques within organizations or ministries charged with allocation and oversight. This would include stringent fiscal discipline and accountability. The effort also would be much enhanced by multi-year planning and budgeting on the part of security forces. In the long run, such measures would enable African military establishments to overcome some of the problems inherent in lack of resources. The skills involved, however, are not easily acquired. Education of qualified personnel—military

and civilian—is very important. Giving qualified personnel the autonomy to perform these functions is essential.

If African military establishments are employed in “nontraditional” roles—such as regional humanitarian assistance or support to internal anticrime police operations—the additional resource requirements should be subject to coherent planning and budgeting processes. Employment in nontraditional roles poses problems to any military establishment, and can significantly undermine the capacity to perform the primary function.⁵¹

African military establishments have made considerable efforts to find educational opportunities for their personnel. Here again, they have been impeded by limited resources and are subject to the whims of donors. But a commitment to education is a wise investment of limited resources. In the long run, it can result in much enhanced military capability and professionalism, as evident in such military establishments as those of Botswana, Ghana, Kenya and Senegal. African efforts to obtain such education for their military professionals should be commended and assisted.

However, the need for the education of military professionals is matched by the need to provide education on security issues to civilian public servants in all branches of government. There is a significant need for institutions like the (U.S.) John F. Kennedy School of Government that could provide graduate-level training for mid-level African civil and military leaders, preferably in mixed groups from all over the continent and preferably focused on African issues and solutions.

Finally, it may be very productive for African countries to continue—and enhance—efforts to seek subregional answers to pressing security problems. This certainly may reduce the sources of regional insecurity. But it may also provide options that somewhat mitigate the lack of resources in individual African countries.⁵² For instance, the East African Community has worked on plans to

integrate the military officer training of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, allowing each country to specialize in different levels of training for the whole community. The Southern African Development Community has established a regional peacekeeping training facility in Zimbabwe. Conceivably, the same sort of rationalization could be applied to military forces of individual countries—one specializing in a certain capability, a second in another. The same could be applied to procurement of some military materiel.

The important thesis to this whole discussion is that defense spending in Africa should be viewed as the tail of a very long chain. An African society will not realize the value of resources devoted to defense unless it first features the kind of democratic consultation that allows the entire society to define its interests and priorities—including security. This process should occur before establishing the roles and missions of the security services based upon what the society can afford. Then, it is important to establish mechanisms that assure the security services are accountable for performing their designated roles and for wisely using resources allocated to them. Finally, the allocation itself should be sufficient to allow the security forces to perform their designated roles.

Conclusion: The Role of the U.S. Department of Defense.

A primary focus of American security policy in Africa is to assist local partners in their efforts to build stable, accountable governments and effective security institutions. Although the U.S. military may be called to participate in humanitarian relief, peace operations, or noncombatant evacuation operations in Africa, its main current role is to assist with professionalization and reform. The longest-standing effort in this vein is the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program that provides U.S. military training (mainly in U.S. military

schools) to African military students. (In Fiscal Year 2000, the United States allocated \$3.9 million for IMET programs, involving some 1,364 personnel from 35 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.⁵³) Much of the IMET training involves relatively junior officers who apply their skills at the tactical level. A relative handful of senior African officers attend U.S. senior service colleges where strategic planning and defense budgeting form a substantial part of the curriculum. A few African officers also attend courses such as those offered by the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School that emphasize civil-military relations, defense budgeting and military justice.

Another significant U.S. professionalization program also is targeted at the tactical level in African armies. The African Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI) provides military forces up to brigade size with skills necessary for peace operations. (As of July 2001, nine African countries had agreed to participate in ACRI, and the United States had active programs with five of these.⁵⁴) Rules of engagement, relations with civilians, and professional conduct in general form an important part of this training.

If the United States is going to make a significant, long-term impact on reform of the security sector in African countries, it must devote substantial attention to the capabilities and professional inclinations of policymakers (both civilian and military) at the strategic level. This attention should include a focus on civil-military relations, strategic planning and security sector budgeting.

To assist African states in efforts to improve the accountability and effectiveness of defense budgeting, DoD should undertake several related activities. The first and most important is to continue support for and development of the African Center for Strategic Studies (ACSS). Founded on the DoD Regional Center concept (under which four other institutes now operate), the Africa Center complements other U.S., African, and multinational programs on the continent.⁵⁵ ACSS seeks to enhance the

professional skills of Africa's civilian and military leaders. Its programs support democratic governance in Africa by offering senior African civilian and military leaders rigorous academic and practical programs in civil-military relations, national security strategy, and defense economics.

ACSS participants include military officers, government officials, and nongovernmental civilian leaders. The Center promotes informed and productive inquiry on the military's role in a democracy. It encourages its participants to assess the importance of civilian control and military professionalism in democracies and examine civil-military relations in formulating and executing national security strategy. It also endeavors to promote an understanding of the military's role shaped and shared by African societies, their governments, and their military establishments.

U.S. attention to Africa often vacillates and the future of ACSS is not assured. However, U.S. national interests in Africa are likely to grow in the future, and relatively small investments in programs like ACSS can have a large payoff. DoD should sustain its support and continue to explore ways to further develop the Center and augment its effectiveness.

With ACSS in the lead, DoD should help publish an international journal designed to help African defense professionals exchange ideas on strategy development, defense budgeting, and building healthy civil-military relations. European nations involved in African security could be partners in this endeavor. Along the same lines, DoD should sponsor an annual workshop for Africans involved in defense budgeting to provide a forum for communication and exchange. Finally, DoD should take the lead in an interagency effort to establish a system of internships in Washington for Africans involved in defense budgeting. These interns could serve on congressional staffs, in the Congressional Budget Office, in the Office of

Management and Budget, and in the Pentagon's budget offices. Such hands-on experience could be invaluable.

Whatever programs the U.S Government sponsors, they will not be a panacea for the shortcomings of security sector financing in Africa. But there are low cost ways of giving the region some essential tools it needs to continue reform and the movement toward greater security and stability. Over the long term, these could play an important role in promoting the security interests both of the United States and of its African partners.

ENDNOTES

1. Dan Henk, "U.S. National Interests in Sub-Saharan Africa," *Parameters*, Winter 1997-1998, pp. 92-107.

2. See Kenneth Good, "Enduring Elite Democracy in Botswana," *Democratization*, Vol. 6, No. 1, Spring 1999, pp. 30-65.

3. See Dan Henk, "Security in Africa: New Definitions?" Paper presented at the African Studies Association 43rd Annual Meeting, Nashville, TN, November 2000.

4. See particularly Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998.

5. *Human Development Report, 1993*, United Nations Development Program, available from <http://www.undp.org/hdro/93.htm>.

6. *Human Development Report, 1994*, United Nations Development Program, available from <http://www.undp.org/hdro/94.htm>.

7. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) data provided on request, March 8, 2000, <http://www.sipri.se>.

8. Todd Sandler and Keith Hartley, *The Economics of Defense*, Cambridge: The Univesity Press, 1995, p. 1.

9. See, for example, Hussein Solomon, "From Marginalized to Dominant Discourse: Reflections on the Evolution of New Security Thinking," in H. Solomon and M. van Aardt, eds., *Caring Security in Africa*, ISS Monograph Series, No. 20, February 1998, pp. 3-14; and Steven Metz, *Refining American Strategy in Africa*; Carlisle Barracks,

PA: U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, February 2000, pp. 7-28.

10. It is worth noting that the U.S. defense budget for Fiscal Year 2000 was \$278 billion, about 2.7 percent of GDP. As a percentage of GDP, the FY 2000 U.S. defense outlays are similar to those of most African countries.

11. For a discussion of the reliability of published data, see M. Brzoska, "World Military Expenditure," in *The Handbook of Defense Economics*, K. Hartley and T. Sandler, eds., Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1995, pp. 45-67; and Nicole Ball, *Security and Economy in the Third World*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988, pp. 84-122.

12. See, for example, "Tracking Angola's oil money," *The Economist*, January 15, 2000, p. 48.

13. Interview, May 4, 2000, with Dr. Peter Batchelor, eminent South African defense economist, currently serving as Project Director, Small Arms Survey, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva.

14. Ball, p. 40.

15. Batchelor.

16. "African Armies Can't Stand Fire," *The Monitor* (Kampala, Uganda), September 1, 1999, p. 2; Batchelor notes that part of the South African press in 1999 and 2000 has supported large-scale military purchases and has been concerned about the reported deterioration of their country's defense capabilities.

17. Douglas Farah, "U.S. to Help Nigeria Revamp its Armed Forces," *Washington Post*, April 29, 2000, p. A14.

18. Based upon the personal experiences of the authors. In the Mobutu era, the Zairian security forces particularly were notorious for this proclivity, leading one author to entitle a descriptive chapter "The State as Bandit." Michael G. Schatzberg, *The Dialectics of Oppression in Zaire*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988, pp. 52-70.

19. See Rocklyn Williams, "How primary is the primary function?: Configuring the SANDF for African realities," *African Security Review*, Vol. 8, No. 6, 1999, pp. 70-83; and Nadir A. L. Mohammed, "Trends, Determinants and the Economic Effects of Military Expenditure in Sub-Saharan Africa," in E. Hutchful and A. Bathily, eds., *The Military and Militarism in Africa*, CODESRIA Book Series, 1998, pp. 47-104.

20. "War and Money: The business of conflict," *The Economist*, March 4, 2000, 46; "Tracking Angola's oil money," *The Economist*, January 15, 2000, p. 48.

21. Ian Fisher, "Uganda's Help to Congolese Rebels Raises Questions about Motives," *New York Times*, December 21, 1998.

22. "Zimbabwe army in Congo diamond deal," BBC News, September 23, 1999, available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/africa/newsid_4550004555882.stm; "Zimbabwe accused of 'economic colonialism'," BBC News, October 1, 1999, available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/africa/newsid_462000/462951.stm; "DRC Slams Door on SA Trade, Favours Zim," *The Zimbabwe Independent* (Harare, Zimbabwe), October 23, 1998, available at: http://www.africanews.org/central/congo-kinshasa/stories/19981023_feat6.html.

23. "Zimbabwe losses add up in Congo," BBC News, November 25, 1999, available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/africa/newsid_536000/536454.stm.

24. *U.N. General Assembly Resolution A/45/258* dated May 3, 1991. This resolution specifies a monthly U.S.\$988 as the basic pay and allowance for soldiers of all ranks with additional allowances of U.S.\$65 for usage factor of personal gear and U.S.\$5 for personal weaponry. These funds are paid directly to the contributing government. Additional supplementary payments also are authorized if the contingent consists of specialists such as logisticians. On-site daily allowances paid to the troops consist of U.S.\$1.28 plus recreational leave and welfare supplements. See also Dan Henk, *Peace Operations: Views from Southern and Eastern Africa*, Occasional Paper, Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College Center for Strategic Leadership, June 1996, p. 23.

25. Interview, April 4, 2000, with Lieutenant Colonel Anthony D. Marley, U.S. Army (retired). Marley, a highly experienced Department of Defense Africanist, served as U.S. military attaché in West Africa in the 1990s.

26. Interview, May 5 2000, with Lieutenant Colonel Eric Bonnemaïson, French Marines, French liaison officer to the Africa Center for Strategic Studies. Bonnemaïson's extensive experience in Africa and service in the French Ministry of Defense provide unique insights into African civil-military relations.

27. See Dan Henk, *Uncharted Paths, Uncertain Vision: U.S. Military Involvements in Sub-Saharan Africa in the Wake of the Cold War*, Occasional Paper, No. 18, Colorado Springs, CO: Institute for National Security Studies, March 1998, pp. 40-42.

28. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

29. For a discussion of the British military assistance program in southern Africa, see Greg Mills, "BMATT and military integration in southern Africa," *South African Defense Review*, No. 2, 1992.

30. Jakkie Cilliers, "Building Security in Southern Africa," *ISS Monograph*, No. 43, November 1999, pp. 47-49.

31. Interview, March 15, 2000, with Dr. Constance J. Freeman, Chair of the Department of Defense Economics, Africa Center for Strategic Studies (ACSS).

32. Mohammed, pp. 60-68, draws on a review of existing literature to offer a catalog of political, economic and military determinants of African defense spending.

33. See Rocklyn Williams, "How primary is the primary function?: Configuring the SANDF for African realities," *African Security Review*, Vol 8, No. 6, 1999. See also *South African White Paper on Defense*, May 1996; *South African Defense Review*, April 1998.

34. SIPRI data.

35. Batchelor.

36. See, for example, Crawford Young and Thomas Turner, *The Rise and Decline of the Zairian State*, Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985, pp. 164-184.

37. Batchelor.

38. For illustrative detail, see Ball, p. 58.

39. See, for example, Parliament of Zimbabwe, *Third Report of the Departmental Committee on Security Ministries*, presented to the 3rd Session of the 4th Parliament on Tuesday, March 24, 1998, Lieutenant Colonel (retired) Shumba, Chairman.

40. Bonnemaïson. Bonnemaïson notes that the coup d'etat in Cote d'Ivoire in early 2000 had its source in unhappiness by junior Ivoirian military personnel over their perception that allowances supposedly

paid for their peacekeeping role in the Central African Republic were being withheld or diverted.

41. Batchelor.

42. Metz, pp. 13-22.

43. See, for example, Dan Henk, *Peace Operations*, No. 6, pp. 17-19.

44. See Sunday Obogonye Ochoche, "The Military and National Security in Africa," in E. Hutchful and A. Bathily.

45. It is worth noting the essential role that the military education system played in the United States in the era between World War I and World War II, when the country allowed its military capability to atrophy alarmingly. The high quality leadership that emerged in the early days of World War II is directly attributable to the continuing emphasis on officer education in the inter-war years.

46. DFID Discussion Paper No. 1, "Security Sector Reform and Management of Defense Expenditure: A Conceptual Framework," London, February 15-17, 2000, <http://www.dfid.gnet.gov.uk>.

47. Eboe Hutchful, "Demilitarizing the political process in Africa: Some basic issues," *African Security Review*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1997, pp. 2-16.

48. Eboe Hutchful, "Militarism and the Problems of Democratic Transition, in M. Ottaway, ed., *Democracy in Africa: The Hard Road Ahead*, London: Lynne Rienner, pp. 43-64.

49. For a related discussion, see C. William Fox, "Military Medical Operations in Sub-Saharan Africa," Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute, June 24, 1997. It is noteworthy that a major activity of the U.S. Central Command in Africa now features an annual exercise ("Golden Spear") with 11 countries of eastern/central Africa around the theme of national/regional planning for natural disasters.

50. "Naval Boss Stresses for Policing Economic Zone," (Lagos) *Post Express*, May 3, 2000, available at http://africanews...ries/20000503/20000503_feat24.html.

51. Rocklyn Williams, pp. 80-81.

52. For a discussion of possibilities—as well as a warning of dangers—see Gavin Cawthra, "Toward a Holistic Approach to Security Management at Regional Security Level," *African Security Review*, Vol.

6, No. 5, 1997, pp. 58-61. For a more generalized discussion, see Sandler and Hartley, p. 337.

53. Defense Security Cooperation Agency Foreign Military Training Report to Congress, January 2001, Vol. 1.

54. The countries with active programs in 2001 were Benin, Kenya, Mali, Malawi, and Senegal. Activities with Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ivory Coast and Uganda were on hold.

55. Information from the ACSS website at http://www.africacenter.org/english/e1000_center.htm.

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE

Major General Robert R. Ivany
Commandant

STRATEGIC STUDIES INSTITUTE

Director
Professor Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr.

Director of Research
Dr. Steven Metz

Authors
Dr. Daniel W. Henk
Dr. Martin Revayi Rupiya

Director of Publications
Ms. Marianne P. Cowling

Publications Assistant
Ms. Rita A. Rummel

Composition
Mrs. Christine A. Williams