

3. Major armed conflicts

RENATA DWAN and MICAELA GUSTAVSSON

I. Introduction

The major armed conflicts that competed with the war in Iraq for international media headlines in 2003 were, with few exceptions, intra-state.¹ Only one case of interstate conflict, other than the war between the multinational coalition and the Government of Iraq, was recorded for 2003. This is the long-standing conflict between India and Pakistan over the disputed territory of Kashmir.² There was cautious optimism that a breakthrough might be made when Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee, during a visit to Indian-administered Kashmir on 18 April 2003, expressed his government's willingness to enter into talks with Pakistan.³ Improvements in relations between the two countries continued during the year and culminated in a ceasefire on the Line of Control on 23 November.⁴ Air traffic between the two countries resumed in December, and in early January 2004 train services were restored.⁵ Despite protests from several Islamic militants active in Kashmir, Vajpayee and Pakistani leader General Pervez Musharraf agreed on 5 January 2004 to hold peace talks on Kashmir in February.⁶ Progress between the two countries has been facilitated

¹ The significance of the conflict in Iraq for international security in 2003 is such that it is treated comprehensively in a separate chapter; see chapter 2 in this volume. For the purposes of this chapter, a 'major armed conflict' is defined as a contested incompatibility that concerns government and/or territory over which the use of armed force between the military forces of 2 parties, of which at least 1 party is the government of a state, has resulted in at least 1000 battle-related deaths in any single year.

² The conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia was formally brought to an end by a peace treaty signed by both parties on 12 Dec. 2000. See United Nations, Agreement between the Government of the State of Eritrea and the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Annex to identical letters dated 12 December 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Algeria to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, UN document A/55/686-S/2000/1183, 13 Dec. 2000. In Apr. 2002 Eritrea and Ethiopia agreed to accept and abide by the recommendation of the international Eritrea–Ethiopia Boundary Commission (EEBC) on the demarcation of their borders. The demarcation process is still ongoing.

³ Bukhari, S., 'PM extends "hand of friendship" to Pakistan', *The Hindu* (Internet edn), 19 Apr. 2003, URL <<http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/2003/04/19/stories/2003041905500100.htm>>.

⁴ Reddy, B. M., 'Pak. offers ceasefire along LoC', *The Hindu* (Internet edn), 24 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://www.hindu.com/2003/11/24/stories/2003112410840100.htm>>.

⁵ India suspended all air, bus and train links with Pakistan in Dec. 2001 after an attack on the Indian Parliament in New Delhi. India claimed that this was the work of Kashmiri militant groups that India alleges are supported by Pakistan. 'India, Pakistan resuming air links', CNN.com, 1 Dec. 2003, URL <<http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/asiapcf/south/12/01/india.pakistan.airlinks/>>; and 'India, Pakistan resume train link', BBC News Online, 15 Jan. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/3395901.stm>.

⁶ Ramesh, R., 'Musharraf and Vajpayee pledge peaceful links', *Guardian Unlimited*, 6 Jan. 2004, URL <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/kashmir/Story/0,2763,1116883,00.html>>.

by India's linked decision to hold talks with Kashmiri separatist leaders for the first time in 14 years.⁷

The classification of armed conflicts as 'interstate' and 'intra-state' should be approached with caution. Few intra-state major armed conflicts remain self-contained.⁸ Civil wars implicate both neighbouring countries and the wider international community, as the conflicts in West and Central Africa illustrated in 2003. Another, albeit distinct, example of a conflict that resists neat 'interstate/intra-state' classification is that between the United States and al-Qaeda and Taliban forces in Afghanistan which has been under way since October 2001. In 2003 the 11 500-strong US-led multinational coalition force, of which approximately 8500 are US troops, continued its efforts to kill or capture key remaining al-Qaeda and Taliban figures.⁹ Taliban fighters who were regrouping and emerging out of Pakistan were increasingly active in south-eastern Afghanistan in 2003. In the most intense fighting in over a year US, Afghan and multinational coalition forces battled up to 1000 Taliban fighters in the province of Zabol, south of Kabul, in August. According to US officials, up to 200 Taliban were killed during two weeks of fighting.¹⁰ On 2 December the USA, backed by Afghan forces, launched a major month-long ground operation, Operation Avalanche, in the south-east. The USA reported 10 Taliban fighters killed and 100 arrested. The accidental killing of a number of civilians, including children, during the campaign provoked protest among Afghan citizens in the region.¹¹ Security remained an issue throughout the country as the Transitional Authority, under President Hamid Karzai, continued its efforts to exert its authority over the powerful warlords in control of large swathes of Afghanistan. A sizeable disarmament and demobilization programme is under way, alongside the development of the national army, in preparation for national elections scheduled for September 2004, almost three years since the Taliban fell from power.

The continued predominance of war within states underlines the need for attention to the causes and dynamics of intra-state conflict. This chapter focuses on intra-state major armed conflicts that were active in 2003, using the findings of the Uppsala Conflict Data Project (UCDP), presented in appendix 3A. Section II outlines the broad types of intra-state conflict and

⁷ Rohde, D., 'India and Kashmir separatists begin talks on ending strife', *New York Times* (Internet edn), 23 Jan. 2004, URL <<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/01/23/international/asia/23KASH.html>>.

⁸ On the regionalization of conflicts see, i.a., Buzan, B., *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-cold War Era*, 2nd edn (Harvester Wheatsheaf: Hemel Hempstead, 1991); Lake, D. A., and Rothchild, D. S. (eds), *The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict: Fear, Diffusion and Escalation* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, N.J., 2003); and Adebajo, A., *Building Peace in West Africa: Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea Bissau* (Lynne Rienner: Boulder, Colo., 2002).

⁹ This force is separate from the 5000-strong International Security and Assistance Force (ISAF) in Kabul. For more on ISAF see chapter 4 in this volume.

¹⁰ Priest, D., 'US officer says operation taking toll on Taliban', *Washington Post* (Internet edn), 8 Sep. 2003, URL <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A40128-2003Sep7?language=printer>>.

¹¹ Approximately 2000 coalition troops were involved. 'US airborne assault targets Taliban forces', *International Herald Tribune* (Internet edn), 9 Dec. 2003, URL <<http://www.iht.com/cgi-bin/generic.cgi?template=articleprint.tpl&ArticleId=120808>>; and 'US military kills 10, arrests 100 in Afghanistan operation', *UN Wire* (Internet edn), 30 Dec. 2003, URL <http://www.unwire.org/UNWire/20031230/449_11604.asp>.

sketches various attempts to explain why intra-state conflict remains a persistent feature of the international system of states. Sections III–V each identify a central aspect of intra-state conflict: the potential for longevity of intra-state conflict; its volatility as a type of armed conflict; and its resistance to settlements that are less than comprehensive. Each section also takes up examples of intra-state conflicts that were active in 2003 to illustrate its analytical theme. All but two of these conflicts appear in the table of major armed conflicts in appendix 3A (table 3A.3). The conflicts in Côte d’Ivoire and Uganda, discussed in this chapter, are not included in the table because they do not meet the criteria for a major armed conflict of 1000 battle-related deaths in any one year. However, the total fatalities in these conflicts, the extent of the humanitarian crisis they have provoked and their significance within their respective regions make them important cases of intra-state conflict in 2003. Section VI points to some of the ways in which the war against terrorism affected intra-state conflicts in 2003, and section VII presents the conclusions. Appendix 3A presents the findings of the UCDP, and appendix 3B provides definitions, sources and methods for the conflict data.

II. The persistence of intra-state conflict

Nine of the intra-state conflicts listed in appendix 3A are contests over self-determination. These are conflicts over territory and usually manifest in a struggle by an opposition group against the recognized government with a view towards independent statehood—for example, the conflicts in Indonesia (Aceh), Angola (Cabinda), Myanmar (the conflict with the Karen National Union) and Russia (Chechnya).¹² A common feature of many self-determinist struggles is the zero-sum perspective on the conflict taken by its protagonists. Pro-self-determination groups which are prepared to use violence to achieve their objectives tend to enter armed conflict with a maximal vision and regard independent statehood as non-negotiable. This commitment is not easily modified or sated by alternative economic or political inducements. States resisting self-determination claims often perceive the struggle as a fight for the survival of the state.

Absolutist perspectives on both sides pose serious challenges for conflict resolution, and steps towards the termination of a self-determinist conflict rarely take place without significant concessions on both sides, as the peace process in Sudan demonstrated in 2003. The willingness of the state in question to contemplate making changes to the distribution of constitutional and political power is a crucial precondition to conflict termination. Modification of the original goal of independence by self-determinist parties to one of substantial autonomous administration is usually a key determinant in progress towards ending conflict, as the recent examples of Serbia and Montenegro,

¹² The conflict between the Government of Angola and separatist forces in the northern province of Cabinda is not listed as a major conflict and is therefore not included in appendix 3A.

Sri Lanka and Sudan potentially illustrate.¹³ While autonomy arrangements may well be a necessary condition, they are not, of themselves, sufficient for conflict resolution, as the examples of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), the international protectorate of Kosovo, and Georgia (Abkhazia) underscore.

As a result of the prominence of ethno-national conflicts in Central Europe, the former Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia throughout the 1990s, separatist struggles are often characterized by both external observers and internal protagonists as 'ethnic conflicts'. The two terms are not interchangeable, as the 1994 massacres in Rwanda and the continuing conflict in Burundi potently demonstrate. Moreover, while the number of conflicts fought over ethnically defined issues continues to decline worldwide, contests over self-determination remain a significant source of major armed conflict in the early part of the 21st century.¹⁴

The second broad type of intra-state conflict is that fought for control over government. This includes conflicts motivated by ideologies other than Islamic fundamentalism. Despite the end of the cold war, with its communist-capitalist perceived rivalry and the worldwide decline of communist regimes, Marxist-led attempts at regime change are a main declared source of conflict in Colombia, Nepal, Peru and the Philippines (the conflict involving the New People's Army, NPA, the armed wing of the Communist Party of the Philippines, CPP). These conflicts have been among the most intense in terms of casualties, including civilian fatalities, as seen most recently in Nepal, where over 1000 people were estimated to have died since the collapse in August 2003 of the seven-month ceasefire between the Nepalese Government and the Communist Party of Nepal-Maoist.¹⁵ The opposition forces in all of these conflicts were initially rural-based, but the increasing use of urban-based tactics by Nepalese guerrillas—as in the conflicts in Colombia (both right- and left-wing paramilitary groups) and Peru (operations of Sendero Luminoso, or Shining Path), involving assassinations, bombings and extortion—affects civilians of all classes. The perceived irreconcilability in Marxist ideology between its objectives and the opposing government/system may serve to fuel conflict intensity and render more difficult the potential for compromise.¹⁶

¹³ Since 1990 only 4 self-determinist conflicts have resulted in the creation of an internationally recognized state: Slovenia, Croatia, Eritrea and, in 2002, East Timor (as of May 2002 the new state of Timor-Leste).

¹⁴ See Marshall, M. and Gurr, T. (eds), *Peace and Conflict 2003: A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements and Democracy* (Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM), University of Maryland: College Park, Md., Feb. 2003), available at URL <<http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/peace.htm>>.

¹⁵ Bhattarai, B., 'Shooting follows end of Nepal truce', *Financial Times*, 29 Aug. 2003, p. 5; Xinhua (Beijing) (in English), 1 Oct. 2003, in 'More than 300 guerrillas killed in Nepal in Sep', Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report—China (FBIS-CHI)*, FBIS-CHI-2003-1001, 2 Oct. 2003; and 'US freezes Nepal Maoist assets', BBC News Online, 31 Oct. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/3231525.stm>.

¹⁶ Waldman, A., 'Nepal Maoist rebels move their attacks into cities', *New York Times* (Internet edn), 12 Oct. 2003, URL <<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/10/12/international/asia/12NEPA.html?th=&PageWanted=Print&Position=>>>; and International Crisis Group (ICG) Report, *Nepal: Back To The Gun*, Asia Briefing (ICG: Kathmandu, Brussels, 22 Oct. 2003), available at URL <<http://www.crisisweb.org/home/index.cfm?1=1&id=2328>>.

More often, however, intra-state conflicts fought over control of government are marked by the lack of any one goal on the part of the opposition forces. Instead, a complex mix of contested issues is involved, including factors such as ethnic rivalry; access to, control and distribution of resources (natural, economic and political); relative lack of representative systems of governance; and religious or human rights grievances. This type of multidimensional intra-state conflict is the most predominant form of armed conflict in Africa—in the Central African Republic (CAR), Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Liberia, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Uganda. The multiplicity of contested issues and combatant groups, the lack of stated war aims and the shifting patterns of allegiances between the various armed groups involved are common features of this 'modern' form of traditional intra-state conflict. This complexity affects the nature of the fighting, especially in relation to military tactics (guerrilla warfare, massacre, ethnic cleansing and torture), intensity (lack of observed 'rules of the game'), shifting location (zones of conflict, e.g., the Ituri province in the DRC) and destructiveness (civilian and urban targets, depletion of natural resources and corruption). The management and resolution of such conflicts are, inevitably, all the more challenging.¹⁷

In addressing the persistence of intra-state conflict, research and policy-making communities have moved away from analysis of the political sources and dynamics of conflict to focus increasingly on the economic factors of war. This approach is less concerned with explaining why conflict breaks out than with the combatants' motivations for waging and maintaining war.¹⁸ Conflict and the chaos it causes create opportunities for self-enrichment for individuals and groups from within or outside the state concerned. This is particularly the case in states with natural 'lootable' resources (diamonds and narcotics, as compared to oil, gas or mineral deposits) that find ready international trading markets for those with access and the capacity to exploit them. Winning war and making peace may well threaten the possibility of profit for such groups by unravelling the war economy (including the trade in arms), taking away control of resources from groups, regulating resource extraction, establishing the rule of law, and redistributing power and wealth. The interest of those profiting from war, therefore, is in maintaining a sufficiently limited level of war that permits economic activities to continue.¹⁹

This analysis of the persistence of conflict has been influential in shaping international policy towards African conflicts, notably those in resource-rich states such as Angola, the CAR, the DRC and Sierra Leone.²⁰ The October

¹⁷ See chapter 4 in this volume.

¹⁸ Keen, D., International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), *The Economic Functions of Violence in Civil Wars*, Adelphi Paper no. 320 (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1998); Collier, P. and Hoeffler, A., *Greed and Grievance in Civil War*, Policy Research Working Paper no. 2355 (World Bank: Washington, DC, 2001); and Ballentine, K. and Nitzschke, H., *Beyond Greed and Grievance: Policy Lessons from Studies in the Political Economy of Armed Conflict*, International Peace Academy (IPA) Policy Report (IPA: New York, Oct. 2003), available at URL <http://www.ipacademy.org/PDF_Reports/BGG_rpt.pdf>.

¹⁹ Keen (note 18), p. 12.

²⁰ E.g., United Nations, 'Report of the Panel of Experts appointed pursuant to Security Council Resolution 1306 (2000) paragraph 19, in relation to Sierra Leone', UN document S/2000/1195, 20 Dec. 2000.

2003 Report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the United Nations Security Council continued the trend set by earlier UN investigations of listing individuals and companies involved in resource exploitation which, the panel claims, have contributed to funding and perpetuating conflict.²¹ This UN-led approach tries to facilitate conflict termination by cutting off the trade in resources to and from the conflict zone and targeting those elites profiting most from the conflict. One example of this was the sanctions imposed on the regime of President Charles Taylor in Liberia in 2001 and renewed in 2002 and 2003 in response to Liberian backing for rebel groups in neighbouring Sierra Leone and Guinea. The sanctions prohibited Liberia from trading in arms, diamonds and, from 2003, timber and imposed travel restrictions on Taylor and his ministers.²²

A related, more structural approach to understanding the persistence of intra-state conflict looks to the nature of the state and, in particular, its framework and practice of governance. This perspective, often too crudely abbreviated to the problem of 'failed states', focuses on the lack of capacity of a state to deliver basic security and welfare to its citizens and its vulnerability to penetration from corruption and crime. The weak state is extremely open to internal challenges and is ill equipped to deal with them successfully, either through repressive means or through accommodation and incorporation. External challenges pose equal problems, whether hostile and/or intervening neighbouring states, aggressive foreign economic actors or active diaspora and exiled opposition groups. Structural weaknesses also help to explain why some states experience such difficulty in maintaining peace after conflict.

As a result of this current emphasis, international responses to conflict, both short- and long-term, are focusing on the challenges of state building and patterns of governance to a far greater extent than in the past.²³ This is leading to greater concentration on the relationship between security and development (security sector reform) as well as on the legitimacy and practical challenges

See also 'Addendum to the final report of the Monitoring Mechanism on Sanctions against UNITA', UN Security Council document S/2001/363, 18 Apr. 2001, Enclosure; and 'Supplementary report of the Monitoring Mechanism on Sanctions against UNITA', UN Security Council document S/2001/966, 12 Oct. 2001, Enclosure; and United Nations, Letter dated 15 October 2003 from the Chairman of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the Secretary-General, UN Security Council document S/2003/1027, 23 Oct. 2003.

²¹ United Nations, Letter dated 23 October 2003 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, UN document S/2003/1027, 23 Oct. 2003.

²² United Nations, Second report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council Resolution 1408 (2002) regarding Liberia, UN document S/2003/466, 22 Apr. 2003; and UN Security Council Resolution 1478, 6 May 2003.

²³ E.g., United Nations, Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration, Report of the Secretary-General, UN document A/58/323, 2 Sep. 2003; Chesterman, S., *You, the People: The United Nations, Transitional Administration and State-Building* (International Peace Academy: New York, Nov. 2003), Executive Summary available at URL <http://www.ipacademy.org/PDF_Reports/YOU_THE_PEOPLE.pdf>; and Schnabel, A., 'Post-conflict peacebuilding and second-generation preventative action', *International Peacekeeping*, vol. 9, no. 2 (summer 2002), pp. 7–30.

of external intervention in state building.²⁴ It should be noted that, although a link is often posited between democracy as a form of governance and peace, less than fully-established democratic states with low capacity to provide for their citizens and to address threats are at least as prone to destabilizing challenges and conflict (e.g., the conflicts in Algeria, Guinea-Bissau, Georgia, the CAR and Rwanda) as are autocratic regimes.²⁵

III. Protracted intra-state conflicts

If the discussion above points to some of the reasons behind the persistence of intra-state conflict, it also helps to explain the protracted nature of many of its instances. Twelve of the major armed conflicts listed in appendix 3A began before 1990. A number of these conflicts are in a stagnant position that has led to a steady decline of fatalities but not the end of hostilities (for example, Myanmar, Peru and Turkey). These conflicts rarely figure in international headlines but retain their potential for re-ignition, as the example of Turkey demonstrated on 1 September 2003, when the Conference of the People's Congress of Kurdistan (KONGRA-GEL) declared an end to its ceasefire.²⁶ Three protracted conflicts, however, occupied significant attention in 2003: Colombia, Israel–Palestinians and Sri Lanka. The first conflict is usually identified as ideologically motivated, while the latter two are conflicts over self-determination.

Colombia

The conflict between the Colombian Government and two leftist rebel groups—the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC, or Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia) and the Ejército de Liberación Nacional (ELN, or National Liberation Army)—that began in the late 1960s intensified in 2003. Inspired by Marxist ideology, FARC and the ELN claim to wage a legitimate war against an unjust state. Some analysts argue that the rebels' objectives have blurred over the years and that drug trafficking, extortion and kidnapping have become an end in themselves.²⁷ FARC, with approximately 18 000 fighters and a stronghold in the south, and the ELN, comprising approximately 3500 fighters based mainly in northern Colombia, remain rivals

²⁴ Paris, R., 'International peacebuilding and the "mission civilisatrice"', *Review of International Studies*, vol. 28, no. 4 (Oct. 2002), pp. 637–56; and Cooper, R., *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-first Century* (Atlantic Books: Boston, Mass., 2003). On security sector reform see chapter 8 in this volume.

²⁵ Tilly, C., *The Politics of Collective Violence* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2003), pp. 55–80; Marshall, M., 'Global trends in democratization', eds Marshall and Gurr (note 14), pp. 17–25; and Huth, P. and Allee, T., *The Democratic Peace and Territorial Conflict in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2002).

²⁶ 'Kurdish rebels abandon truce', BBC News Online, 2 Sep. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3200907.stm>>. KONGRA-GEL was previously called the Partiya Karkeren Kurdistan (PKK, or Kurdish Workers' Party).

²⁷ McDermott, J., 'FARC: rebels without a cause?', BBC News Online, 21 May 2002, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1998304.stm>>.

despite occasional joint operations. A complicating factor in the conflict has been the emergence of paramilitary groups and their right-wing umbrella organization, the Autodefensas Unidas de Colombia (AUC, or United Self-Defence Forces of Colombia), formed by drug traffickers and landowners with the declared aim to eradicate FARC and the ELN.²⁸ The AUC, in its turn, has been increasingly motivated by the profits of war and through its terror tactics has wrought some of the worst atrocities against civilians.²⁹ To date, the conflict has claimed the lives of almost 60 000 people. Peace talks between the Colombian Government and the two rebel groups broke down in 2002 and remained in suspension in 2003.

The most positive development in 2003 was the peace talks between the new Colombian right-wing Government of President Álvaro Uribe Vélez, elected in May 2002, and the AUC.³⁰ The negotiations, which began on 22 January 2003, led to agreement by the paramilitaries on 15 July to stop the fighting and to demobilize 13 000 combatants by 31 December 2005. In return, the AUC demanded the suspension of all legal actions against AUC combatants and the release of imprisoned AUC members. Uribe submitted a bill to the Colombian Congress in August, outlining a plan by which disarmed AUC members would pay a fee to escape jail. The proposal sparked strong criticism from the UN and international human rights groups.³¹ There is still no agreement on the judicial liability of disarmed combatants for massacres committed by the AUC.

Uribe maintained his tough stance with regard to peace initiatives with leftist FARC and ELN rebels and continues to demand a commitment by the rebels to renounce violence as a precondition for negotiations.³² The Colombian Government's counter-insurgency strategy, launched in 2002, gives more powers to the military and the police and provides for the creation of a network of civilian informants who receive payments for information on rebel activities as well as a new part-time force consisting of 16 000 peasant soldiers.³³ Uribe's strategy was a personal success, pushing up his approval rating from 60 per cent to almost 78 per cent in the first half of 2003. His strategy to curb FARC and ELN violence, however, appears to have had little effect on bringing the rebels closer to the negotiating table.³⁴ Efforts by the UN to stem the

²⁸ The AUC has drawn international condemnation as a terrorist group owing to its attacks on civilians suspected of being sympathizers of FARC and the ELN. McDermott, J., 'Colombia's growing paramilitary force', BBC News Online, 7 Jan. 2002, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1746943.stm>>.

²⁹ Kirk, R., 'Colombia: "checkbook impunity" for murderers', *Human Rights Watch Commentary*, 14 Sep. 2003, URL <<http://hrw.org/editorials/2003/colombia091403.htm>>.

³⁰ 'Colombia: peace talks', *Latin American Andean Group Report*, RA-03-01, 28 Jan. 2003, p. 8.

³¹ Around 850 AUC fighters disarmed on 25 Nov. in Medellín. President Uribe claimed that these fighters had not been responsible for any massacres committed against civilians and they were therefore pardoned. 'Colombia disarms militiamen', BBC News Online, 25 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/3237310.stm>>.

³² 'Country Profile: Colombia', BBC News Online, 8 Nov. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/country_profiles/1212798.stm>.

³³ 'Superman Uribe holds back the tide', *The Economist*, 7 June 2003, p. 49.

³⁴ 'FARC attempts to regain initiative', *Latin American Andean Group Report*, RA-03-07, 9 Sep. 2003, p. 9.

violence in 2003 also failed. Although FARC agreed in August to hold talks in Brazil with the UN Secretary-General's Special Advisor on Colombia, James LeMoyné, the talks had still not taken place by December 2003.³⁵

The Colombian Government launched several offensives in 2003 against the left-wing rebels in the north-eastern provinces of the country (Arauca, Sucre and Bolívar) which form part of a rehabilitation and consolidation zone decreed by the government in September 2002.³⁶ Fighting intensified in the oil-rich Arauca municipality, where the Caño Limón-Coveñas oil pipeline starts. The province is strategically important to the rebels, who see the pipeline as both a military target and a source of revenue from the extortion of US oil companies based there. The oil issue has further implicated the United States in the Colombian conflict. The USA became directly involved in the conflict in January 2003, when 70 US Special Forces were deployed in Arauca to train 6500 Colombian soldiers in counter-insurgency and intelligence-gathering techniques. The aim was to create a new Colombian rapid reaction force to prevent rebel attacks on the pipeline.³⁷

Colombia is the third largest recipient of US military aid: it has received almost \$2 billion in US military assistance since the 2000 initiation of Plan Colombia.³⁸ This aid was further increased in 2003, following the lifting of US restrictions preventing the Colombian Government from using US aid to combat armed groups in 2002. The George W. Bush Administration provided Uribe's government with \$320 million to counter arms transfers, drug production and trafficking, and an additional \$130 million was allocated specifically to fight FARC and ELN rebels, as well as the AUC.³⁹

Despite the implementation of Uribe's tougher stance, FARC and the ELN remain formidable.⁴⁰ The guerrillas still control almost 40 per cent of the country, notwithstanding the loss of the demilitarized zone in the south as a result of the breakdown of the peace talks in 2002.⁴¹ The loss of this safe haven has led large numbers of rebels to move north-east towards the Colombian-Venezuelan border.⁴² Multiple cross-border incidents between Colombia and its neighbouring states Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru and Brazil in 2003 underscore the threat posed to regional security by the conflict in Colombia.⁴³

³⁵ 'Lula's breakthrough: Brazil as venue for talks between FARC and UN', *Latin American Weekly Report*, WR-03-35, 9 Sep. 2003, p. 1.

³⁶ 'Colombia creates security zones', BBC News Online, 22 Sep. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/2273680.stm>>.

³⁷ Wilson, J., 'US goes deeper into Colombian conflict', *Financial Times*, 29 Jan. 2003, p. 5.

³⁸ Center for International Policy (CIP), 'US aid to Colombia since 1997: summary tables', The Colombia Project, URL <<http://www.ciponline.org/colombia/aidtable.htm>>; and Human Rights Watch, 'Colombia: US "misses an opportunity"', ReliefWeb, 8 July 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

³⁹ Center for International Policy (note 38).

⁴⁰ 'Once again, Colombia mourns', *The Economist*, 15 Feb. 2003, p. 50.

⁴¹ The demilitarized zone (DMZ) was created in 1998 by Colombian President Andrés Pastrana to facilitate peace talks with FARC. The DMZ remained in existence until the collapse of the peace talks on 20 Feb. 2002.

⁴² McDermott, J., 'Cross border activities embroil Venezuela in Colombian conflict', *Jane's Intelligence Review*, vol. 15, no. 8 (Aug. 2003), pp. 12-13; and 'Profile: Álvaro Uribe Vélez', BBC News Online, 25 Oct. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/3214685.stm>>.

⁴³ McDermott (note 42).

Israel–Palestinians

The conflict between the Government of Israel, the Palestinian Authority (PA) and various militant Islamic groups⁴⁴ originates in the war of 1948–49, when the disputed territory was divided into three sections: the state of Israel, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Israel occupied the West Bank and the Gaza Strip following the Six-Day War of June 1967, and since then Palestinians have fought for control of the occupied territories. Despite the launch of a ‘road map’ to peace that followed in the wake of the Iraq war, the conflict continued unabated in 2003. Approximately 400 Israelis and Palestinians were killed in fighting during 2003.⁴⁵ A total of 4000 people have been killed since the second Intifada began in September 2000, following the breakdown of the Oslo Peace Process.⁴⁶

Fighting between Israeli Defence Force (IDF) and pro-Palestinian militants followed the same pattern of spiralling violence of 2002. Israeli army incursions into the West Bank and the Gaza Strip were often in retaliation for attacks by Palestinian or Islamic militant forces and in turn prompted responses, often in the form of suicide attacks, against Israeli targets. Israel continued its official counter-terrorism strategy of containing Palestinian suicide bombers through military infiltration of almost all major cities and towns in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and maintained its policy of targeted assassinations of militant leaders launched in 2001. Work on the construction of a 365-km barrier, begun in June 2002, further reduced the movement of Palestinians from the West Bank into Israel.⁴⁷

The number of suicide bombings in 2003 decreased compared to 2002, when almost twice as many people died as a result of suicide attacks.⁴⁸ The two bloodiest incidents took place in Tel Aviv on 5 January, when two suicide bombers killed 25 people, and on 19 August, when 20 people were killed and 100 wounded in a bus bombing in Jerusalem.⁴⁹ Israel’s policy of aggressive response threatened to destabilize the entire region on 5 October, when Israel launched an air strike on a training camp near Damascus, the capital of neighbouring Syria, allegedly used by the Islamic Jihad. The attack was in response

⁴⁴ These groups include the Islamic Jihad, Hamas, Al Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigades, the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP), Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), the Izz-al-Din-al-Qassam Brigades, the Fatah Tanzim and Force 17.

⁴⁵ As recorded in appendix 3A.

⁴⁶ The first Intifada began in 1987 and ended in 1993, when both parties signed the Israel–PLO Declaration of Principles. See ‘Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements’, 13 Sep. 1993, URL <http://www.usip.org/library/pa/israel_plo/oslo_09131993.html>. The principles stipulated an Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and Jericho and instigated the Oslo Peace Process, which broke down in the summer of 2000.

⁴⁷ ‘A safety measure or a land grab’, *The Economist*, 11 Oct. 2003, p. 27; see also ‘The fence/security barrier/separation barrier’, 19 Jan. 2004, GlobalSecurity.org, URL <<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/israel/fence-imagery.htm>>.

⁴⁸ ‘Israel’s history of bomb blasts’, BBC News Online, 4 Oct. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/1197051.stm>.

⁴⁹ Knowlton, B., ‘21 die in bombings in central Tel Aviv’, *International Herald Tribune*, 6 Jan. 2003, p. 1; and ‘Bus bomb carnage in Jerusalem’, BBC News Online, 20 Aug. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/3165279.stm>.

to a suicide attack the previous day in Haifa and provoked widespread international concern.⁵⁰ Sporadic skirmishes between the Israeli army and Hezbollah fighters continued along the Israel–Lebanon border in 2003. On 10 August a 16-year-old Israeli was killed and four others wounded when Hezbollah shelled the northern Israeli town of Shlomi.⁵¹ The attack was in response to a car bomb in Beirut on 2 August that killed a member of the group. Hezbollah alleged Israel was responsible for the bomb.⁵²

The ‘road map’ to peace—first outlined in September 2002 by the ‘Quartet’ comprising the United States, the United Nations, the European Union (EU) and Russia but launched only on 30 April 2003—had little effect on the violence. The three-stage plan, based on the previous Oslo Peace Process, envisages the creation of an independent Palestinian state in 2005. The road map timetable set May 2003 as the deadline for the cessation of Palestinian violence, the reform of Palestinian institutions, the dismantling of Israeli settlements and Israeli withdrawal from Palestinian territory. The second phase, from June to December 2003, envisages the creation of an independent state of Palestine, and the third phase (2004–2005) the end of the conflict and a final agreement on the fate of Palestinian refugees.⁵³

A first step forward was made with a UK-sponsored conference on Palestinian reform on 14 January 2003, backed by the UN, the EU and the governments of Russia and the USA. It resulted in the appointment of the new Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority, the reform-minded Mahmoud Abbas, on 18 March.⁵⁴ On 9 June Israel began dismantling the first Jewish settlement outposts, in Neva Erez and Amuna. On 29 June the leaders of the Islamic groups Hamas and Islamic Jihad announced a three-month suspension of their attacks against Israel. The same day, the Israeli Army withdrew from northern Gaza and the city of Bethlehem in the West Bank. On 12 August Hamas ended its ceasefire with a suicide bombing on a Jewish settlement in the West Bank in retaliation for the 8 August Israeli Army operation that killed two Hamas leaders. The situation deteriorated further when Mahmoud Abbas, who had not succeeded in wresting control of the Palestinian Liberation Army (PLA) from Yasser Arafat, resigned on 6 September after only six months in office.⁵⁵ His resignation and the subsequent difficulties in forming a new Palestinian

⁵⁰ Morris, H., ‘Syria demands action on Israel raid’, *Financial Times*, 6 Oct. 2003, p. 1.

⁵¹ ‘Israelis see Hezbollah escalation’, BBC News Online, 11 Aug. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/3141201.stm>.

⁵² ‘Hizb Allah member killed in Beirut blast’, *Aljazeera* (Internet edn), 2 Aug. 2003, URL <<http://english.aljazeera.net/NR/exeres/E1EBE28E-65CF-4226-9EC2-E0EE703028C1.htm>>.

⁵³ On the road map see United States Institute of Peace, ‘A performance-based road map to a permanent two-state solution to the Israel–Palestine conflict’, 30 Apr. 2003, URL <http://www.usip.org/library/pa/israel_plo/adddoc/roadmap_04302003.html>.

⁵⁴ Israel was not invited to the London conference on 14 Jan. ‘London conference splits Mid-East media’, BBC News Online, 14 Jan. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/2657041.stm>; and ‘Abbas accepts Palestinian PM post’, BBC News Online, 19 Mar. 2003, URL <http://Pnews.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2866099.stm>.

⁵⁵ Morris, H., ‘Qurei becomes Palestinian premier’, *Financial Times*, 11 Sep. 2003, p. 1. For further details on Mahmoud Abbas’ resignation see Bennet, J., ‘Abbas steps down, dealing big blow to US peace plan’, *New York Times* (Internet edn), 7 Sep. 2003, URL <<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/07/international/07MIDE.html?th=&pagewanted=print&position=>>>.

cabinet, finally resolved with the appointment of Ahmed Qurei on 12 November, highlighted the divisions within the Palestinian leadership and the continuing role of Arafat. Israel continued to refuse to recognize this role and to reject any negotiations with Arafat, who has remained in virtual captivity since September 2002, when Israeli tanks surrounded the PA compound in Ramallah.⁵⁶ The road map for peace was at a standstill at the end of 2003.

Concern over the building of the Israeli barrier led the UN General Assembly to pass a resolution in October calling for a halt to the construction.⁵⁷ The USA also expressed concerns over Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's decision to expand the barrier further and in a rare, albeit mild, rebuke cut nearly \$290 million from a loan guarantee package worth over \$9 billion to Israel on 25 November.⁵⁸ The controversy over the Sharon Government's strategy led to significant opposition within Israel. On 12 November four former heads of Israel's Shin Bet security service criticized the government's policies towards Arafat and the Palestinians and, warning of their negative effect on the country's democracy and economy, urged Israel to end its occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.⁵⁹ International and domestic opposition did not affect the continued construction of the Israeli barrier.

International optimism was raised when an unofficial peace plan, known as the Geneva Accord, was formally launched in Switzerland on 1 December 2003. The initiative, the result of two and a half years of negotiations led by former Israeli Justice Minister Yossi Beilin and former Palestinian Information Minister Yasser Abed Rabbo, was condemned by the Israeli Government and not endorsed by the Palestinian Legislative Council or Islamic Jihad.⁶⁰ The accord's key tenets concern the sensitive issues of Palestinian rights of return and the division of Jerusalem. Under the proposal, Palestinians who have been forced to leave the West Bank or Gaza Strip would give up their right to return. In exchange 97.5 per cent of the territory occupied by Israel during the 1967 Six-Day War would be ceded to a future Palestinian state. The city of Jerusalem would be divided administratively between Israel and the Palestinians, with an international force to monitor the division.⁶¹ An Israeli newspaper poll of 24 November cited 53 per cent of Israeli opinion and 56 per cent of Palestinian in support of the Geneva Accord. Around 39 per cent of Palestinians and 44 per cent of Israelis polled opposed the initiative.⁶²

⁵⁶ 'Israeli troops besiege Arafat HQ', BBC News Online, 20 Sep. 2002, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/2269610.stm>.

⁵⁷ UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/ES-10/13, 27 Oct. 2003.

⁵⁸ 'US cuts Israeli loan guarantees', BBC News Online, 27 Nov. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/3238632.stm> and 'UN resolution: Israel halt security barrier', CNN, 22 Oct. 2003, URL <<http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/meast/10/21/un.israel.barrier/>>.

⁵⁹ Myre, G., 'Ex-spy chiefs fault Sharon's policy', *International Herald Tribune* (Internet edn), 15 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://www.iht.com/articles/117797.html>>.

⁶⁰ 'Striking accord', *The Economist* (Internet edn), 5 Dec. 2003, URL <http://www.economist.com/agenda/displaystory.cfm?story_id=2260740>.

⁶¹ 'A change of heart on Mideast ceremony', *International Herald Tribune*, 1 Dec. 2003, p. 5.

⁶² 'Most Israelis and Palestinians support Geneva Accord', *The Haaretz* (Internet edn), 24 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://www.haaretz.com>>.

Sri Lanka

The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) have battled the predominantly Sinhalese Sri Lankan Government in the north-eastern part of the country since 1983. The separatist conflict has caused approximately 65 000 deaths and displaced 800 000–1 000 000 people. There was a significant breakthrough on 23 February 2002, when Prime Minister Ranil Wickremasinghe and LTTE leader Velupillai Prabhakaran entered into a mutual ceasefire agreement brokered by Norway.⁶³ However, on 21 April 2003, following six rounds of direct talks, the rebels pulled out of the talks.⁶⁴ Although substantial violence did not erupt for the remainder of 2003, the lack of progress towards resumption of peace negotiations made for a gloomy prognosis for Sri Lanka.

The LTTE withdrew from the peace process for several reasons. One factor was the slow rate of benefits accruing from peace. The deteriorating humanitarian situation in the war-torn north-east, as a result of 19 years of war, had been a factor behind the ceasefire. In the second round of peace talks, in November 2002, both parties underlined the need to move rapidly on humanitarian and rehabilitation efforts. A joint LTTE–government sub-committee was set up to address refugee resettlement and economic development assistance in the region.⁶⁵ The rebels argued that the subsequent lack of progress in economic development demonstrated the government's failure to honour its promise to rehabilitate the war-ravaged Tamil region.⁶⁶ The LTTE further demanded that the international ban on their organization, imposed in 1998, be lifted before talks could be renewed. The Sri Lankan Government lifted the ban on 4 September 2002, but it still remains in place in the USA and in the EU member states.⁶⁷

The core issue in the peace process remains the future status of the Tamil homeland in north-eastern Sri Lanka. Although the Tamil Tigers abandoned their quest for full independence during the first session of peace talks in February 2002, they continue to demand substantial autonomy. In April 2003 the LTTE declared the establishment of an interim regional administration with adequate powers to undertake reconstruction and development activities a precondition for re-entering peace talks.⁶⁸ Prime Minister Wickremasinghe expressed his willingness to meet this demand during a donor conference in

⁶³ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 'Tokyo Declaration on Reconstruction and Development of Sri Lanka', 10 June 2003, URL <<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/srilanka/conf0306/declaration.html>>.

⁶⁴ Agence France-Presse (Hong Kong), 4 June 2003, in 'New diplomatic push to revive Sri Lanka Peace Talks', Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report–West Europe (FBIS–WEU)*, FBIS-WEU-2003-0604, 5 June 2003.

⁶⁵ Saravanamuttu, P., 'Sri Lanka: the best and last chance for peace?', *Conflict, Security & Development*, vol. 3, no. 1 (Apr. 2003), p. 135.

⁶⁶ For further details see Waldman, A., 'In new proposal, rebels seek territorial autonomy in Sri Lanka', *New York Times* (Internet edn), 2 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/11/02/international/asia/02LANK.html>>

⁶⁷ 'Rescuing the peace', *The Economist*, 12 July 2003, p. 55; and Government of Sri Lanka, 'Government lifts LTTE proscription', ReliefWeb, 5 Sep. 2002, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

⁶⁸ 'Rescuing the peace' (note 67), p. 56.

Tokyo on 10 June. On 17 July the government proposed a provisional administrative structure in the north-east with authority for rehabilitation and resettlement issues.⁶⁹ The LTTE released a counter-proposal in November with further demands, including power over all financial matters and control of the police and external trade in the north-east region. The two proposals thus differ substantially in regard to the nature of the interim administration and the extent of its proposed authority.⁷⁰

Growing tensions between Wickremasinghe and President Chandrika Kumaratunga, leader of the opposition People's Alliance (PA), over the handling of the peace process, exploded on 4 November when Kumaratunga suspended parliament, took control of the ministries of defence, interior and communications, and declared a state of emergency. Kumaratunga accused Wickremasinghe of compromising Sri Lanka's security and sovereignty through too many concessions to the LTTE, arguing that no step towards regional autonomy should be taken before the LTTE makes a commitment to disarm. She has also accused the rebels of using the February 2002 ceasefire and subsequent peace process as an opportunity to secretly equip and rebuild its forces.⁷¹ LTTE leader Prabhakaran reacted to the suspension of parliament by reaffirming the Tamil Tigers' commitment to the ceasefire agreement but warned that he was prepared to revive demands for full independence if the peace talks remain suspended.⁷²

International efforts to revive peace talks continued unsuccessfully in 2003. In November Norway, the lead negotiator in the Sri Lankan peace process, announced that it would put on hold its mediation between the rebels and the Sri Lankan Government until the political crisis is resolved.⁷³ On 25–26 November Chris Patten, the EU External Relations Commissioner, visited Sri Lanka for talks with all parties to try to end the political deadlock and restart the peace process. The EU has promised substantial reconstruction assistance if peace talks are successful.⁷⁴ In the interim, sporadic outbursts of violence have continued. On 10 March, a month before the rebels withdrew from peace negotiations, 11 rebels were killed when the Sri Lankan Navy sank an LTTE ship suspected of containing smuggled arms. LTTE rebels have also been accused of being behind around 35 assassinations of anti-LTTE politicians and government officials since the signing of the ceasefire in February 2002.⁷⁵

⁶⁹ Waldman (note 77).

⁷⁰ For further details see Waldman (note 66).

⁷¹ 'Sri Lanka crisis: What does it mean for the peace process?', BBC News Online, 13 Nov. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/talking_point/3240885.stm>; and *India Today*, 28 Apr. 2003 in 'Kumaratunga interviewed on direction of peace process in Sri Lanka', pp. 54–55, Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report—Near East and South Asia (FBIS-NES)*, FBIS-NES-2003-0428, 30 Apr. 2003.

⁷² 'Tamil rebel chief warns leaders', BBC News Online, 27 Nov. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/3242128.stm>.

⁷³ McDonald, S., 'Norway sees no peace role until Sri Lanka crisis ends', Reuters, ReliefWeb, 14 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

⁷⁴ 'Tamil rebel chief warns leaders' (note 72).

⁷⁵ Agence France-Presse (Hong Kong), 10 Mar. 2003, in 'Tamil Tigers warn ship's sinking will affect Sri Lankan peace process', in FBIS-NES-2003-0310, 11 Mar. 2003; and Agence France-Presse (Hong

IV. The volatility of intra-state conflict

In 2003 a number of conflicts which had previously appeared to be making progress towards resolution and/or stabilization experienced a renewal or intensification of fighting. In some cases renewed fighting was the result of the opposition's rejection of initiatives aimed at mitigating or ending the conflict (e.g., Nepal). However, a substantial increase in violence may also reflect a decision on the part of the government to defeat opposition rebels by military means, as in the conflict in Indonesia (Aceh). Targeted offensive strategies may lead to the isolation and/or substantial weakening of a rebel group (the Moro Islamic Liberation Front in the Philippines, Sendero Luminoso in Peru and Hutu extremist rebels in Rwanda) but usually without collateral civilian casualties and humanitarian cost, as the examples of Chechnya and northern Uganda demonstrated in 2003. Outright military victory is rare. Two of the most recent examples of intra-state conflict resolution—Angola and Sierra Leone—occurred because the rebel leader was, respectively, killed and captured.⁷⁶

Renewed conflict is often directly linked, however, to an ongoing peace process. Government or rebel parties may use violence as a tactic to enhance their position before or during negotiations, as fighting in Burundi and Sudan during 2003 suggest. The outbreak of conflict during or particularly after a peace settlement, as the case of violence by the Real Irish Republican Army (RIRA) and Loyalist rebel groups in Northern Ireland demonstrates, can signal the presence of those unwilling to compromise on their objectives—often described as 'spoilers'.⁷⁷ This in turn can lead to increased factionalism within rebel groups (e.g., Liberia and the DRC) and an increase in intra-rebel violence. Many of these challenges were reflected in two cases of renewed conflict in 2003, Burundi and Uganda.

Burundi

The conflict between the transitional government in Burundi and the two Hutu rebel groups—Forces pour la Défense de la Démocratie (FDD, Forces for the Defence of Democracy) and Forces Nationales de Libération (FNL, Forces for National Liberation)—has claimed the lives of an estimated 200 000 people. The conflict began in October 1993 when elements in the Tutsi army, angered at the June election of a Hutu president, Melchior Ndadaye, staged a coup and assassinated Burundi's first freely elected president. Tensions between the minority Tutsi and the Hutus (estimated to be 85 per cent of Burundi's population) over the distribution of power within the government deteriorated

Kong), 14 Aug. 2003, in 'Sri Lanka warns peace confidence eroding amid Tamil Tiger killings', in FBIS-NES-2003-0814, 15 Aug. 2003.

⁷⁶ See Wiharta, S. and Anthony, I., 'Major armed conflicts', *SIPRI Yearbook 2003: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2003), pp. 87–108.

⁷⁷ See Stedman, J. S., 'Spoiler problems in peace processes', *International Security*, vol. 22, no. 2 (fall 1997), pp. 5–53; and Darby, J. and MacGinty, R. (eds), *The Management of Peace Processes* (Macmillan: Basingstoke, 2000), pp. 231–36.

into civil war. Peace talks, negotiated by the late former Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere and subsequently by Nelson Mandela of South Africa, led to the signing of a power-sharing deal in Tanzania on 28 August 2000 between the Burundian Government and the main opposition parties.⁷⁸ Under the terms of the Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement, a transitional government was established in 2001. The two biggest armed Hutu groups—the FDD, estimated to number around 10 000 fighters; and the FNL, with around 2000 fighters—did not participate in the peace process and criticized the South African facilitation team for having a pro-Tutsi bias.⁷⁹ The FDD and the FNL reject proposals for power sharing along ethnic lines and call for the restoration of the 1992 constitution with its majority-based multiparty system.⁸⁰ However, a significant step towards progress was made on 2 December 2002, when the transitional government and the FDD signed a ceasefire agreement in Arusha, Tanzania, brokered by the South African-led Regional Initiative on Burundi.⁸¹ The agreement provides for the establishment of a Joint Ceasefire Commission (JCC) and the deployment of an African Union (AU) military observer mission.⁸²

The transitional government made several attempts to build on this progress and involve the two rebel groups in the peace process. On 27 January 2003 new talks opened between the FDD and President Pierre Buyoya in Pretoria, South Africa, to discuss the implementation of their ceasefire agreement.⁸³ A further meeting between the two parties, held in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, on 1–2 March, led to the FDD's agreement to the terms of the 2000 Arusha Agreement on power sharing.⁸⁴ The same month, Switzerland hosted peace talks between the Burundian Government and the FNL in the city of Caux in an attempt to facilitate a similar breakthrough.⁸⁵

⁷⁸ The Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement lays down the principles according to which future institutions should be organized. The main principle of the agreement is respect for ethnic and religious diversity. On 1 Nov. 2001 the 3-year transitional government was put in place. President Pierre Buyoya, a Tutsi, headed the new power-sharing administration for the first 18 months. During this period Domitien Ndayizeye, a Hutu, served as vice-president. They reversed roles on 30 Apr. 2003, for the second 18-month period. The Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi, 28 Aug. 2000, URL <http://www.usip.org/library/pa/burundi/pa_burundi_08282000_toc.html>; and Seybolt, T. B., 'Major armed conflicts', *SIPRI Yearbook 2001: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2001), pp. 21–23.

⁷⁹ 'Diehard Hutus', *The Economist*, 6 Dec. 2003, p. 39.

⁸⁰ In 1992 President Buyoya introduced a new constitution, which allowed a multiparty political system, a president elected for a maximum of 2 5-year terms and an 81-member national assembly. The president shares power with a prime minister (who appoints and heads a cabinet), chosen by the assembly. The constitution specifically bans parties that are ethnically or regionally based.

⁸¹ United Nations, Secretary-General welcomes ceasefire agreement in Burundi, UN document SG/SM/8539AFR/529, 3 Dec. 2002, ReliefWeb, 3 Dec. 2002, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

⁸² Government of Burundi, 'Burundi—Cessez-le-feu: Joint Declaration of Agreement between the Government of Burundi and the CNDD–FDD', ReliefWeb, 28 Jan. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>. See also table 4.3 in chapter 4 in this volume.

⁸³ International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), *The Military Balance 2003/04* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2003), p. 207.

⁸⁴ International Institute for Strategic Studies (note 83).

⁸⁵ 'Secret Burundi peace talks', BBC News Online, 20 Mar. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/2868037.stm>>; and International Institute for Strategic Studies (note 83).

Notwithstanding these positive signals, fresh fighting broke out between the transitional government and the two rebel groups in June.⁸⁶ Between 14 and 20 June, FDD rebels attacked and abducted several politicians and clashed with government troops in northern Kayanza province, forcing 43 000 people to flee from their homes.⁸⁷ FNL rebels, who still refuse to recognize Burundi's transitional government, launched a series of attacks on the capital Bujumbura between 7 and 13 July, causing some 200 deaths.⁸⁸

There are grounds for belief that the FDD's attacks were not so much a rejection of the peace process as an attempt to strengthen the rebels' position at the negotiating table. Shortly after the outbreak of violence, the FDD reiterated its commitment to implement the 2002 ceasefire agreement. The FDD claimed, however, that the Tutsi minority retains too much control over the army and demanded that at least 75 per cent of its fighters should be incorporated into the future national army. The FDD also demanded at least 50 per cent of the posts in the transitional government.⁸⁹ On 16 November the FDD and the government signed a comprehensive power-sharing plan in Dar es Salaam, brokered by the Regional Initiative on Burundi, which gives the rebels four ministers in the transitional government and 40 per cent of the officer posts in the army.⁹⁰ The FNL condemned the agreement and still refuses to participate in any negotiations with the government. The FNL continues to launch attacks against the transitional regime.⁹¹ FNL rebels have also extended their campaign to the FDD: on 10 December the FNL ambushed members of the FDD in Bujumbura, killing three of them as well as two civilians.⁹² FNL rebels have also been accused of murdering the Vatican's ambassador (Apostolic Nuncio) to Burundi, Michael Courtney, who was killed in an ambush in December.⁹³

Uganda

Violence escalated in 2003 as the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) intensified its 16-year campaign in northern Uganda to overthrow the Government of President Yoweri Museveni, who came to power in 1986 by force. The LRA,

⁸⁶ Integrated Regional Information Network for Central and Eastern Africa (IRIN-CEA), 'Burundi: rebel group steps up attacks', IRIN Weekly Round-up 179, 14–20 June 2003.

⁸⁷ United Nations–Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN-OCHA), 'Burundi Situation Report, 23–29 June 2003', ReliefWeb, 29 June 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

⁸⁸ 'Burundi rebels renew assault', BBC News Online, 13 July 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/3062179.stm>>.

⁸⁹ Under the Arusha peace accord, no more than 50% of the national defence force can be drawn from any 1 ethnic group. See "'Breakthrough" in Burundi talks', BBC News Online, 21 July 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/3085073.stm>>.

⁹⁰ 'Burundian rebels join government', BBC News Online, 24 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/africa/3232126.stm>>.

⁹¹ Agence France-Presse, 'Eight die in two attacks by FNL rebels in Burundian capital', ReliefWeb, 17 Dec. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

⁹² UN-OCHA, 'Burundi Situation Report', 8–14 Dec. 2003, ReliefWeb, 17 Dec. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

⁹³ UN-OCHA, 'Burundi: Assassination of Apostolic Nuncio blamed on FNL/Palipehutu', ReliefWeb, 30 Dec. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

numbering around 4000 fighters, claims to fight for the establishment of a Christian regime based on the Ten Commandments and makes extensive use of child soldiers.⁹⁴ To date, the conflict between the LRA and the Ugandan Government has claimed the lives of 7000 people, and more than 1 million people have been internally displaced.⁹⁵ The humanitarian situation in northern Uganda deteriorated dramatically during 2003. According to the UN Under Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, Jan Egeland, the humanitarian situation in northern Uganda is worse than any other crisis in the world.⁹⁶

The systematic escalation of violence that began with the launch of the government's Operation Iron Fist in 2002 worsened in 2003. The operation seeks to reproduce the apparent success of the government's 2000 military campaign in south-western Uganda, which effectively crushed the Islamist rebel group, Allied Democratic Forces (ADF), operating from there.⁹⁷ With the permission of the Sudanese Government, President Museveni deployed up to 10 000 Ugandan troops in southern Sudan in March 2002 to destroy the LRA's bases there, capture LRA fighters, and release thousands of abducted children and adults.⁹⁸ The government offensive forced a large number of LRA fighters to flee Sudan for their stronghold in Acholiland, in northern Uganda. In retaliation, LRA rebels stepped up their attacks on civilians and military forces.⁹⁹ A unilateral ceasefire announcement by the LRA on 1 March 2003, following a major government offensive, came to nothing. On 20 April the government announced all-out war against the rebels, accusing them of not being committed to the March ceasefire.¹⁰⁰ The conflict showed signs of spreading further on 9 August, when the LRA attacked the town of Atirir in eastern Uganda.¹⁰¹

The intensification of fighting between the Ugandan Government and LRA rebels in 2003 has further escalated human costs.¹⁰² Approximately 8400 children were abducted by the LRA between June 2002 and May 2003, a sharp

⁹⁴ Somerville, K., 'Uganda's rebels keep the faith', BBC News Online, 3 July 2002, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/2083241.stm>>. Because the conflict between the Ugandan Government and the LRA has not reached the threshold of 1000 deaths in any single year, Uganda is not included in table 3A.3, appendix 3A.

⁹⁵ IRIN-CEA, 'Uganda: More than a million displaced people', IRIN-CEA Weekly Round-up 194, 27 Sep.–3 Oct. 2003.

⁹⁶ UN-OCHA, 'Great Lakes: IRIN interview with OCHA chief Jan Egeland', ReliefWeb, 12 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

⁹⁷ The aim of the ADF is to overthrow the Ugandan Government and replace it with a regime based on Sharia law. *Amnesty International Report 2003*, 'Uganda', URL <<http://web.amnesty.org/report2003/index-eng>>.

⁹⁸ UN-OCHA, 'Uganda: Army happy with Sudan protocol on LRA', ReliefWeb, 19 Mar. 2002, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

⁹⁹ Human Rights Watch, 'Abducted and abused: renewed conflict in northern Uganda', *Human Rights Watch*, vol. 15, no. 12(A) (July 2003), available at URL <<http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/uganda0703/>>.

¹⁰⁰ 'Uganda peace hopes set back', BBC News Online, 21 Apr. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/2963843.stm>>.

¹⁰¹ IRIN-CEA, 'Uganda: renewed fighting in the east', IRIN-CEA Weekly Round-up 187, 9–15 Aug. 2003.

¹⁰² UN-OCHA (note 96).

increase from 2001, when around 100 children were taken forcibly.¹⁰³ Over the past five years, the LRA has abducted more than 20 000 children.¹⁰⁴ Operation Iron Fist, originally planned as a short operation, was renewed for the eighth time by the governments of Uganda and Sudan on 15 September 2003.¹⁰⁵ Many Ugandans warn of the consequences, while the Acholi Religious Leaders Peace Initiative (ARLPI) in northern Uganda has urged the UN to intervene in the conflict.¹⁰⁶

V. Comprehensive peace processes

The persistent, protracted and volatile nature of intra-state conflict presents enormous challenges for conflict management and peace making. The resistance of contemporary intra-state conflicts to any 'quick-fix' solutions and the necessity for a comprehensive peace arrangement in each case were once more evident in 2003. Continued instability in Côte d'Ivoire illustrated the vacuity of rapid and/or top-down solutions that hinge on limited power-sharing arrangements. Burundi illustrated the futility of peace agreements that exclude significant rebel opposition movements. Sudan, by contrast, offered a positive example of the progress that can be made by slow, steadfast and patient negotiation and a phased approach to resolution of the most vexed issues perceived to be at stake in the conflict.¹⁰⁷ There is hope that the lengthy peace process under way in neighbouring Somalia since 2000 may yield similar gains.¹⁰⁸

Comprehensive peace processes, as the case of Liberia testified in 2003, rely heavily on third-party intervention to assist in bringing warring parties to the table and to provide a framework in which compromise can be contemplated, implemented and followed up. External actors—states, international and regional organizations or non-governmental organizations—also serve as guarantors of a peace agreement, through both the monitoring of ceasefires and the provision of economic and political incentives for maintaining peace. While peace is impossible without the commitment of the main belligerents, third-party assistance is usually a crucial step on the way to resolving intra-

¹⁰³ See 'Schoolgirls taken by Ugandan rebels', BBC News Online, 24 June 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/3017442.stm>>; and Human Rights Watch (note 99).

¹⁰⁴ The abductions usually take place during attacks on villages or in displaced people's camps. The younger children are usually released within 48 hours, while the older boys are trained as guerrillas. The girls are sent to southern Sudan to act as 'wives' for the LRA rebels. IRIN, 'Uganda: civilians targeted by their own people', IRIN Web special on civilian protection in armed conflict, URL <<http://www.irinnews.org/webspecials/civilprotect/Uganda.asp>>.

¹⁰⁵ UN-OCHA, 'Uganda: Operation Iron Fist agreement renewed amid tensions', ReliefWeb, 15 Sep. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

¹⁰⁶ Agence France-Presse, 'Religious leaders call for UN intervention in Uganda war', ReliefWeb, 9 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

¹⁰⁷ Similar phased approaches to peace negotiations have had some success in such diverse cases as Northern Ireland and El Salvador. The current peace initiative between India and Pakistan, although centred around an interstate conflict, reflects a similar emphasis on a more sober, slower and steadier approach to peace negotiations than that evidenced in the past.

¹⁰⁸ The Djibouti-led peace initiative led to the creation of the Transnational Government (TNG) in May 2000. IGAD has been leading peace talks since 2002. See Wiharta, S. and Anthony, I., 'Major armed conflicts', *SIPRI Yearbook 2003* (note 76), pp. 104–107; and appendix 3A in this volume.

state conflict. Some form of official external engagement was involved in every intra-state peace process under way in 2003.¹⁰⁹

Third-party engagement in the resolution of intra-state conflict raises enormous questions about the legitimacy, feasibility and sustainability of outside intervention. This is particularly the case when the external actor is the regional hegemon, for example, Nigeria in West Africa, or where the engagement takes place without host invitation and/or UN mandate. Even where initiated or welcomed by parties to a conflict, such engagement requires a substantial commitment of time and resources to yield success (e.g., the EU in the Western Balkans, Norway in Sri Lanka, and both Nigeria and the UK in Sierra Leone). These demands pose particular challenges for non-western regional-led peace efforts, such as the mediating role played by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) in the conflicts in Somalia and Sudan. Moreover, third-party peace mediation efforts can only be successful if they are actively backed by broad-based international support. Somalia offered an example of this in 2003: the lack of unity between the principal sponsors of the peace process, the IGAD member states, impeded the pace and substance of progress.¹¹⁰ In 2003 Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia and Sudan eloquently testified to the challenges of negotiating peace.

Côte d'Ivoire

Côte d'Ivoire descended into civil war on 19 September 2002, when 800 armed soldiers staged attacks on military installations in the capital Abidjan and the northern towns of Bouake and Korhogo to oust President Laurent Gbagbo and to protest against their planned demobilization from the army in early 2003. The majority of the soldiers had been recruited during the military regime of General Robert Gueï, who was replaced by Gbagbo in the presidential elections of October 2000.¹¹¹ Although security forces regained control of the capital, the rebels held the two towns.¹¹² The offensive expanded further in the north and west of the country and within a few weeks the rebels—calling themselves the Mouvement Patriotique de Côte d'Ivoire (MPCI, or Patriotic Movement of Côte d'Ivoire)—controlled the northern half of the country. Two other groups were formed in November 2002—the Movement for Justice and Peace (MJP) and the Mouvement Populaire Ivoirien

¹⁰⁹ The 2003 peace talks in Colombia between the government and right-wing paramilitaries took place without international mediation but as these arrangements do not include the opposition in the Colombian conflict, they do not represent a comprehensive peace process.

¹¹⁰ The TNG accused Ethiopia and Djibouti of pursuing their own interests in the Somali peace process. In Sep. Djibouti withdrew from the IGAD Technical Committee managing the peace negotiations, accusing Kenya of leading the peace process into disarray. Agence France-Presse, 'Djibouti quits technical committee mediating Somali peace process', ReliefWeb, 27 Sep. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>. See also ICG, 'Salvaging Somalia's chance for peace', ICG Africa Briefing, 9 Dec. 2002, p. 6, URL <<http://www.crisisweb.org/home/index.cfm?id=1822&l=1>>. For the membership of IGAD see the glossary in this volume.

¹¹¹ Somerville, K., 'Mutiny caps years of Ivorian instability', BBC News Online, 19 Sep. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/low/world/africa/2268110.stm>>; and Associated Press, 'General dies as coup bid collapses in Ivory Coast', *International Herald Tribune*, 20 Sep. 2003, p. 5.

¹¹² Associated Press (note 111).

du Grand Ouest (MPIGO, or Ivorian Popular Movement of the Great West). All three groups demanded the resignation of President Gbagbo.¹¹³ More than 1000 people have been killed and over 1 million have been displaced since the outbreak of violence.¹¹⁴ However, as the threshold of battle-related deaths has not exceeded 1000 in any single year, the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire is not included in appendix 3A.

On 30 September 2002 the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) dispatched an ECOWAS Contact Group to mediate between President Gbagbo and the MPCJ leaders.¹¹⁵ This led to a ceasefire agreement on 17 October and the deployment of an ECOWAS force—the ECOWAS Mission in Côte d'Ivoire (ECOMICI)—in February 2003. The former colonial power, France, also intervened, deploying approximately 1000 troops in September 2002 to protect 20 000 French and other foreign nationals.¹¹⁶

On 3–4 January 2003 Dominique de Villepin, French Minister for Foreign Affairs, visited Côte d'Ivoire to secure an agreement with rebel groups and the government to attend face-to-face talks in France. The parties agreed and talks took place in Linas-Marcoussis on 15–23 January, resulting in the signing of a power-sharing agreement.¹¹⁷ The Linas-Marcoussis Agreement called for the creation of an interim reconciliation government with wide executive powers, representing all parties and rebel groups and headed by a new prime minister. The transitional power-sharing arrangement also called for the transfer of some presidential powers to the prime minister, but did not, however, specify how ministerial portfolios would be distributed.¹¹⁸

In the first step towards implementation of the agreement, President Gbagbo appointed Seydou Diarra as prime minister on 11 February 2003.¹¹⁹ The main task of the new government is to restructure the army, disarm the rebels and prepare a timetable for national elections in 2005.¹²⁰ However, the French-brokered peace deal was rejected by many of President Gbagbo's supporters. Hundreds of thousands took to the streets of the capital in February to protest against the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement and the participation of rebels in the

¹¹³ United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General on Côte d'Ivoire, UN document S/2003/374, 26 Mar. 2003; and 'Country profile: Ivory Coast', BBC News Online, 1 Dec. 2003, URL <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/country_profiles/1043014.stm>.

¹¹⁴ Associated Press, 'Ivory Coast again tries ceasefire', *International Herald Tribune*, 5 May 2003, p. 5.

¹¹⁵ The ECOWAS Contact Group comprised Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Niger, Nigeria and Togo, and the AU. For the members of ECOWAS see the glossary in this volume.

¹¹⁶ Nevill, H., 'Agence France-Presse, Ivory Coast prepares to strike rebels as foreigners pull out', ReliefWeb, 27 Sep. 2002, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>. For further details on the ECOMICI force see chapter 4 in this volume.

¹¹⁷ Tuquoi, J-P., 'The conclusion of the roundtable talks on Côte d'Ivoire should open the way to a peace process', 24 Jan. 2003 (in French), in *Le Monde*, 'French-sponsored Côte d'Ivoire's roundtable talks concluded', Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report—Sub-Saharan Africa (FBIS-AFR)*, FBIS-AFR-2003-0124, 27 Jan. 2003.

¹¹⁸ The Linas-Marcoussis Agreement, 24 Jan. 2003, URL <http://www.usip.org/library/pa_cote_divoire/pa_cote_divoire.html>.

¹¹⁹ Davenport, K., 'Ivory Coast appoints new prime minister', BBC News Online, 11 Feb. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/2747583.stm>>.

¹²⁰ The Linas-Marcoussis Agreement (note 118).

government.¹²¹ Fighting between rebels and government forces broke out on 7 March in Bangolo in western Côte d'Ivoire, killing some 100 people.¹²² Violence there was intensified by the presence of Liberian fighters from across the border. A ceasefire signed on 3 May between President Gbagbo, President Taylor of Liberia and the rebel groups did little to stop the violence, which expanded to northern Côte d'Ivoire.¹²³ The situation deteriorated further on 23 September when the rebels boycotted the transitional government, accusing President Gbagbo of not handing over enough power.¹²⁴

Although the war is officially over, the rebels still control north-western regions of the country. Central elements of the power-sharing deal, particularly rebel demobilization and disarmament, have not been initiated. Many of President Gbagbo's supporters remain opposed to the agreement. On 30 November soldiers loyal to President Gbagbo forced their way into the state television building in Abidjan and broadcast appeals urging the resumption of war against the rebels and the withdrawal of French peacekeepers.¹²⁵ A second assault on the television station by unidentified attackers was repulsed on 12 December 2003.¹²⁶

Liberia

The conflict between the Liberian Government and two rebel groups—Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) and the Movement for Democracy in Liberia (MODEL)—has claimed more than 2000 lives and displaced nearly half of Liberia's 2.8 million citizens. The war has destroyed most of Liberia's infrastructure, and approximately 85 per cent of the population are unemployed.¹²⁷ The main rebel group, LURD, numbering around 3000 fighters, has been active in northern Lofa county since 1999. MODEL, a breakaway faction of around 1000 former LURD fighters and with its base in the south of the country, began incursions into Liberia from Côte d'Ivoire in

¹²¹ Agence France-Presse, 'Hundreds of thousands protest peace deal: ECOWAS heads arrive', 1 Feb. 2003, in Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report—Sub-Saharan Africa (FBIS-AFR)*, FBIS-AFR-2003-0201, 3 Feb. 2003.

¹²² Agence France-Presse, 15 Mar. 2003 in 'UN envoy submits report on Banholo fighting, 100 reported killed', Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report—Sub-Saharan Africa (FBIS-AFR)*, FBIS-AFR-2003-0315, 17 Mar. 2003.

¹²³ Integrated Regional Information Network for West Africa (IRIN-WA), 'Côte d'Ivoire—Liberia: Ceasefire agreement signed', IRIN-WA Weekly Round-up 173, 26 Apr.–2 May 2003.

¹²⁴ Agence France-Presse, 'Ivory Coast rebels shun officialdom and threaten a new war', *New York Times* (Internet edn), 24 Sep. 2003, URL <<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/24/international/africa/24IVOR.html>>.

¹²⁵ 'Ivory Coast soldiers call for war', BBC News Online, 1 Dec. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/3251684.stm>>.

¹²⁶ Associated Press, '18 killed in Ivory Coast in attack on troops guarding TV station', *New York Times* (Internet edn), 13 Dec. 2003, URL <<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/12/13/international/africa/13IVOR.html>>.

¹²⁷ Sengupta, S., 'In Liberia, UN refugee chief foresees disaster', *International Herald Tribune*, 16 May 2003, p. 2; and Norwegian Refugee Council, 'Liberia: IDPs forced to exodus—is it for a promised land?', ReliefWeb, 13 Sep. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

2003.¹²⁸ Both groups demanded the resignation of Charles Taylor, who was elected president in July 1997 after seven years of civil war.¹²⁹ The governments of Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire are alleged to have fuelled the Liberian conflict by providing financial and military support to the rebels in a manner similar to the support which Taylor provided to opposition rebels for many years in Sierra Leone and Guinea.¹³⁰ Both Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire deny this.

Fighting between LURD and government forces spread in 2003 as LURD advanced towards the capital Monrovia.¹³¹ Violence further intensified when MODEL attacked Sinoe county in south-eastern Liberia.¹³² The fighting provoked fresh waves of displacement. Up to 300 000 people fled to Guinea, Côte d'Ivoire and Sierra Leone while attacks on aid workers stopped the delivery of food and other humanitarian assistance.¹³³ Peace talks between President Taylor's government and the rebel groups brokered by ECOWAS in Ghana in early June were abruptly cancelled when the Special Court for Sierra Leone indicted Taylor for war crimes.¹³⁴ Taylor fled back to Liberia and, on 17 June, agreed to a ceasefire as a prerequisite for further peace talks. Crucially, Taylor also agreed to cede power to a transitional government to be appointed within 30 days.¹³⁵ Heavy fighting resumed shortly again and centred in Monrovia. The violence was exacerbated by Taylor's reluctance to step down as well as ECOWAS and Western hesitation on the form and substance of any international peacekeeping force.¹³⁶ Liberia's long historical ties with the USA led the warring parties, aid agencies and many of Liberia's distraught population to call on the USA to intervene in the conflict.¹³⁷ As violence escalated in July,

¹²⁸ United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Liberia, pursuant to the letter dated 29 November 2002 (S/2002/1305) from the President of the Security Council, UN document S/2003/582, 2 June 2003.

¹²⁹ Human Rights Watch, 'Human Rights Watch World Report 1998: Liberia', URL <<http://www.hrw.org/worldreport/Africa-07.htm>>.

¹³⁰ Human Rights Watch, 'Back to the brink: war crimes by Liberian Government and rebels', *Human Rights Watch Report*, vol. 14, no. 4(A), (May 2002), URL <<http://www.hrw.org/reports/2002/liberia/index.htm#TopOfPage>>.

¹³¹ 'The mother of local wars', *The Economist*, 12 Apr. 2003, p. 42; and International Crisis Group (ICG), 'Liberia: Security challenges', ICG Africa Report no. 71 (3 Nov. 2003), p. 5.

¹³² Paye-Layleh, J., 'New front in Liberia fighting', BBC News Online, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/2929749.stm>>; and International Crisis Group (note 131), p. 11.

¹³³ Sengupta, (note 127); and Cooper, S. and Herrmann R., 'Real time evaluation of UNHCR's response to the Liberian emergency', UN document EPAU/2003/05, UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, Dec. 2003, p. 5.

¹³⁴ The charges relate to his role in the war in Sierra Leone between 1991 and 2000 where he backed the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) rebels responsible for widespread atrocities. The indictment was issued several months earlier under seal but revealed when Taylor left Liberia to attend the ECOWAS negotiations. Human Rights Watch, 'West Africa: Taylor indictment advances justice', Human Rights News, 4 June 2003, URL <<http://www.hrw.org/press/2003/06/westafrica060403.htm>>. See also chapter 5 in this volume.

¹³⁵ IRIN-WA, 'Liberia: Ceasefire signed', West Africa: IRIN-WA Weekly 180, 14–20 June 2002; and 'Praising God, with human bones', *The Economist*, 21 June 2003, p. 41.

¹³⁶ Peel, M., 'Liberia ceasefire under strain as Taylor dismisses call to step down', *Financial Times*, 23 June 2003, p. 2; 'Liberia: Weird scenes inside the gold-mine', *Africa Confidential*, vol. 44, no. 13 (27 June 2003), pp. 3–4.

¹³⁷ In the early 1820s, hundreds of freed US slaves were sent to Liberia by anti-slavery societies. In 1847, when Liberia was founded, the rulers gave it a constitution and a flag modelled after the US flag. 'Liberia's historical US ties', BBC News Online, 26 June 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/world/africa/3022740.stm>>.

the USA deployed 41 troops in Monrovia to provide enhanced security at the US embassy and evacuate US personnel.¹³⁸ Although a US fact-finding mission to Liberia in July recommended the dispatch of troops, the Bush Administration agreed only to act as a backup to African peacekeeping forces. Three US warships, with troops, were ordered to deploy near the coast of Liberia on 25 July.¹³⁹

Under intense international pressure, amid a catastrophic humanitarian situation throughout the country and with a besieged capital, Taylor finally agreed on 2 August to resign. On 11 August Taylor took up the offer of asylum in Nigeria that he had first accepted one month earlier.¹⁴⁰ On 18 August the rebel groups and the Liberian Government signed a power-sharing deal, brokered by ECOWAS, in Accra, Ghana, setting the timetable for the creation of an interim government, which will hand over power to an elected administration in January 2006.¹⁴¹ Under the agreement, the new transitional government will have 76 members, including 12 each from the Liberian Government and the two rebel groups; 18 from political parties; seven from civil society and special interest groups; and one from each of Liberia's 15 counties.¹⁴² In spite of continuing skirmishes between the rebels and Liberian security forces the new transitional government, led by Gyude Bryant, was inaugurated on 14 October, taking over from the caretaker regime of Moses Blah.¹⁴³

ECOWAS, which had already agreed in July to send more than 3000, mainly Nigerian, troops to Liberia finally began dispatching forces in early August. The delay in the sending of African peacekeepers was caused by a dispute over who would bear the costs of such a force, known as the ECOWAS Mission in Liberia (ECOMIL).¹⁴⁴ In the end, the EU, the UN and the USA all provided financial support to the force.¹⁴⁵ The West African force was supported by the arrival of some 200 US marines who helped to secure Monrovia's port and secure the main airport so as to enable the provision of humanitarian aid to Monrovia's population of 1.3 million.¹⁴⁶ By mid-September ECOMIL troops had begun to move outside the capital to the rest

¹³⁸ Agence France-Presse, Kniazkov, M., 'More US troops ordered to Liberia amid new fighting', ReliefWeb, 21 July 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

¹³⁹ Dinmore, G. and Peel, M., 'US team recommends sending peacekeepers to Liberia', *Financial Times*, 19–20 July 2003, p. 1; and Borger, J., 'Pentagon needs more than suffering from Liberia', *Guardian Weekly*, 31 July–6 Aug. 2003, p. 6.

¹⁴⁰ IRIN-WA, 'Liberia: Taylor's departure ushers in prospects for peace', IRIN-WA Weekly Round-up 188, 8–15 Aug. 2003.

¹⁴¹ 'Comprehensive peace agreement between the Government of Liberia and the Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) and the Movement for Democracy in Liberia (MODEL) and political parties', 18 Aug. 2003, URL <http://www.usip.org/library/pa/liberia/liberia_08182003_toc.html>.

¹⁴² Peel, M., 'Interim Liberian government set to be agreed', *Financial Times*, 19 Aug. 2003, p. 5.

¹⁴³ Sengupta, S., 'In Liberia new leader vows reform at inaugural', *International Herald Tribune*, 15 Oct. 2003, p. 6.

¹⁴⁴ For further details on ECOMIL see chapter 4 in this volume.

¹⁴⁵ IRIN-WA, 'Liberia: Aid reaches rebel areas, UN discusses new mission', IRIN-WA Weekly Round-up 193, 13–19 Sep. 2003.

¹⁴⁶ US Department of State, '200 US troops to support African peacekeepers in Liberia', ReliefWeb, 13 Aug. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

of the country.¹⁴⁷ The USA withdrew its troops with the arrival in Liberia of the first 5500 troops of the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) on 1 October.¹⁴⁸ In November the Security Council agreed to maintain sanctions on Liberia in view of continued instability and amidst allegations that Charles Taylor continued to intervene in Liberian affairs from exile.¹⁴⁹

Sudan

The conflict between the Sudanese Government and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A), active in the south, entered its 20th year in 2003. The objectives of the rebels involve a complex mix of issues related to disputes over religion, governance, autonomy and resources. With over 20 000 fighters, the SPLM/A seeks to oust the northern-dominated National Islamic Front (NIF) government, which attempted to impose Islamic Sharia Law across Sudan in 1983.¹⁵⁰ More than 50 000 people have been killed in fighting and approximately 4 million people are currently displaced within Sudan.¹⁵¹

There was a substantial breakthrough in the conflict in 2003: the NIF government and the SPLM/A signed a security agreement on 25 September, in Naivasha, Kenya, known formally as the Agreement on Security Arrangements during the Interim Period.¹⁵² The agreement, negotiated directly between SPLM/A leader John Garang and Ali Othman, vice-president of the NIF government, is the product of negotiations which had been under way since 1999, in which former US President Jimmy Carter mediated between Uganda and Sudan to normalize their relations and cease support to rebel groups.¹⁵³ The agreement, signed between the two states on 8 December 1999, was also seen as a first step towards ending the war in Sudan.¹⁵⁴

Sudan's endgame for peace began on 20 July 2002, when the SPLA/M rebels and the government signed the Machakos Protocol. The deal—brokered by the IGAD, which had been involved in the peace process since 1994—provided the framework for future negotiations and granted southern Sudan a self-

¹⁴⁷ UN-OCHA, 'Liberia: Peacekeepers fan out to rural Liberia', West Africa: IRIN-WA Weekly Round-up 192, 6–12 Sep. 2003.

¹⁴⁸ For further details on UNMIL see chapter 4 in this volume.

¹⁴⁹ 'UN maintains sanctions on Liberia', BBC News Online, 7 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/3249161.stm>>.

¹⁵⁰ International Crisis Group (ICG), 'God, oil and country: changing the logic of war in Sudan', ICG Africa Report no. 39 (28 Jan. 2002), available at URL <<http://www.crisisweb.org/home/index.cfm?id=1615&l=1>>.

¹⁵¹ US Committee for Refugees, 'Country Report: Sudan 2002,' available at URL <<http://www.refugees.org/world/countryrpt/africa/sudan.htm>>.

¹⁵² Walls, W. and Drummond, J., 'Hopes rise for deal to end Africa's longest civil war', *Financial Times*, 7 Oct. 2003, p. 8. For the text of the agreement see URL <http://www.usip.org/library/pa/sudan/sudan_security_09252003.html>.

¹⁵³ Throughout the 1990s, Uganda was arming and training the SPLM/A while Sudan was supporting the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA), providing bases, arms and training. Carter Center, 'Sudanese and Ugandan delegations agree on steps to implement the Nairobi agreement', ReliefWeb, 21 Jan. 2000, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

¹⁵⁴ Agreement Between the Governments of Sudan and Uganda, 8 Dec. 1999, available at URL <http://www.usip.org/library/pa/sudan_uganda/sudan_uganda_12081999.html>.

determination referendum after a six-year interim period.¹⁵⁵ Between August 2002 and May 2003, IGAD organized several rounds of talks between the SPLM/A and the Sudanese Government to discuss other sensitive issues, such as power and wealth sharing and the three contested central areas of Abyei, the Nuba Mountains and Southern Blue Nile.¹⁵⁶ Following the signing of the Machakos Protocol, IGAD and the so-called Observer Countries, including the USA, the UK, Norway and Italy, put pressure on the parties to solve any outstanding issues and sign a final peace agreement.¹⁵⁷

Under the terms of the September 2003 agreement, the Sudanese Government agreed to withdraw 12 000 of its 100 000 troops in the south. In return, SPLM/A rebels consented to withdraw their fighters from the north. Both sides agreed to contribute 12 000 troops to an integrated national army. The government and the rebels will also each contribute 3000 troops to be deployed in two of the three disputed areas, the Southern Blue Nile and the Nuba Mountains region.¹⁵⁸ The USA, which views Sudan as a front-line state in its war against terrorism, has continued to put pressure on both parties to reach agreement: on a visit to Sudan on 22 October 2003, US Secretary of State Colin Powell offered to lift US sanctions and remove Sudan from its list of states suspected of sponsoring terrorism if a final deal is signed.¹⁵⁹ During a separate meeting in Washington on 21 November with Garang, Powell further emphasized the importance of finalizing the agreement.¹⁶⁰ After months of talks, the government and the SPLM/A signed an agreement on wealth sharing in Naivasha on 7 January 2004. They agreed to divide the country's oil wealth equally and to establish a presidential commission to oversee future oil exploration and to monitor the fair division of revenues.¹⁶¹

A number of key issues remain to be resolved, however—notably, whether the capital Khartoum should be governed by Sharia law. Agreement on the status of the three contested areas in central Sudan is also required. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) sent a team of aid workers to Sudan in late December 2003 to prepare for what is expected to be one of its largest refugee return operations in recent years. An estimated 4 million people have been internally displaced since the war started and approximately 570 000 people have fled to neighbouring countries.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁵ Machakos Protocol, 20 July 2002, available at URL <http://www.usip.org/library/pa/sudan/sudan_machakos07202002_toc.html>.

¹⁵⁶ International Crisis Group (ICG), 'Sudan: Towards an incomplete peace', ICG Africa Report no. 73 (11 Dec. 2003), p. 8, available at URL <<http://www.crisisweb.org/home/index.cfm?id=2416&l=1>>.

¹⁵⁷ International Crisis Group (note 156).

¹⁵⁸ Agreement on Security Arrangements during the Interim Period (note 152).

¹⁵⁹ 'Peace in our time', *The Economist* (Internet edn), 23 Oct. 2003, available at URL <http://www.economist.com/displaystory.cfm?story_id=2158399>. For the US list of suspected terrorist individuals and organizations see URL <<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/designated.htm>>.

¹⁶⁰ 'US resume[s] Sudan peace effort', *Washington Times* (Internet edn), 21 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://www.washtimes.com/upi-breaking/20031121-041651-9046r.htm>>.

¹⁶¹ 'Government and rebels sign Sudan wealth-sharing pact', *International Herald Tribune*, 8 Jan. 2004, p. 8.

¹⁶² UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), 'UNHCR team lays groundwork for return to southern Sudan', UNHCR News Stories, 5 Jan. 2004, available at URL <<http://www.unhcr.ch>>.

Despite the historic progress made in 2003, the outbreak of a new conflict in the west of the country underlines the fragility of Sudan's tortuous move towards peace. In February 2003 a new armed political group—the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) began attacks on government troops to protest the perceived failure of the government to protect villagers from attacks by nomadic groups and the marginalization of the region of Darfur.¹⁶³ The SLM/A was joined by another armed group espousing broadly similar aims, the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). By April 2003 fighting was rife throughout the Darfur region. The isolated and impoverished nature of Darfur has complicated international coverage of the conflict. Talks in Chad between the Sudanese government and SLM/A rebels brokered by the Chadian government broke down in December.¹⁶⁴ The UN envoy to Sudan, Tom Eric Vraalsen, arrived in Chad on 8 January 2004 to examine the situation of an estimated 80 000 Sudanese refugees who had fled the fighting between rebels and government soldiers and to urge the parties to resume peace talks.¹⁶⁵

VI. The impact of the 'war against terrorism' on intra-state conflicts

While the form and substance of major armed conflict in 2003 reflected continuity rather than change vis-à-vis the past decade, the environment since the attacks of 11 September 2001 is having a significant impact on ongoing conflicts in multiple, complex ways. Much of the international preoccupation with terrorist threats and the US-led 'war against terrorism' has focused on the threat of terrorism that is supported or initiated by states. Accusations of state-sponsored terrorism have focused on the threat of the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) by terrorist groups.¹⁶⁶ However, the campaign has also targeted non-state actors and ongoing intra-state conflicts. Although it is still too early to draw conclusions, some tentative observations can be drawn about the impact of the 'war against terrorism' on the definition, conduct and intensity of a number of intra-state conflicts active in 2003.¹⁶⁷

The first trend is one of reclassification of the opposition rebel movement. Tensions have always existed between the perception of armed opposition groups and the state or government authority resisting them, and the debate

¹⁶³ Amnesty International, 'Sudan-Darfur: "Too many people killed for no reason"', AI Index: AFR 54/008/2004, 3 Feb. 2004; and Integrated Regional Information Network for the Horn of Africa (IRIN-HOA), 'Sudan: Darfur rebels keen to extend ceasefire', IRIN-HOA Weekly Round-up 163, 18–24 Oct. 2003.

¹⁶⁴ IRIN-HOA, 'Sudan: resumption of ceasefire unlikely, say Darfur rebels', IRIN-HOA Weekly Round-up 169, 29 Nov.–5 Dec. 2003.

¹⁶⁵ Agence France-Presse, 'UN envoy in Chad over Sudanese refugee plight', ReliefWeb, 8 Jan. 2004, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

¹⁶⁶ In his 2002 State of the Union Address, President Bush characterized the 'axis of evil' by linking the alleged sponsoring of terrorism by Iran, Iraq and North Korea with their alleged development of WMD. See URL <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>>.

¹⁶⁷ For a comprehensive discussion of the broad effects of the war on terrorism on international security, see Bailes, A. J. K., 'Introduction: trends and challenges in international security pp. 1–22, and Simpson, G., 'Terrorism and the law: past and present international approaches', pp. 23–31, in *SIPRI Yearbook 2003* (note 76).

about one man's terrorist being another man's freedom fighter is well known. However, in the period of decolonialism that marked post-World War II politics, the legitimacy of national self-determination movements became an increasingly recognized norm. Accompanying this was greater focus on the link between peace and democratic governance and the negotiated resolution of conflict.¹⁶⁸ The attempt to distinguish terrorism from other forms of armed violence and deny it legitimacy has thus centred on the political agenda and methods of terrorist groups. The deliberate targeting of civilians by terrorist groups is central to the efforts to identify and classify them.¹⁶⁹ Since 11 September 2001, a number of government parties to ongoing conflict have increasingly sought to identify their opponents as terrorists rather than national liberation fighters: for example, in the conflicts in Russia (Chechnya), Israel (with the Palestinians), the Philippines (the CPP and Abu Sayaf), Indonesia and Uganda. Adopting the language and terms employed in the context of the global war against terrorism, these governments have emphasized the links (whether proven or not) between such opposition groups and international terrorist movements. Increased formal designation of terrorist groups (for example the UN, EU and US lists) as well as the UN Security Council recognition of terrorism as a threat to international peace and security offer strong incentives to states seeking to defend and promote their position on an internal conflict.¹⁷⁰

The implications of this reclassification mark a second trend. In defining an armed opposition movement as a terrorist group, the government in question has less of a moral and political (domestic and/or international) imperative to negotiate an end to the conflict. On the contrary, there may well be greater international and domestic support for an aggressive military response to perceived illegitimate violent threats to the state and its citizens: for example, Israeli and Spanish domestic support for government anti-terrorist campaigns against pro-Palestinian militants and Basque separatists, respectively. Moreover, international pressure for a negotiated end to conflict and respect for human rights is considerably reduced if the opposition party to the conflict is deemed not to have, or to have forfeited through its actions, grounds for legitimate grievance. In such circumstances, the conflict ends only through the military defeat of or surrender by the opposition party.

If states or international organizations also perceive the alleged terrorist group as constituting a threat to their own security and/or international order, they may give active support to the government's counter-terrorist efforts.

¹⁶⁸ See the comparative survey in Holsti, K., *Peace and War: Armed Conflicts and International Order 1648–1989* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1991).

¹⁶⁹ This is a difficult task, given the increasing targeting of civilians in conflict. For more on the definition of terrorism see Stepanova, E., *Anti-terrorism and Peace-building During and After Conflict*, SIPRI Policy Paper no. 2 (SIPRI: Stockholm, June 2003), available at URL <<http://editors.sipri.se/recpubs.html>>; and Gearson, J., 'The nature of modern terrorism', ed. Freedman, L., *Superterrorism: Policy Responses* (Blackwell Publishing: Oxford, 2002), pp. 7–24.

¹⁷⁰ For the US list of designated Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTO) see note 159; for the EU list (22 Dec. 2003) see *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 340 (24 Dec. 2003), URL <http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/archive/2003/l_34020031224en.html>. See UN Security Council Resolutions 1373, 28 Sep. 2001, and 1483, 22 May 2003.

Military assistance, such as that provided by the USA to the governments of Indonesia, the Philippines and Uganda, may facilitate the defeat of armed opposition groups in an intra-state conflict.¹⁷¹ In the short term, at least, this is likely to lead to a further intensification of the conflict, as was evident in a number of cases in 2003. Even where military assistance is not forthcoming, international support for curbing the financing of terrorist movements, the main element in current multilateral counter-terrorism strategies, is likely. The EU, for example, established a pilot project for technical assistance to third countries facilitating the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1373 on terrorist financing. In 2003 Indonesia, Pakistan and the Philippines were designated priority third countries in this EU initiative.¹⁷²

Opposition rebel groups may respond to new offensives by surrender. However, examples to date and the implications of the war against terrorism for intra-state conflict, a third trend, point in another direction. They show that under superior military attack, armed opposition fighters may well embrace more, rather than less, guerrilla warfare tactics and target civilians as easier prey.¹⁷³ Such groups may well be motivated to turn to international terrorist groups to seek financial, personnel and military resources and assistance. Training assistance, such as that allegedly provided by members of the IRA to Colombia's FARC guerrillas, is one example of the multiple links that can be forged by seemingly diverse groups. Declaring a common agenda and/or linkage with an internationally known terrorist group offers one way for smaller groups to achieve wider notoriety. In some cases, increased international attention to the government's campaign may make the opposition group attractive for individuals espousing similar ideologies, as the conflicts in the Balkans, Afghanistan, Chechnya and, from March 2003, Iraq have demonstrated. The cause-and-effect relationship between government military offensives against terrorist threats remains, therefore, a complex one. The intra-state conflicts in Russia (Chechnya), Indonesia and the Philippines demonstrated this clearly in 2003.

Russia (Chechnya)

The conflict between the Russian Government and the Chechen separatist rebels in the republic of Chechnya that began in 1999 continued in 2003. Approximately 10 000 people have died in four years of conflict and around 160 000 remain internally displaced in Chechnya.¹⁷⁴ In the face of restricted

¹⁷¹ For details on the decision to increase Ugandan military spending see Sköns, E. *et al.*, 'Military expenditure', *SIPRI Yearbook 2003* (note 76), pp. 327–28.

¹⁷² Draft Presidency Report to the European Council on EU External Action in the Fight Against Terrorism (including CFSP/ESDP), 10323/2/03 Rev 2, 12 June 2003. For more on UN Security Council Resolution 1373 see Anthony, I. *et al.*, 'The Euro-Atlantic system and global security', and Simpson, G., 'Terrorism and the law: past and present international approaches', *SIPRI Yearbook 2003* (note 76), pp. 47–78 and pp. 23–31, respectively.

¹⁷³ E.g., Baev, P., 'Examining the "terrorism-war" dichotomy in the "Russia-Chechnya" case', *Contemporary Security Policy*, vol. 24, no. 2 (Aug. 2003), pp. 29–46.

¹⁷⁴ Norwegian Refugee Council, 'IDPs in northern Caucasus endure violence and destitution', Russian Federation, Global IDP Database, URL <<http://www.idproject.org>>.

press and humanitarian relief organizations' access to the region, it is difficult to assess with precision the costs of the conflict.

President Vladimir Putin has linked the war in Chechnya to the global war against terrorism. On 12 September 2001 Putin declared that the USA and Russia had a 'common foe' because 'Bin Laden's people are connected with the events currently taking place in our Chechnya' and that the events in Chechnya could not be considered outside the context of counter-terrorism.¹⁷⁵ After the hostage crisis of 23 October 2002, when 50 armed Chechens attacked the Dubrovka Theatrical Centre in Moscow and held approximately 700 people hostage, Putin declared that 'Russia will make no deals with terrorists and will not give in to any blackmail'.¹⁷⁶

Chechen militants, although weakened, are still capable of causing significant casualties. With a combination of mountain and increasingly urban guerrilla warfare tactics, the rebels have targeted Russian forces, alleged Chechen collaborators and civilians in Moscow. On 12 May a truck carrying approximately 1 ton of explosives crashed into the regional headquarters of the Federal Security Service (FSB) in Znamenskoye in northern Chechnya. The bomb killed 59 people and left over 200 wounded.¹⁷⁷ A growing phenomenon in the Chechen war is suicide attacks by female bombers. One such attack took place on 5 July, when two female suicide bombers detonated bombs at the Krylya festival held in Moscow, killing up to 20 people.¹⁷⁸ Some analysts argue that the increase in suicide bombings in 2003 indicates a shift in Chechen rebel tactics. The head of the FSB's Chechnya operations, Colonel Ilya Shabalkin, claimed that new Islamic recruits trained in al-Qaeda camps have penetrated the separatist fighters in Chechnya, bringing with them terrorist tactics seen in the Middle East.¹⁷⁹ Others contend that the terrorist tactics are an inevitable response to the brutal application of force by the Russian Government and will, in turn, prolong the conflict.¹⁸⁰ The previous criticism of Russia's abuse of human rights in Chechnya, particularly by the Council of Europe, the EU and the USA, has softened considerably in the wake of the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁵ Glasser, S. and Baker, P., 'Putin, Bush weigh new unity against a common foe', *Washington Post*, 13 Sep. 2001, p. 25.

¹⁷⁶ 'The Chechens strike', *The Economist*, 26 Oct. 2002, p. 28; and 'Tense vigil for Moscow relatives', CNN.com, 29 Oct. 2002, URL <<http://www.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/europe/10/29/moscow.gas/>>.

¹⁷⁷ Paton Walsh, N., 'At least 40 die in Chechnya blast', *Guardian Unlimited*, 13 May 2003, URL <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/chechnya/Story/0,2763,954746,00.html>>.

¹⁷⁸ 'Moscow mourns bomb victims', BBC News Online, 6 July 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3048942.stm>>.

¹⁷⁹ Weir, F., 'Shifting tactics in Chechnya', *Christian Science Monitor* (Internet edn), 30 Dec. 2002, URL <<http://www.csmonitor.com/2002/1230/p01s04-woeu.html>>. It is worth noting that although the practice of suicide bombings emerged in Lebanon following the Israeli invasion in 1982 it is in Sri Lanka, a non-Muslim-related conflict, that the practice was taken to unprecedented levels. See Gearson (note 169), pp. 7–24.

¹⁸⁰ Baev (note 173); and Evangelista, M., *The Chechen Wars: Will Russia Go the Way of the Soviet Union?* (Brookings Institution Press: Washington, DC, 2003).

¹⁸¹ E.g., in 2002 Russia twice fought off proposals to include a reference to Chechnya in EU–Russia joint declarations. Jack, A., 'Chechnya likely to overshadow forthcoming EU–Russia summit', *Financial Times*, 26 May 2003, p. 4. A reference to Chechnya was included in the Joint Statement of the EU–

Moscow's strategy of normalization in Chechnya centred on a referendum held on 23 March on a new Kremlin-backed constitution, which reiterated Chechnya's status as part of Russia and proposed a new two-chamber legislature and a Chechen president to be elected in October 2003. According to Russian authorities, around 95 per cent of the estimated 88 per cent of registered voters who turned out for the election accepted the proposals.¹⁸² In the ensuing presidential election, boycotted by the Chechen rebels and dismissed by international and domestic human rights groups, the Kremlin-supported candidate, Akhmad Kadyrov, won a landslide victory. Kadyrov, a former Chechen rebel who changed sides after Russian troops overthrew the Chechen separatist government in 1999, was previously Moscow's appointed administrator in the province.¹⁸³ No international observers were present for the elections.¹⁸⁴

Another development towards normalization in Chechnya was Putin's proposed amnesty on 16 May for Chechen separatists who laid down their weapons before 1 August 2003. The amnesty offer was not, however, open to those wanted for serious crimes, such as murder and kidnapping, and did not guarantee any political representation in the new legislature. The Russian Duma voted in favour (352 votes to 25) of Putin's amnesty offer on 6 June.¹⁸⁵ Putin has since then claimed to have the situation in Chechnya under control but a suicide attack on 9 December on a Russian train near Chechnya between the towns of Mineralniye Vody and Kislovodsk, killing at least 36 people, indicates the challenges that Chechnya continues to present.¹⁸⁶

Indonesia (Aceh)

Fighting between the Gerakan Aceh Merdeka (GAM, or Free Aceh Movement) and Indonesian security forces in the Aceh province has caused more than 12 000 deaths, most of them civilians, in 27 years of conflict.¹⁸⁷ GAM rebels have sought an independent Aceh state since 1976. Although Islam is an element of GAM's identity, the popular-based structure and political agenda have marked GAM as a self-determinist militant organization. It has

Russia Summit of 31 May 2003 under the paragraph 'Common response to the threat of drugs and terrorism'. Council of the European Union Press Release 9937/03 (Presse 154), 31 May 2003.

¹⁸² Zaks, D., 'Putin hails Chechnya poll as the end of separatist war', ReliefWeb, 24 Mar. 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

¹⁸³ According to Russian authorities, Akhmad Kadyrov won 81% of the votes, with a turnout of 88%. 'Putin's man wins Chechen poll', BBC News Online, 6 Oct. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3166586.stm>>; and 'Vote for the devil', *The Economist* (Internet edn), 9 Oct. 2003, URL <http://www.economist.com/background/displaystory.cfm?story_id=2122044>.

¹⁸⁴ Lobjakas, A., 'EU issues cautious assessment of Chechen elections', *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty* (Internet edn), 6 Oct. 2003, URL <<http://www.rferl.org/features/2003/10/06102003154413.asp>>.

¹⁸⁵ Zaks, D., 'Russia's parliament amnesties Chechen guerrillas', ReliefWeb, 6 June 2003, URL <<http://www.reliefweb.int>>.

¹⁸⁶ 'At least 36 killed in train blast near Chechnya', *International Herald Tribune* (Internet edn), 5 Dec. 2003, URL <<http://www.iht.com/ihsearch.php?id=120382&owner=&date=20031205053847>>.

¹⁸⁷ Donnan, S., 'Murder and torture fears add to the burden of suffering in Aceh's dirty war', *Financial Times*, 27 May 2003, p. 6.

not been internationally designated as a terrorist organization.¹⁸⁸ Peace efforts under way between the Indonesian Government and GAM since 1999 collapsed in 2003 with the launch of a major government military offensive in May.

The progress that had previously been achieved had been the result of significant international pressure on Indonesia to negotiate a peaceful solution to the long-standing conflict in Aceh. A ceasefire agreement on 9 December 2002 brokered by the Henry Dunant Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HDC), based in Geneva, Switzerland, was the first significant breakthrough, the outcome of three years of mediation by the HDC with the conflicting parties.¹⁸⁹ A Joint Security Committee (JSC), consisting of 150 international peace monitors, was set up to supervise the implementation of the ceasefire agreement.¹⁹⁰ The December agreement also called for free elections in 2004 to establish an autonomous government in Aceh and the demilitarization of GAM rebels.¹⁹¹ Despite unresolved differences and attacks by both sides, the demilitarization process began on 9 February 2003.¹⁹² Neither side took firm action to implement it and the situation deteriorated further. In the face of increased attacks and rebel threats the JSC international monitors withdrew from Aceh on 8 April 2003.¹⁹³

Talks to salvage the peace process were held in Tokyo on 17–18 May 2003 following pressure from the EU, Japan and the USA.¹⁹⁴ However, the talks broke down when the parties failed to agree on disarmament measures and the issue of independence against autonomy. On 19 May, the government of President Megawati Sukarnoputri, which now refers to the rebels as terrorists, placed Aceh under martial law and ordered a six-month military offensive to defeat the separatists.¹⁹⁵ Up to 35 000 troops and 14 000 police officers backed by artillery power were deployed to deal with the estimated 4000 GAM fighters. Between May and November 2003, approximately 1000 Aceh rebels

¹⁸⁸ For a discussion of the differences between the Indonesian Islamist groups see Gershman, J., 'Is Southeast Asia the second front?', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 81, no. 4 (July/Aug. 2002), pp. 60–74.

¹⁸⁹ Cessation of Hostilities Framework Agreement between Government of the Republic of Indonesia and the Free Aceh Movement, 9 Dec. 2002, available at URL <http://www.usip.org/library/pa/aceh/aceh_12092002.html>.

¹⁹⁰ International Crisis Group (ICG), 'Aceh: a fragile peace', ICG Asia Report no. 47, 27 Feb. 2003, p. 10, available at URL <<http://www.crisisweb.org/home/index.cfm?id=1396&l=1>>. The contingent was divided into 12 teams of 6 monitors each. Each team had 2 representatives from the Indonesian security forces, 2 from the GAM and 2 military observers from either Thailand or the Philippines. 'Peace monitors start work in Indonesia', BBC News Online, 28 Dec. 2002, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/2610725.stm>>.

¹⁹¹ Cessation of Hostilities Framework Agreement (note 189).

¹⁹² Jakarta Media Indonesia, 'Popular Jakarta daily carries editorial "Demilitarisation in Aceh"', 10 Feb. 2003, in 'Demilitarisation in Aceh', Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report—East Asia (FBIS-EAS)*, FBIS-EAS-2003-0210, 11 Feb. 2003.

¹⁹³ Donnan, S., 'Demonstrators destabilise Aceh peace deal', *Financial Times*, 8 Apr. 2003, p. 10.

¹⁹⁴ Agence France-Presse (Hong Kong), 'Indonesia says Aceh peace talks in Tokyo still on despite rebels' detention', 17 May 2003, FBIS-EAS-2003-0517, 19 May 2003.

¹⁹⁵ In Aug. 2002 the Indonesian Security Minister, Lt-Gen. Bambang Yudhoyono, branded the GAM as terrorists for the first time. See Ghosal, B., 'Indonesia: which direction?', *Asian Defence Yearbook 2002–2003* (Syed Hussain Publications: Kuala Lumpur, 2003), p. 13; and 'No early victory', *The Economist*, 24 May 2003, pp. 55–56.

were killed and 2000 GAM fighters were captured or surrendered.¹⁹⁶ Around 400 civilians have been killed in the offensive.¹⁹⁷ Independent reporting on the conflict has been hampered by restricted access to the province for foreign journalists and aid workers.¹⁹⁸ In June the government imposed further legal and bureaucratic restrictions on foreign media.¹⁹⁹

With GAM rebels still active in some areas in Aceh, such as Pidie, Bireuen and Aceh Besar, the military offensive and martial law were extended for another six months on 19 November 2003.²⁰⁰ This decision was condemned by the EU, Japan and the USA, and all three urged the parties to revive the peace talks.²⁰¹ The Indonesian Government insists that the GAM rebels must first disarm and accept autonomy as the principle for a future peace agreement before any talks resume.²⁰²

The political and military feasibility of the government offensive in Aceh has been facilitated by Indonesia's rehabilitation as part of the global coalition against terrorism. In the wake of the end of the cold war and the collapse of the Suharto regime, Indonesia's human rights record had come under increasing international criticism. This reached an apogee following the massacres that took place in East Timor during that province's referendum on independence in September 1999. The US Administration imposed a ban on military aid to Indonesia and stipulated that it must first prosecute those responsible for atrocities in East Timor and ensure the safe return of East Timorese refugees before bilateral military relations could be restored.²⁰³ Although the Indonesian Government's failure to bring its military leaders publicly to bear for the East Timor massacres continues to elicit international criticism, international sanctions against the regime have been lifted in the wake of the war against terrorism particularly after the 2002 terrorist attack in Bali. In August 2002 the Bush Administration renewed US military assistance to Indonesia. A package of approximately \$50 million over a three-year period—fiscal years (FYs) 2002–2004—is earmarked for counter-terrorism development, including measures to improve intelligence and training.²⁰⁴ In

¹⁹⁶ 'No early victory' (note 195).

¹⁹⁷ Agence France-Presse (Hong Kong), 'Indonesia's military neutralizing 60 percent of separatist rebels in Aceh', 19 Nov. 2003, FBIS-EAS-2003-1119, 20 Nov. 2003.

¹⁹⁸ Harvey, R., 'Aceh reporters "intimidated"', BBC News Online, 26 Nov. 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/3237006.stm>>.

¹⁹⁹ Human Rights Watch, 'Aceh under martial law: muzzling the messengers: attacks and restrictions on the media', *Human Rights Watch Report*, vol. 15, no. 9 (Nov. 2003), URL <<http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/indonesia1103/>>.

²⁰⁰ Jingsheng, Z., 'Indonesia to extend military operation in Aceh for another six months', Beijing Xinhua, 19 Nov. 2003, in 'Indonesia to extend military operation in Aceh', Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report-China (FBIS-CHI)*, FBIS-CHI-2003-1119, 20 Nov. 2003; and Burhaini Faizal, E., 'Warding off election saboteurs, Suara Pembaruan', 19 Nov. 2003, in 'Interview with police chief on Aceh and 2004 election sabotage', FBIS-EAS-2003-1119, 24 Nov. 2003.

²⁰¹ Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia, 'Indonesia regrets US, EU, Japan "meddling" in Aceh', Press Release, Tokyo, Japan, 7 Nov. 2003, available at URL <<http://www.indonesian-embassy.or.jp/menue/information/news/meddling.htm>>.

²⁰² Jingsheng (note 200).

²⁰³ Huang, R., 'Priority dilemmas: US–Indonesia military relations in the anti-terror war', Center for Defence Information (CDI), 23 May 2002, URL <<http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/priority-pr.cfm>>.

²⁰⁴ Haseman, J., 'USA thaws Jakarta split', *Jane's Defence Weekly*, 14 Aug. 2002, p. 17.

October 2002 the US Administration lifted sanctions on certain types of defence equipment and training to increase counter-terrorism cooperation with Indonesia.²⁰⁵ The USA insists that the emphasis of its assistance to Indonesia is on law enforcement rather than on military capacity and maintains tight controls on the sale of weapons to the country.²⁰⁶ The foreign aid bill for FY 2003 contained several conditions for providing licences and financing for the export of military equipment to Indonesia.²⁰⁷

The Philippines

President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo came to power in January 2001 with a strategy to engage in peaceful dialogue with the Philippines' two biggest opposition movements—the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) and the NPA. On-again off-again talks with both groups throughout 2002–2003 have seen a shift in the Philippine Government's classification of the NPA as terrorists. The government's policy towards a third rebel group, the southern-based Abu Sayyaf, has been consistently one of eradication.

Prior to September 2001 the Philippine Government had regarded the Abu Sayyaf group as primarily a criminal organization whose main activities were focused on extortion and kidnapping.²⁰⁸ The government's efforts to defeat the group have been facilitated substantially by US support as part of its war against terrorism. Washington declared Abu Sayyaf a foreign terrorist organization on 5 October 2001 and in January 2002 dispatched 600 US soldiers to support 4000 Philippine military forces in their offensive on the southern island of Basilan.²⁰⁹ Despite the failure of the operation to defeat Abu Sayyaf, US–Philippine anti-terror cooperation continues to expand. A joint operation on the island of Jolo announced in February 2003 was cancelled after public outcry in the Philippines at the prospect of US troops engaged in combat on Philippine national territory.²¹⁰ In May 2003 the Bush Administration committed more than \$114 million in military aid to help defeat terrorist groups in the Philippines. This aid package is the largest since the USA closed its bases there in 1992. It included \$47 million to fund the 'Balikatan 2003-1' US–

²⁰⁵ Bauer, S., 'Arms exports post 9/11—and the flood gates open?', *European Security Review*, no. 11 (Mar. 2002), p. 6.

²⁰⁶ See Gershman (note 188); and Carothers, T., 'Promoting democracy and fighting terror', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 82, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 2003), pp. 84–97.

²⁰⁷ Under the bill, licences may be issued only if the US President certifies to Congress that members of the Indonesian Army who are responsible for atrocities are being prosecuted or suspended. 'Limits on Indonesia's military', *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 6 Mar. 2003, p. 8.

²⁰⁸ See Anthony et al., *SIPRI Yearbook 2003* (note 172), pp. 50–52; and Gershman (note 188).

²⁰⁹ US Department of State, 'Global patterns of terrorism 2002', 30 Apr. 2003, URL <<http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/pgtrpt/2002/html/>>; and Rogers, S., 'Beyond the Abu Sayyaf: the lessons of failure in the Philippines', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 83, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 2004), pp. 15–20.

²¹⁰ The Philippine Constitution prohibits foreign troops from engaging in combat missions on its territory. US soldiers were designated as trainers for the Philippine military in the Basilan operation in Jan. 2002.

Philippine training exercise which took place in April–May 2003 in Sulu, where the Abu Sayyaf is active.²¹¹

Arroyo's government used the threat of terrorist designation to effect in negotiations with the MILF in 2003. Peace talks between the government and the 12 500-strong MILF, which has fought for an independent Muslim state on the island of Mindanao since 1984, had been under way since March 2001 with the mediation of Malaysia. Negotiations, which had been stalling since 2002, were suspended in May 2003, when Arroyo accused the MILF of being behind two bombings in the south of the country. President Arroyo threatened to label the MILF as a terrorist group and freeze all its assets if it did not halt its attacks by 1 June 2003.²¹² The threat was not carried out because the MILF declared a 10-day unilateral ceasefire on 28 May. A formal agreement between the Philippine Government and the MILF, signed on 18 July 2003, opened the way for substantive peace talks and the potential of an international monitoring team, facilitated by Malaysia.²¹³ The MILF has publicly denounced any links to international terrorists.²¹⁴

The Philippine Government has already designated the CPP as terrorists. In her weekly radio address on 5 July 2002, President Arroyo said, 'we shall isolate this group [the NPA] from the international community by exposing them for what they are—terrorists masquerading as revolutionaries'.²¹⁵ Following a review of the group's activities, the USA designated the NPA a foreign terrorist organization on 9 August 2002.²¹⁶ The EU followed suit on 28 October 2002.²¹⁷ The peace talks between the NPA and the government, which began in 2001 with the assistance of Norway and broke off the same year, remained in suspension in 2003. The government maintained its military operations against the NPA and declared a crackdown on charitable and socio-civic associations which it alleged served as fronts for the NPA and the recruitment of child soldiers.²¹⁸ Although there were some indications in July

²¹¹ Joint US Military Assistance Group (JUSMAG) Fact Sheet, 'RP biggest beneficiary of US military aid in Asia', 16 Oct. 2003, available on the Internet site of the Embassy of the United States to the Philippines, URL <<http://usembassy.state.gov/posts/rp1/www/rp126.html>>; *Manila Philippine Daily Inquirer*, 'Arroyo itemizes components of defence, military package coming from US', 28 May 2003, in 'US pouring money, guns into Mindanao', Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report-East Asia (FBIS-EAS)*, FBIS-EAS-2003-0528, 29 May 2003.

²¹² 'Philippines rebels call ceasefire', BBC News Online, 28 May 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/2942814.stm>>.

²¹³ 'Manila signs ceasefire with MILF', BBC News Online, 18 July 2003, URL <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/3077137.stm>>; and Agence France-Presse (Hong Kong), 13 July 2003, in 'Malaysian armed forces ready to send peace monitors to Philippines', FBIS-EAS-2003-0713, 13 July 2003.

²¹⁴ Agence France-Presse (Hong Kong), 18 Sep. 2003 in 'Philippine President Arroyo to push for talks resumption before OIC meeting', FBIS-EAS-2003-0918, 22 Sep. 2003.

²¹⁵ 'Arroyo exposes terrorists' links to drug trade', *Manila Times* (Internet edn), 6 July 2003, URL <http://www.manilatimes.net/national/2003/jul/06/top_stories/20030706top4.html>.

²¹⁶ US Department of State, Office of Counterterrorism, 'Philippine Communist Party designated foreign terrorist group', Fact Sheet, 9 Aug. 2002, URL <<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/02080903.htm>>.

²¹⁷ 'The crossroads for Joma', *Manila Times* (Internet edn), 3 Nov. 2002, URL <<http://www.manilatimes.net/national/2002/nov/03/opinion/20021103opi1.html>>.

²¹⁸ Agence France-Presse (Hong Kong), 9 July 2003, in 'Philippines to crack down on Communist guerrilla "fronts"', FBIS-EAS-2003-0709, 10 July 2003.

that CPP–government peace talks might resume, no substantive breakthrough occurred in 2003.²¹⁹

VII. Conclusions

The year 2003 was a salutary reminder that interstate conflict remains a threat for international peace and security, however more globalized and regulated relations between states have become in the decade and a half since the end of the cold war. Attention to interstate disputes in the Middle East, the Korean peninsula, South Asia and Africa is therefore important, and the renewed focus on the threat of the proliferation of WMD, in particular, is welcome. This apprehension, however, must not obscure the fact that most major armed conflicts in today's world are intra-state. Internal wars, on the basis of the statistics presented in appendix 3A, were responsible for more than twice the number of battle-related deaths in interstate conflicts in 2003. The grim reality of intra-state conflict makes continued focus on it—as a general phenomenon of the international state system as well as its particular manifestations in each case—a necessity for international peace and security.

In overall terms, there has been a steady, if undramatic, decline in the number of intra-state conflicts around the globe. Arguably, this says more about the completion of the processes of the break-up of cold war federative entities (the Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia) than it does about contemporary patterns of intra-state conflict. More noteworthy is the tendency towards longevity of many intra-state conflicts. The truism that violence begets violence appears particularly pointed with regard to internal conflicts. Once a state starts to spiral into armed conflict, its institutions and frameworks inevitably respond, if they are capable of doing so, by mobilizing for war. In the short term, at least, wider political, economic and social development is halted. Where the state is incapable of a successful war mobilization effort, the direct (e.g., physical destruction) and indirect (e.g., neglect and corruption) effects of the conflict lead to the withering and even collapse of the state's frameworks and institutions. Whatever the capability of the state, the possibility of 'normal' state functioning during internal conflict is impossible. In this context, new sources of tension and dispute are created, and termination of conflict becomes still more difficult.

The resilience of internally warring states and societies to resolution of their conflicts is sometimes perceived by outside observers as indicative of the futility of external intervention. Internal conflicts are viewed as too complex, intractable and self-contained for outsiders to understand them. Their longevity is seen as indicative of the lack of internal will to negotiate and compromise. The cases outlined in this chapter would appear to suggest the opposite. First, as demonstrated by conflicts as diverse as those in Colombia, Indonesia, Liberia and Sudan, conflicts within the state are rarely self-

²¹⁹ Agence France-Presse (Hong Kong), 4 July 2003, in 'Philippine negotiators, Communist "insurgents" agree to resume peace talks', FBIS-EAS-2003-0704, 7 July 2003.

contained. Intra-state dispute and conflict have repeatedly shown a sensitivity to external dynamics, either positive (as Sierra Leone after the withdrawal of active Liberian support for the RUF rebels) or negative (the international demand for drugs and the profits to be made fuelling conflict in Colombia). In a globalized world, the consequences of internal conflict are no longer confined to the immediate neighbourhood of the warring state. External engagement is, to some extent, inevitable. The question, therefore, is one of what type of engagement and with what instruments.

Second, the cases highlighted in this chapter suggest that direct external engagement in resolving internal conflicts is, in almost all cases, a prerequisite for peace. For the reasons outlined above, a state in war rarely has the capacity or the means to manage this task alone. Divided, wounded societies may not be able to negotiate and manage the resolution of conflict without assistance. This does not mean, however, that external actors can enforce peace on a state. A sustained end to internal conflict, as the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire demonstrates, is only possible if and when it is locally 'owned'. External engagement can, however, provide mediation between warring parties and bring them together in a non-threatening environment (e.g., the efforts of Norway in Sri Lanka and of ECOWAS in Liberia). External engagement can provide the military and political assistance required to support a fragile peace agreement, deal with the threat of spoilers and enable a start to peace-building. External financial and development assistance can play a crucial role in implementing and sustaining peace and in assisting the state and society to develop frameworks and institutions for the management of peace.

The cases reviewed in this chapter have also demonstrated, however, that external engagement is a lengthy and demanding task. It requires a comprehensive understanding of the long- and short-term causes of conflict as well as thorough knowledge of the parties to the conflict and their agendas and, crucially, of those who are or are not willing to engage in a peace process. External intervention necessitates a wide range of tools, diverse actors with appropriate capabilities and a strategy for their combined use. This strategic approach can only be elaborated in partnership with the state and society concerned. Too often, however, external crisis-management and conflict-resolution efforts neglect the perspective or limit it to coordination with the government in question. In an environment in which the concept of state sovereignty is being critically re-examined and in which intervention, coercive or not, has increased, a comprehensive assessment of the relationship between external interveners and local actors in crisis management and conflict resolution is needed. The elaboration and development of coordination between local state and society representatives and the international community assisting the management and resolution of their internal conflicts, across all stages of the conflict cycle, remain central challenges in addressing major armed conflict.