

Working Paper Series

## **Working Paper 14**

Angola in Search of Peace:  
Spoilers, Saints and Strategic Regional Interests

Neuma Grobbelaar

Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'  
Conflict Research Unit  
October 2003



Netherlands Institute of  
International Relations  
'Clingendael'  
Clingendael 7  
2597 VH The Hague  
P.O. Box 93080  
2509 AB The Hague  
Phonenumber: # 31-70-3245384  
Telefax: # 31-70-3282002  
Email: [research@clingendael.nl](mailto:research@clingendael.nl)  
Website: <http://www.clingendael.nl/cru>

© Netherlands Institute of International Relations *Clingendael*. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright holders. *Clingendael* Institute, P.O. Box 93080, 2509 AB The Hague, The Netherlands.

# Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>List of Abbreviations</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Foreword</b>   | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>I. Introduction</b>  | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>II. Historical Overview of the Conflict and Peace Efforts</b>              | <b>11</b> |
| 2.1. The End of Colonialism   | 11        |
| 2.2. Civil War and External Actors: 1976 – 1988                               | 12        |
| 2.3. Attempts and Failures at Peace: The UN Contribution                      | 13        |
| 2.4. Developments Since 1998  | 17        |
| <b>III. Political War Economy</b>   | <b>21</b> |
| 3.1. Introduction   | 21        |
| 3.2. Oil, Diamonds and War  | 22        |
| <b>IV. Recent Trends</b>  | <b>25</b> |
| 4.1. UNITA: A Return to Guerrilla Warfare and a Change of Tactics             | 25        |
| 4.2. MPLA: In Search of a Military Victory and Political Legitimacy           | 29        |
| 4.3. Angola and the Region: Seeking out Allies and Throwing Around its Weight | 32        |
| 4.3.1. <i>Zambia</i>  | 33        |
| 4.3.2. <i>Namibia</i>   | 33        |
| 4.3.3. <i>South Africa</i>  | 34        |
| 4.3.4. <i>Zimbabwe</i>  | 34        |
| 4.3.5. <i>Mozambique</i>  | 35        |
| 4.3.6. <i>Democratic Republic of Congo</i>                                    | 35        |
| 4.3.7. <i>Southern African Development Community (SADC)</i>                   | 36        |
| 4.4. Growth of Civil Society: The Saints amongst the Spoilers of Peace?       | 38        |
| <b>V. Conclusion and Recommendations</b>                                      | <b>43</b> |
| <b>Annex 1</b>  | <b>47</b> |
| <b>Annex 2</b>  | <b>49</b> |
| <b>Annex 3</b>  | <b>51</b> |

## List of Abbreviations

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| AMC    | <i>Ampla Movimento dos Cidadãos</i>  |
| Ascorp | Angola Selling Corporation   |
| COIEPA | <i>Comite Intereclesial para a Paz em Angola</i> (Inter-Church Committee for Peace)                              |
| CONGA  | Committee of Non-Governmental Organizations in Angola  |
| DEMOP  | Mobile Police Detachments  |
| DRC    | Democratic Republic of Congo   |
| EIU    | Economist Intelligence Unit  |
| FAA    | <i>Forças Armadas Angolanas</i> (Angolan Armed Forces)   |
| FESA   | Eduardo dos Santos Foundation  |
| FNLA   | <i>Frente Nacional de Libertação de Angola</i> (National Front for the Liberation of Angola)                     |
| FONGA  | Forum of Angolan Non-Governmental Organisations  |
| IDP    | Internally Displaced Person  |
| IMF    | International Monetary Fund  |
| IRIN   | UN Integrated Regional Information Network   |
| MONUA  | UN Observer Mission in Angola  |
| MPLA   | <i>Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola Popular</i> (Movement for the Liberation of Angola)                 |
| NEPAD  | New Partnership for Africa's Development   |
| OAU    | Organization of African Unity  |
| OCHA   | Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs   |
| ODC    | Angolan Civil Militia Forces   |
| OPDS   | Organ on Politics, Defence and Security  |
| OSCE   | Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe   |
| PAJOCA | <i>Partido da Aliança da Juventude Operária Camponesa de Angola</i>  |
| PIR    | Rapid Intervention Police  |
| SADC   | Southern African Development Community   |
| SINFO  | <i>Servico de Informação</i>   |
| SMP    | Staff Monitored Programme  |
| SWAPO  | South West African People's Organisation   |
| UNAVEM | UN Angola Verification Mission   |
| UNITA  | <i>União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola</i> (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola) |
| UNOA   | UN Office of Angola  |

## **Foreword**

This paper is part of a larger research project, 'Coping with Internal Conflict' (CICP), which was executed by the Conflict Research Unit of the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael' for the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The CICP, which was finalized at the end of 2002, consisted of three components: 'Political Economy of Internal Conflict'; 'Managing Group Grievances and Internal Conflict'; and 'Security Sector Reform'. This paper was written in the framework of the research component 'Political Economy of Internal Conflict'.

Addressing the political economy of internal conflict calls for policies on the basis of good analysis. The purpose of this component was to make such analyses. It carried out studies on Angola, Colombia, Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka. The studies particularly examined the local dimension of political economies of conflict, the interface between the national and the international dimension, and the role of outside actors.

# I. Introduction

Angola, throughout its 40 years of continuous high-intensity internal conflict,<sup>1</sup> presents a classical case study of a political war economy that has been shaped and sustained by the overarching, global political and ideological paradigms that determined the course of the twentieth century. In its first phase, it represented a struggle for independence against its former colonial masters, the Portuguese; in its second phase until the late eighties, a proxy war determined and fed by Cold War rivalry, which saw the two superpowers maintain and support a range of essentially undemocratic African elites; and now in its third phase, a classical resource war sustained by an ethnic, social and urban/rural divide and locked into a larger-than-life and highly personalized 'winner-takes-all' power struggle manipulated and controlled by the *People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola* (MPLA) and the *National Union for the Total Independence of Angola* (UNITA).

Indeed, it is the grave irony of the Angolan conflict that the detente and rapprochement between the Cold War antagonists that shaped the last twenty years of the previous century, only served to expose the mercenary zeal with which the two main Angolan belligerents were willing to pursue their goals, despite the cost to the Angolan population.

At the same time, the internal Angolan conflict has become an example of the pitfalls to be avoided in international peace-keeping operations, the willingness of external actors to adopt a cavalier and expedient approach towards peace while pursuing commercial interests, the ability of multinational corporations, as exemplified by both the diamond and oil industries, to pursue business 'for the sake of business' in a highly enabling environment, and lastly, the propensity of internal conflicts to spill across borders and to evolve into regional conflicts – especially, where they become resource-driven, tapping into existing cross-border supply networks and benefiting from and exploiting traditional regional, ethnic and political sympathies.

The 'winds of change' that blew across the African continent in the late eighties and early nineties have not released the Angolan internal conflict from the vestiges of entrenched and long-standing interests, nor have they prevented the development of new political and business interests. They have only managed to partially lift the veil from the intricate interplay between individuals, movements, members of the armed forces, local, provincial and national levels of government, regional and external governments, and international and regional businesses - in pursuit of profit. Thus, this has to be taken into account when assessing the Angolan conflict: The conflict *has been profitable* and the main dilemma facing those who would see its end is that *the incentives for war by far outweigh the incentives for peace*.

In the 14 years since the first attempt at peace in Angola, the international community has vacillated between various policy options in order to promote or enforce peace. The one policy decision that has remained constant despite varying degrees of adherence, has been the imposition of

---

<sup>1</sup> The Angolan struggle for independence through military means began in 1961 and civil conflict has been part of Angolan life since independence in 1975 with only intermittent brief reprieves. As such it presents one of the longest ongoing contemporary civil conflicts in the world.

sanctions against UNITA in 1993.<sup>2</sup> In the eight years since then, there has been no real or significant progress in bringing the different protagonists to the negotiating table, and not even the death of Jonas Malheiro Savimbi, the leader of UNITA, has thus far forced the hand of UNITA to agree to peace<sup>3</sup> The other constant has been the uncritical recognition of the MPLA by the international community as the legitimate government of the Angolan people, especially since 1992. This has been the case despite the fact that 'technically' the current government's term lapsed in 1996. The effect has been the pursuit of clearly undemocratic and unjustifiable practices by the Angolan government - couched as an appropriate response to the rebel threat' - that are undeniably sustained by a 'cowed, subdued and thus decidedly complicit' international donor community. The latter has allowed itself to be usurped by an agenda that does not reflect the interests of ordinary Angolans, but instead supports the narrow interests of two powerful and wealthy actors. They in turn are sustained by close-knit web of regional and international client-patron business relationships that drive the Angolan resource war. The end result is that both parties to the conflict have absolved themselves from any social and political responsibility towards the Angolan population in whose interest they profess to pursue this conflict.

However, there have been important changes in the Angolan environment that suggest a thawing of the current impasse - most notably the rise and growth of civil society. Although civil society in itself is not guaranteed to bring about a peaceful resolution of the conflict, it is an important building block in an unfolding process in which the international community has to play a decisive role.

This paper will briefly trace the history of the conflict since independence; the various attempts at peace and the reasons for their failure; how the war economy feeds the conflict; recent trends (the impact of sanctions on UNITA and the death of Savimbi, the increase of internal and international pressure on the MPLA, the growing regional dimension of the conflict and the development of civil society as a potentially important actor in addressing the conflict); and will end with recommendations to bolster the achievement of peace in Angola.

---

<sup>2</sup> Sanctions were introduced against UNITA by the United Nations in 1993 and have been consistently expanded, monitored and endorsed by the UN Security Council until the present.

<sup>3</sup> Jonas Savimbi has long been regarded as the main stumbling block in the Angolan peace process. However, his death on 22 February 2002 has not brought about a more responsible pursuit of peace by the Angolan government and it is an open question whether a political elite that has for so long drawn its 'legitimacy' and sustenance from the pursuit of war will be willing to relinquish this course of action.

## II. Historical Overview of the Conflict and Peace Efforts

### 2.1. The End of Colonialism<sup>4</sup>

The colonial period in Angola came to an abrupt end on 11 November 1975 after 400 years of colonial rule - nineteen months after the overthrow in Lisbon of the Salazar regime by a military coup in April 1974 that paved the way for the independence of Portugal's colonies.

Despite the formal and 'orderly' transition of power from Portugal to Angola by the signing of the Alvor Accords on 15 January 1975, the transition of political power did not proceed peacefully. The signing of the Accords was preceded by an all-out struggle for supremacy between the three main liberation movements (FNLA, MPLA and UNITA) with no clear winner emerging. The last year of colonial rule under the Portuguese was marked with more violence than the 14 years of liberation struggle that had preceded the signing of the Accords.<sup>5</sup>

In the end the government of Portugal signed a joint agreement with the FNLA, MPLA and UNITA leading to the installation of a transitional coalition government comprising representatives from all three movements on 31 January 1975. However, peace was short-lived and the struggle for political supremacy in Angola continued in earnest.

At this point in time external intervention in the Angolan conflict became a core feature of the conflict. However, as Hodges points out, intervention was 'not motivated by Angola's oil or other natural resources, but driven by the geo-political rivalries of the Cold War.'<sup>6</sup> The white National Party government of South Africa, which was keen to counter Angolan support for the South West African People's Organisation (SWAPO) in South West Africa (now Namibia), invaded southern Angola and extended support to UNITA. This intervention was supplemented by covert support to UNITA from the United States (US) to counter Soviet and Cuban military support to the MPLA. The FNLA in turn received support from the US, China and the Zairean army.

By November 1975, the MPLA had secured control of Luanda with Cuban and Soviet help, Portugal ceded sovereignty over Angola to the MPLA on the basis that 'whoever controls Luanda, controls Angola' and Augustinho Neto was declared president. The FNLA was decisively beaten and UNITA retreated to southwestern Angola where it began to rebuild an insurgency from a predominantly Ovimbundu base with support from South Africa, Morocco and the Ivory Coast. The US terminated its support to UNITA in terms of the Clark Amendment and only resumed support in 1986. The next thirteen years marked the intensification of the civil conflict in Angola with a gradual escalation of external intervention.

---

<sup>4</sup> Please note Hodges, T. *Angola from Afro-Stalinism to Petro-Diamond Capitalism*, Oxford: James Curry, 2001, Chapter 2 and Cilliers, J. & Dietrich, C. *Angola's War Economy: The Role of Oil and Diamonds*, Pretoria: Institute of Security Studies, 2000, Chapter 3.

<sup>5</sup> See Cleary, S.M. *A Failure to Manage: Political Transition and Conflict in Angola*, Paper, 2nd Draft, Strategic Concepts, 1993.

<sup>6</sup> See Hodges, *op. cit.*

## 2.2. Civil War and External Actors: 1976 – 1988

The MPLA government adopted Marxism-Leninism as its official ideology in 1976 and attempted to build a strong centralized state on Marxist principles. However, the mass exodus of expatriates and Portuguese settlers (5% of the population) in 1975, who mainly represented the skilled class, combined with the outbreak of civil war, crude and inefficient economic central planning, political oppression and widespread corruption, led to a failure of state institutions and the economy. As noted by Cleary (1993), only the oil and diamonds enclave economies, managed predominantly by foreign companies, managed to keep the Angolan economy afloat.

At this time, the consolidation of MPLA rule was cemented in the national consciousness of the Angolan population through one of the most traumatic events in its history; namely, the purges effected by the government after the unsuccessful coup attempt by the 'nitistas' in support of Nito Alves, the former Minister of the Interior on 27 May 1977. The failed coup was used as an excuse by the government to execute thousands of Angolans who were suspected of or accused of supporting Nito. Besides their ideological slant, the purges also had a distinct ethnic dimension and targeted predominantly the Bakongo (associated with the FNLA and the former Zaire) and the Ovimbundu (associated with UNITA). The purpose of the purges was to eliminate any form of resistance against the MPLA. The randomness and scale of the killings that followed Angola's first multiparty, democratic elections in 1992, the so-called *limpeza étnica*, are hauntingly reminiscent of this event. The 1977 purges served to suppress any hint of opposition in society and act as a constant reminder – even today – of the brutality with which the MPLA regime is willing to act against its own citizens.

Despite the increase in Cuban troops in Angola<sup>7</sup> and the massive increase in arms transfers to the MPLA, the Angola government was unable to crush the UNITA insurgency. The support rendered by the South African Defence Force to UNITA since 1975 was supplemented by US support after the repeal of the Clark Amendment in 1985. This led to a military stalemate between the MPLA and UNITA.

However, the changing international environment, mainly precipitated by the collapse of the Soviet Union, had a decisive impact on external involvement in the Angolan conflict. The linking of the Cuban withdrawal from Angola with the withdrawal of South African forces from South West Africa/Namibia paved the way for UN-supervised elections there and opened the door to a negotiated settlement of the Angolan conflict. Angola, South Africa and Cuba signed the New York Accords in December 1988. The implementation of the accords was monitored by a small UN mission (the UN Angola Verification Mission – UNAVEM) with the Cuban withdrawal completed by May 1991.

The collapse of the Cold War order opened the way for peace negotiations between the two main parties to the conflict. However, a first meeting in Zaire between President Dos Santos and the leader of UNITA, Jonas Savimbi in June 1989 at the behest of President Mobutu Sese Seko, failed to make headway due to differing interpretations between the two parties of what a ceasefire and peace talks would entail. It was to become symptomatic of their vacillating commitment to peace and indicative of the level of distrust between both parties.

---

<sup>7</sup> Different figures are bandied about the amount of Cuban troops that were active in Angola. Most analysts agree that there were between 50 000 and 60 000 Cuban soldiers in Angola at the height of the conflict, namely by 1988.

### 2.3. Attempts and Failures at Peace: The UN Contribution

It was only with the signing of the *Acordos de Paz para Angola* on 31 May 1991 in Bicesse, the end-result of a flurry of negotiations under the auspices of US Secretary of State Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, that substantial progress was achieved. According to Cleary, the role of the third member of the troika, Portugal, was more opportunistic: 'Portugal retained the style of mediator but not its substance'. Under the Accords provision was made for:

- A ceasefire between the MPLA and UNITA;
- The quartering of UNITA troops;
- The formation of a new unified armed force;
- The demobilization of surplus troops;
- The restoration of government administration in UNITA-controlled areas; and
- Multi-party parliamentary and presidential elections.

Elections eventually took place on 29 and 30 September 1992 in relative calm, but the outcome of the election was not peace.<sup>8</sup>

| Outcome of the 1992 Presidential Elections |              |                   |                                |
|--|--------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Candidates</i>                          |              | <i>Votes</i>      | <i>% of total</i>              |
| Jose Eduardo Dos Santos, MPLA              |              | 1 953, 335        | 49.6                           |
| Jonas Malheiro Savimbi, UNITA              |              | 1 579, 298        | 40.1                           |
| Antonio Alberto Neto, PDA                  |              | 85, 249           | 2.2                            |
| Roberto Holden, FNLA                       |              | 83,135            | 2.1                            |
| Others                                     |              | 239,866           | 6.0                            |
| Total                                      |              | 3 940,883         | 100.0                          |
| Outcome of the 1992 Legislative Elections  |              |                   |                                |
| <i>Party</i>                               | <i>Votes</i> | <i>% of total</i> | <i>National Assembly Seats</i> |
| MPLA                                       | 2 124,126    | 53.74             | 129                            |
| UNITA                                      | 1 347,636    | 34.0              | 70                             |
| Others                                     | 480,503      | 12.25             | 21                             |
| Total valid votes                          | 3 952,265    | 100.0             | 220                            |
| Spoilt/Blank                               | 458,310      |                   |                                |
| Total votes                                | 4 410,575    |                   |                                |
| Registered voters                          | 4 828,468    |                   |                                |
| <i>Source: Conselho Nacional Eleitoral</i> |              |                   |                                |

<sup>8</sup> The inconclusive results of the presidential elections meant that a second round of presidential elections was required under the constitution. However, with the rejection of the results by Savimbi and the return to war the second round never took place.

Analysts provide various reasons for the failure of the Bicesse peace effort. These include:

- The inadequacy of the UN mandate and the resources allocated to the peace mission. Margeret Anstee's remarks as Head of UNAVEM II that she had been asked 'to fly a 747 with only the fuel for a DC 3' is an ironic reminder of the complete inadequacy of the UN peace mission. The realities were that UNAVEM was wholly unprepared and under-resourced for the mission. The number of peace monitors allocated for Angola reflected this situation: 'The resources assigned to (UNAVEM II) were commensurately modest: 350 unarmed military observers, 130 unarmed observers and 100 electoral observers, increased to 400 over the election period itself'<sup>9</sup>  
Angola had an estimated 5.3 million voters (4.8 million of whom were eventually registered to vote), spread over a land area of 1 246 700 square kilometers, with a complete breakdown of infrastructure. Troops under arms amounted to almost 155,000, with 38,000 under UNITA and 117,000 under the Angolan government that had to be quartered to 48 designated areas until their demobilization or integration (in the case of UNITA) into FAA;  
In comparison, the elections in Namibia, a country two thirds the size of Angola, with a well-developed infrastructure and an estimated voting population of 700,000, commanded the deployment of over 8,000 UN troops and monitors, namely 4,650 military personnel, 1,700 election supervisors and 1,500 police monitors. Internal elections had been held before in 1978 and 1980 respectively;<sup>10</sup>
- The timeframe allocated for the implementation of the peace process was unrealistic, namely between 15 – 18 months. The decision to proceed thus was a result of pressure by the mediator and observers (Portugal, the US and the Soviet Union) and was mainly driven by interests of negotiating efficiency and economy. This proved to be one of the root causes of the collapse of the peace process;
- The Bicesse Accords also failed to make elections conditional on the successful completion of the military provisions of the accords. The symbolic integration of the new national *Forças Armadas Angolanas* (FAA) just two days before the elections, reflected the inadequacy of this approach. Both parties had retained a substantial part of their forces and had in fact begun rearming them;
- Hodges (2001) points out that there was no requirement for powersharing in the Accords thus enforcing a 'winner-takes-all' outcome in Angola. To this could be added that UNAVEM II failed miserably in responding to reports of gross violations of the spirit of the Accord by both parties in the run-up to the elections. Both UNITA and the MPLA acted with impunity. The failure of the UN Mission to respond to this not only sidelined the organization in the overall process, it also cemented the perception that the organization was unwilling or unable to fulfill the task of objective broker in the process. This was especially the case after the UN refused to respond to allegations by most of the opposition parties of large-scale election fraud.

---

<sup>9</sup> Washington Post, Letters, 10 June 1993.

<sup>10</sup> The disastrous outcome of the peace process in Angola motivated the UN Secretary General to send 7500 UN personnel to Mozambique to oversee the peace process there. Mozambique had 8 million potential voters and is about two-thirds the size of Angola. Infrastructure was in the same derelict state as that of Angola.

The UN emerged not only largely distrusted by both parties, but also hugely discredited in the eyes of the ordinary Angolan population.

By October 1992 civil war had broken out on a scale and with a ferocity not seen before in Angola. The UN estimated that 300,000 Angolans died during this phase of the conflict (1992 – 1994).<sup>11</sup> Initially UNITA gained the upper hand and managed to take several cities in 1992 – 1993. The movement also managed to exert its control over the diamond-rich areas of Angola.

However, the attack on the oil operations in Soyo in 1993 by UNITA forces prompted the Angolan government to employ a South African ‘security’ company, Executive Outcomes, to assist in defending Soyo. The deployment of Executive Outcomes had a significant impact on the conflict and tipped the scales in favour of FAA. Not only was the Angolan government able to consolidate its control over most of the provincial cities, but the introduction of sanctions against UNITA by the UN on 15 September 1993, banning the sale of arms and fuel to UNITA, began to have effect.

| UN Sanctions against UNITA           |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| UNSC Resolution 864 of 15 Sept 1993  | Banning the sale of arms and fuel to UNITA   |
| UNSC Resolution 1127 of 28 Aug 1997  | Travel restrictions on senior UNITA officials, closing of UNITA foreign offices, flight restrictions on all aircraft to UNITA-controlled areas |
| UNSC Resolution 1173 of 12 June 1998 | Restricting purchase of diamonds sourced from UNITA-controlled areas and freezing of UNITA bank accounts                                       |

This pressure led to the signing of a new peace agreement in Lusaka, Zambia, on 20 November 1994, the Lusaka Protocol. The new agreement attempted to address some of the loopholes in the Bicesse Accords and included innovations related to greater power-sharing between the parties, the postponement of elections until the military situation had been resolved, (which in effect meant a unilateral and unconditional ceasefire and downing of weapons by UNITA), the handing over of UNITA-controlled administrative areas to the government, and the dispatch of a much strengthened UN peace-keeping force of 7,000 troops to Angola under UNAVEM III.

However, procrastination on both sides, encouraged by a misguided policy of appeasement by the UN, led to a repeat of the failure of the Bicesse Accords. UNITA used the lull in conflict to regroup and rearm its forces, and when it could not consolidate any substantial political gains and assurances in its own view – especially related to the personal security of Savimbi, it resorted to a gradual increase in military offensives. By June 1997, the UN had scaled down its presence in Angola substantially and remained in Angola under the auspices of a much-reduced peacekeeping mission, the UN Observer Mission in Angola (MONUA) with only 1,500 troops.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The journalist Judith Matloff provides an incisive overview of the disastrous consequences of the resumption of the Angolan conflict in her book *Fragments of a Forgotten War*, 1997.

<sup>12</sup> Please note the Human Rights Watch Report, *Angola Unravels: The Rise and Fall of the Lusaka Peace Process*, New York, September 1999 for a comprehensive overview of the failure of the UNAVEM III mission in Angola and meticulous documentation of UNITA and MPLA transgressions of the Lusaka Protocol, as well as the ambivalent role played by the Troika members and other external actors.

The remarks by Abel Chivukuvuku, the former UNITA spokesperson on foreign affairs and now independent Member of Parliament, are telling about the failure of the Lusaka Protocol to provide a sustainable framework for peace.<sup>13</sup>

- Firstly, that the concepts of powersharing and national reconciliation encapsulated in the agreement remained focused on reconciling the interests of elites without redressing the imbalances between the different regions with respect to power and resources;
- Secondly, that the nature of powersharing envisaged by the MPLA government was perceived as superficial by UNITA leading to its rejection of the Protocol;
- Thirdly, that UNITA's rejection of the Protocol due to its narrow self-interest (UNITA for example wanted to maintain control of some of the diamond-rich areas) led to its missing a historic opportunity to move the conflict beyond its stalemate and to correct some of the deficiencies of the Protocol from within.<sup>14</sup>

By the end of 1998 the peace process was in crisis, with the Angolan government calling for the withdrawal of MONUA from Angola because it believed it to be 'pro-UNITA'. The UN Security Council had to accede to this request despite the misgivings expressed by the UN Africa Group and other members of the Security Council.<sup>15</sup> However, the precarious and uncertain security position that MONUA found itself in - as illustrated by the downing of two UN chartered humanitarian aircraft on 26 December 1998 and 2 January 1999 and the harassment of several humanitarian organizations by members of FAA, UNITA and unidentified bandits - contributed to this decision. At the same time the UN was subjected to an emotional media campaign, orchestrated by the Angolan government, blaming the United Nations and MONUA for the failure of the Lusaka Protocol.<sup>16</sup>

MONUA began withdrawing from Angola in February 1999 and the UN political presence was eventually scaled down to only 30 members. The political mandate of the new United Nations Office of Angola (UNOA) was limited purely to human rights education and training - with no peacekeeping role. This compromise was achieved only after lengthy and protracted negotiations between the Angolan government and the UN.

Mussagy Jeichande, the UN special representative to Angola, eventually arrived in Luanda on 29 September 2000 to a cool official reception. Dos Santos refused to receive the representative for well over a month. At the same time the Angolan government publicly questioned the authority of Jeichande, prompting the UN to issue a statement that the head of the UNOA office, and not the head

---

<sup>13</sup> Address at the South African Institute of International Affairs on Conflict resolution and Peace-building in Africa, Johannesburg, 13 September 2001.

<sup>14</sup> Some observers argue that had UNITA accepted the 1992 election results and taken its seats in parliament, the democratic ousting of the MPLA government - due to its large-scale corruption and bureaucratic ineptitude - would have followed at the next elections.

<sup>15</sup> Musifiky Mwanasali, an expert on African issues at the International Peace Academy in New York noted that he was in agreement with the UN African Group of Ambassadors that it was necessary for the UN to stay in Angola because of the grave consequences of a UN withdrawal for the population. See Experts insist UN must remain in Angolan Pan African News Agency, 26 January 1999 and Angola: Dos Santos calls for withdrawal of UN Mission, Pan African News Agency, 17 January 1999.

<sup>16</sup> See UN Security Council Press Release, SC/6630: *Security Council, Alarmed by Deteriorating Situation in Angola Stresses Importance of Continued UN Presence*, 21 January 1999 and *United Nations to Decide on its Peacekeeping Role as Conflict Continues in Angola*, UN Department of Public Information, 17 December 1998.

of the UNDP and OCHA offices, was the highest representative of the Secretary General in Angola.<sup>17</sup> UNOA has since toed the political line in Angola, taking care not to antagonise the MPLA government.

## 2.4. Developments Since 1998

As previously in 1992 – 1993, UNITA initially made several conventional warfare gains against the MPLA after the resumption of war in 1998. However, by the end of 1999 the Angolan government managed to recapture several cities. UNITA was also successfully removed from its stronghold in Bailundo and Andulo and from most of the diamond-rich areas it controlled.

UNITA's inability to maintain control over the cities it had captured should be considered against the backdrop of the operational and logistical difficulties it experienced in sustaining the use of heavy armaments and artillery, and especially, its inability to secure a constant flow of fuel, supplies and arms to its troops. The presence of huge concentrations of UNITA troops also meant that UNITA became easy targets for FAA who had by this time managed to rearm substantially and had embarked on a full-scale conventional war and sustained and indiscriminate air attacks against UNITA-held territories. UNITA accepted that it had made a costly and possibly fatal tactical mistake (as borne out by the death of Savimbi) in pursuing a conventional warfare strategy and was forced to return to its long-tested, traditional guerrilla tactics.<sup>18</sup>

Despite various indications at the beginning of 2000 that UNITA might have been willing to return to the negotiating table due to the impact of sanctions and the 'gains' made by the government, the military stalemate continued with no conclusive victory on either side, although the MPLA government announced several times that UNITA was a spent force and that military victory was imminent.

By the end of 2000, President José Eduardo dos Santos was confident enough of imminent victory to make a surprise announcement in his 2000 year-end address that the Angolan government would begin to develop plans for the holding of general elections in the second half of 2002,<sup>19</sup> so sure was he that the UNITA military threat would be completely eliminated. It took another year for the FAA to succeed against Savimbi. Elections with any legitimacy now seem possible only in late 2003, but more likely in 2004.<sup>20</sup>

Efforts by the UN to find a peaceful solution to the Angolan conflict continued in 2001, with mixed results. From a UN perspective, the most significant development has been the endorsement by the Angolan government to Ibrahim Gambari in December 2001 that the UN 'may' pursue a more proactive role in the Angolan peace process.<sup>21</sup> Despite reservations expressed by the MPLA about direct contact between the UN and, at the time, Savimbi (as a matter for further consideration), the MPLA government stated that it would not object to a role for the church in facilitating contacts with

<sup>17</sup> Please note 'Pretence of Normality', *Africa Confidential*, Vol 41, No 24, 6 December 2000.

<sup>18</sup> Interview with Hannelie de Beer, SaferAfrica, Pretoria, 14 November 2001 and Jakkie Potgieter, SaferAfrica, Pretoria, December 2001.

<sup>19</sup> See *O Pensador Newsletters*, Embassy of Angola, Washington D.C., 24 January 2001.

<sup>20</sup> This is especially the case in view of the general organisational and political disarray that UNITA finds itself in after the death of Savimbi and the absence of a clear successor in his place.

<sup>21</sup> Security council 4444th Meeting, Opinion emerging for more active United Nations Role in the Angola peace process, says Under-Secretary-General, during briefing of Security Council, SC/7250, 21 December 2001.

UNITA. The government also expressed the wish for UN assistance in the joint management of the Fund for Peace and Reconciliation (directed at UNITA-combatants to down their arms); pilot projects for demobilized soldiers; assistance with the electoral process and the resettlement of IDPs.

This shift in official policy towards a UN role in the Angolan peace process deserves closer scrutiny - especially, in view of the traditional scepticism with which the UN has been viewed by the Angolan government.

By agreeing to a facilitating role by the churches through the UN, the Angolan government has achieved two objectives.

- Firstly, it has managed to absolve itself of any responsibility in driving the Angolan peace process forward. Thus, as in the case of the Bicesse Accords and the Lusaka Protocol, the pursuit of peace might potentially degenerate once again into a UN-'driven' process if the commitment of the main parties is questionable. The UN should thus consider its future role in the peace process with great care;
- Secondly, the Angolan government has managed, by granting a facilitating role to the churches, to counter the growing demands by civil society for an immediate ceasefire and negotiations between the MPLA and UNITA on a much broader, participatory platform.<sup>22</sup>

Although there seemed to be small glimmers of hope at the end of 2001 that progress was possible with regard to the resumption of peace negotiations, any pronouncements by the Angolan government on the issue of negotiations with UNITA needs to be viewed with some circumspection. The statement by President Dos Santos during the first meeting of the SADC Organ for Politics, Defence and Security in Luanda on 18 December 2001 (*after* the UN Under Secretary General's visit to Angola) illustrates this point aptly.

He said in his opening statement that 'the Angolan government wants to find a solution to attain peace, based on the Lusaka Protocol and considers that there are three [sic] possible scenarios for the evolution of the process.

- In keeping with the Lusaka Protocol Mr Savimbi and his forces will voluntarily:
  - Cease all military and terrorist actions;
  - Surrender all their weapons and military equipment to the UN or proceed to destroy them;
  - Demobilise all their troops;
  - The sovereign organizations in the Angolan state will define the situation after that.
- The military and terrorist actions continue and he is captured in combat by our forces and delivered to justice;
- Death in combat, Savimbi himself assumes this responsibility given he does not accept peace.'

---

<sup>22</sup> During the visit of Ibrahim Gambari to Angola in December 2001 civil society presented him with a statement arguing that the 1994 Lusaka Protocol that the Angolan government sees as the key to peace is not sufficient to ensure a lasting settlement in Angola. The statement read 'The Lusaka Protocol is a base, but it cannot continue to be a graveyard for innocent Angolans, while the signatories of the protocol continue to use it for their own benefit. The whole of society, including non-governmental organisations, churches, traditional authorities and organized civil society, should also be involved, so that an effective peace can quickly become a reality in our country.' See 'Demands for an Immediate Ceasefire', UN Integrated Regional Information Networks, 14 December 2001.

This statement suggests that unbridled optimism about the willingness of the MPLA to compromise on how peace is achieved, is premature. This is borne out by the conduct of the Angolan government after the death of Savimbi. There was no clear sense of urgency emerging from the government side that the attainment of peace in Angola was a priority issue. Instead it seems bent on complete destruction of UNITA, irrespective of the costs to the Angolan population and despite the announcement of a possible ceasefire in March 2002.

The above historical overview of the conflict suggests that if the achievement of peace is left entirely to the two main belligerents in the conflict, the chances of arriving at national reconciliation and peace are slim.

The political solutions thus far offered have not achieved the middle ground that is required to address the underlying causes of the conflict. It is, therefore, time to look elsewhere for a solution to the Angolan conflict. (See Annex 1, for a further elaboration of the causes of the Angolan conflict.)

### III. Political War Economy<sup>23</sup>

#### 3.1. Introduction

It is one of the great ironies of the Angolan conflict that a country so richly endowed with mineral wealth (the second largest oil producer after Nigeria on the African continent and the fourth largest diamond producer in the world) and with immense agricultural potential, has the second highest child mortality rate in the world, is ranked the 15th most underdeveloped country in the world with a commensurate breakdown in social service delivery, infrastructure development and education, has 4.1 million (33%) of its population displaced,<sup>24</sup> 9 million out of 13 million people living on less than a dollar a day - and an estimated debt burden of US \$11 billion, which has been accumulated mostly since 1990 to service the MPLA war effort. These alarming conditions are not only the result of 40 years of almost continuous war, but have been exacerbated by gross mismanagement of the economy and endemic corruption within the political elite in Luanda.

However, the economic quagmire in which Angola finds itself becomes most apparent when, as noted by Le Billion (2001), it is taken into account that 'While oil and diamond revenues have captured the attention of commentators as symbols of wealth starkly contrasting with the misery of Angolans, their combined revenues would not generate more than US \$500 in per capita annual income – no more than the Sub-Saharan average.'<sup>25</sup> However, Angola's potential to prosper if the conflict is resolved peacefully is directly related to its wealth in resources. The potential benefits that could accrue to the rest of the Angolan economy far outweigh the potential of a range of Sub-Saharan countries.<sup>26</sup>

The importance of oil and diamonds in providing the resources to sustain the Angolan conflict have not decreased with the decline of illicit diamond generated revenue for UNITA due to sanctions and better international controls on the origin of diamonds. In fact it has upped the stakes considerably between the two parties. The MPLA's income from Angola's enclave oil economy has maintained its high level, despite the seasonal decline in oil prices, achieving US \$3.3 billion in 1998 in comparison with an estimated US \$ 200 million in diamond generated revenue for UNITA during the same year. Thus the revenue generated in one year by the Angolan government tops the total amount generated by

<sup>23</sup> This section should be read in conjunction with Working Paper 10, *The 'Middle Men': War Supply Networks in Sierra Leone and Angola* by Mark Shaw and only briefly touches on some of the latest developments (see [www.clingendael.nl/cru](http://www.clingendael.nl/cru)). Further reading suggested: Cilliers, *et. al*, op. cit. and Hodges, *op cit*.

<sup>24</sup> The figure of 33 per cent of the Angolan population displaced is the highest in the world. Noted by Kishore Mahbubani, representative from Singapore at the 4444th Annual Meeting of the Security Council. Please see *Opinion Emerging for More Active United Nations Role in Angola Peace Process Says Under-Secretary General, During Briefing of Security Council, SC/7250*, 21 December 2001.

<sup>25</sup> See Le Billion, P. 'Angola's Political Economy of War: the role of oil and diamonds (1973 – 2000)' in *African Affairs*, Vol 100, 2001. p. 57

<sup>26</sup> The author wishes to thank Pyt Douma for the elaboration of this point.

UNITA from 1992 -1998.<sup>27</sup> This disparity is predicted to increase, as Angola should be able to increase its oil revenues to around US \$12 billion by the year 2005 if all the current projects come on line. UNITA's revenue from diamonds, in contrast, is down to approximately US \$100 million in 2000 – however, it is quite sufficient for their current strategy of guerrilla warfare.

### 3.2. Oil, Diamonds and War

The oil sector is the single most important and largest contributor to state revenue and represents 87 per cent of the country's total income. Angola's oil production accounts for more than 40 percent of Angola's gross domestic product (GDP), between 70 – 90 per cent of government revenues from 1994 – 1999 and between 85 - 92 percent of all Angolan exports, according to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Angola ranks third in new oil discoveries and as a result a further \$US 18 billion in oil investment has been planned for implementation by 2004.<sup>28</sup> The latest developments with regard to the oil sector are closely linked to the beginning of a Staff Monitored Programme (SMP) between IMF and the Angolan government on 3 April 2000. Linked to the SMP is a provision to monitor oil revenues in the form of an Oil Diagnostic programme, the first report of which was originally due in April 2001 but has been delayed. Although the 'Oil Diagnostic' does not measure what happens to oil revenue after it has been deposited in the Central Bank, the step was welcomed by Human Rights Watch as a 'limited, but positive first step toward promoting transparency, accountability and good governance in Angola and, ultimately, greater respect for human rights.'<sup>29</sup>

The IMF estimates that defence spending averaged 34.6 per cent of government expenditure from 1995 – 1999, reaching its highest level in 1999 (41 per cent of expenditure – linked to the resumption of the civil war after the collapse of the Lusaka Peace Accord in 1999). As such it represents the government's single largest expenditure. However, there is a great lack of transparency about government defence expenditure, with the IMF estimating that only 18.1 per cent of expenditure was actually recorded by the government from 1997 –98, whereas the actual expenditure amounted to 40 per cent. Most payments for weapons bypassed the Ministry of Finance and Central Bank and were made directly through the state company Sonangol<sup>30</sup> and the Presidency.

According to Global Witness, economists and analysts involved with the 'Oil Diagnostic' have uncovered that an estimated US\$ 1.5 billion in oil revenues, over one third of Angola's US\$ 3 – 5 billion income, went missing in 2000. The funds seem to disappear between the state oil company Sonangol, the Treasury and the Presidency.<sup>31</sup> The amount was corroborated by a study done by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), which compared the 2000 estimated oil tax revenue stated by the

<sup>27</sup> See Reno, W. 'The real (war) economy of Angola' in Cilliers, *et. al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

<sup>28</sup> Press Release: Angola Oil and Gas Exhibition 2002, Ministry of Petroleum, Angola, 6 December 2001; Human Rights Watch Report 2000, *Angola*, <http://www.hrw.org/> & 'Shell Digs for Black Gold in Rich Fields of Angola', *Business Day*, 20 November 2001.

<sup>29</sup> See Human Rights Watch Press Release, *The Oil Diagnostic in Angola: An Update*, March 2001.

<sup>30</sup> Sonangol, the *Sociedade Nacional de Combustiveis de Angola*, is the sole concessionaire for oil exploration and production in the country, is 100 % owned by the state and serves as the business arm of the government in petroleum related activities. It has been extensively used by the state to obtain oil-backed loans the shore up the economy and the purchase arms.

<sup>31</sup> Please note Global Witness press release, 'Financial Analysts reveal Government's Secret – Where are the 'Missing Billions'?', 13 December 2001.

Finance Ministry with the Petroleum Ministry's figures and found a similar discrepancy of US\$ 1.5 billion.<sup>32</sup>

Angola agreed to the SMP due to its crippling foreign debt<sup>33</sup> and the fact that most of its future oil revenue has to be mortgaged in expensive short-term oil-backed loans, typically for less than two years at a rate of 2 – 4 per cent of the benchmark Libor rate.<sup>34</sup> Access to World Bank and IMF loans would ease pressure on the Angolan government significantly. The latest revelations have increased international criticism that the government is not doing enough to support desperate humanitarian efforts to provide basic food and medical assistance to the Angolan population.<sup>35</sup>

Therefore, for UNITA the implications are of great significance, as it is clear that the Angolan government has the means to sustain its war effort against UNITA indefinitely.

As important as oil is for the MPLA war campaign diamonds are for UNITA. Revenue generated from the illicit trade in diamonds has largely been used to buy arms. Angola watchers have different opinions about the impact of sanctions on UNITA's ability to find buyers for its diamonds or source diamonds. Some argue that it is rather the military offensive against UNITA and the sanctions related to its supply lines and freedom of movement that have impacted most on UNITA's war tactics, rather than the diamond sanctions. In fact, it is claimed that a significant number of 'UNITA' diamonds are sold through official channels via Ascorp<sup>36</sup> (Angola Selling Corporation), established in 2000 to boost state revenue and provide tighter monitoring of potential access points to UNITA diamonds. The combination of a relatively difficult selling environment combined with the capture of several of the diamond-rich areas by government troops are the most significant factors having an impact on UNITA's sources of revenue.

Although progress has been made in the Kimberly process in terms of developing an international certification system for diamonds, it remains notoriously difficult to determine the origin of rough diamonds and impossible to determine the origin of cut diamonds. The Kimberly process is directed at developing greater internal control amongst signatories to the treaty. The process advocated and adopted is the development of a standardised traceable paper trail of each parcel of rough and cut diamonds that is exported and imported. The process is premised on the basis that every exporting and importing country will adopt transparent measures that ensure a traceable record of all legitimate diamonds from the moment of exploitation to refining and the final point of sale.<sup>37</sup> However, beyond the loopholes in the international system - the least of which are the unwillingness of some countries to release basic statistics regarding diamond imports and exports and the technical barriers in determining the origin of diamonds - are the loopholes in Angola. They relate to vagaries in the internal registration system in Angola; the propensity to corruption and collusion between UNITA and FAA forces on the ground in the exploitation of diamonds; the involvement of informal diggers (with no clear distinction who they are working for); the weak infrastructure, control and access to the isolated diamond areas; and the porousness of the Angolan-Zambian border. This makes it notoriously

<sup>32</sup> 'Billions Missing from Angolan Revenues Study', *Reuters*, 12 December 2001.

<sup>33</sup> Mostly to the former Soviet Union (now Russia) for arms purchases to fight UNITA.

<sup>34</sup> The Libor rate refers to the London Interbank Exchange Rate. A significant proportion of the overall national budget, between 10% and 20% over the last five years, is used to service debt.

<sup>35</sup> International humanitarian organizations expect a shortfall of least US \$200 million for 2002 in its international donor appeal.

<sup>36</sup> Ascorp is now the sole licensed diamond consortium in Angola.

<sup>37</sup> The author wishes to acknowledge inputs from Pyt Douma in the above regard.

difficult to follow the diamond trail in Angola. Although UNITA's source of revenue has thus been significantly compromised, revenue obtained from diamonds is still sufficient to finance the current UNITA guerrilla campaign adequately.

## IV. Recent Trends

### 4.1. UNITA: A Return to Guerrilla Warfare and a Change of Tactics

The imposition of UN sanctions against UNITA has had a decisive impact on the movement's ability to source supplies to support its war effort in Angola. The most significant impact has been in terms of the war strategy that UNITA has developed. It has reverted back to its traditional guerrilla warfare tactics with high-profile targets specifically selected:

- to remain in the international consciousness as a force to be reckoned with<sup>38</sup> and to illustrate that UNITA has the capacity to strike at will in any part of the country;
- to intimidate the Angolan population in ensuring compliance with UNITA requirements related to food and fuel;
- to pressurize the MPLA government to concede to UNITA demands<sup>39</sup> and to discredit and disrupt the MPLA's ability to provide basic security and social services to the Angolan population, also in the urban centres; and
- to stretch the capacity of the FAA to the limit by ensuring a wide deployment of the Angolan forces in every part of Angola with its resultant implications for costly supply lines. (The result has been that FAA forces are either paid late or not at all and resort to banditry; intimidation of the local population to supply food and supplies; and bilateral arrangements with UNITA forces on the ground, often at commander level/and or higher to ensure access to supplies in the regions that they control).

UNITA launched an attack on three power transformers just outside Luanda on 25 September 2001, plunging parts of the capital into darkness. This was combined with an attack on government positions close to Luanda, seizing huge amounts of armaments and leaving 23 FAA troops dead. Analysts interpreted the attack, the closest to Luanda in years, as an attempt 'to force government troops to ease pressure on UNITA's operational zones, especially in the Moxico province on the border of Zambia.'<sup>40</sup> However, it also conveyed the chilling message that UNITA has the capacity to initiate an urban terror campaign.

---

<sup>38</sup> The attack by UNITA on Caxito, only 60 km from Luanda in May 2001 coincided with the visit of UN Special representative Ibrahim Gambari to Angola to discuss ways of taking the process forward. The attack by UNITA on a train near Zenza do Itombe, in Kwanza Norte Province similarly coincided with a visit by the US State Department investigating the viability of elections, see Angola IRIN Review of 2001, 18 December 2001.

<sup>39</sup> Herman Hanekom, an Angola analyst at the Africa Institute in Pretoria commented on an attack by UNITA on Luanda on 25 September 2001 that 'The idea is to bring discomfort to the people of Luanda, and UNITA hopes that in so doing, it will cut off government support and force the government to talks.' See McClelland, C. 'Weakened UNITA Rebels Turn to Hit-and-Run', *Business Day*, 27 September 2001.

<sup>40</sup> McClelland, *op. cit.*

UNITA's selection of its targets is thus motivated by the objective of ensuring maximum impact, while circumventing the logistical and operational constraints under which it operates. UNITA stated on 8 October 2001 in a public communiqué that it considers the following as legitimate targets:<sup>41</sup>

- Any locality that is protected by the Angolan government's Civil Militia Forces (ODC), the National Police, Mobile Police Detachments (DEMOP), the Rapid Intervention Police (PIR), the Angolan Armed Forces (FAA) and any other units linked to the state security structures of the Government;
- All military logistical supply lines.

However, the change from semi-conventional warfare to guerrilla warfare is not without its complications. UNITA has *not* managed to obtain the same level of support that it enjoyed previously from the population in the regions that it traditionally controlled. The reasons for this vary:

- Lack of capacity to provide social services to the community (education, clinics, etc.) as it had done during the heyday of the movement - namely when it enjoyed substantial support from sections of the international community and had access to a steady and large supply of revenue guaranteed through its control of the diamond areas. This has meant that UNITA has had to resort to pillaging villages for food and supplies. It has also brutally enforced recruitment of troops, porters, women and children in support of its military activities;
- The conventional strategy that UNITA followed in 1993-94 and again in 1998 in taking and controlling urban centers, either through besieging the cities or virtually cutting them off from any international humanitarian support and only abandoning them after constant, sustained and indiscriminate aerial bombardments by FAA (over several months in some cases), has had huge costs for the civilian population and has sapped their sympathy;
- Fear of revenge reprisals by the FAA and the MPLA. Human Rights Watch has documented several instances where FAA forces had pillaged areas traditionally considered UNITA areas, after UNITA had abandoned these areas. At the same time, the Angolan government has embarked on a large-scale military offensive 'of moving people from their areas of origin, to deny UNITA food and recruits'. This has led to the rapid increase in IDPs in Angola of 4.1 million.<sup>42</sup> Media reports have indicated that not all these movements have proceeded voluntarily as stated in interviews with the IDPs; and humanitarian organizations reporting that 'there is evidence that the army is carrying out a scorched earth campaign, often forcibly evacuating the peasant population in its attempts to cut off the rebels' food sources';<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> See UNITA Communiqué N.11/C.P.C.P.-UNITA/2001 of 8 October 2001 on <http://www.kwacha.org/>. The press release was issued after the Angolan government claimed that UNITA had attacked a chapel in Kwanza-Norte province. It also relates to an attack on a train near Zenzo do Itombe in Kwanza Norte Province with UNITA refuting that it was a passenger train, instead claiming that it was a supply train to the MPLA. About 200 people died during this incident.

<sup>42</sup> See briefing by Ibrahim Gambari, Under-Secretary-General and Special Advisor of the Secretary-General for Special Assignment in Africa to the UN Security Council annual meeting on 21 December 2001.

<sup>43</sup> Interview with Justin Perce, BBC Correspondent on 18 January 2002 and see also IRIN Angola Review of 2001, 18 December 2001.

- The loose command structure that UNITA has adopted in view of its guerrilla strategy has often meant that the discipline of UNITA units is sometimes questionable, with UNITA admitting that the hostage-taking of 60 children from an orphanage in Caxito had been a mistake;<sup>44</sup>
- Lastly, the relatively brief reprieves from conflict in 1991-92 and again 1994 - 1997 has cemented the desire for peace among the population. Angolans have grown tired of war and are increasingly questioning the imperatives for war, despite ethnic, clan, tribal and political/ideological sympathies.

Commentators regard the guerrilla war strategy by UNITA as an indication of the decline of UNITA's military strength. 'This is a classic phase (in a rebel group) when power is reduced. You sow terror and instability with a minimum amount of force without taking on military targets.'<sup>45</sup> The MPLA government argued in 2001 that it had reduced UNITA's fighting force from 40,000 to 8,000, although UNITA observers suggest that UNITA still has more than 30,000 highly disciplined troops and is constantly recruiting and training soldiers – mostly through force.<sup>46</sup>

Some believe that UNITA has not been this weak militarily since the 1970's<sup>47</sup> especially since the deaths of Savimbi and possibly of his successor, the UNITA Vice-President, General Antonio Dembo. It is still too soon to judge whether the MPLA's recent successes and the apparent disarray that it has created in the armed wing of UNITA, are indicative of a possible petering out of the military campaign of UNITA. The continued, sporadic military action by UNITA forces suggests that the rebel movement is still sufficiently intact to launch attacks, whereas the continuance of the FAA campaign prior to the announcement of a ceasefire on 13 March 2002 suggested that the MPLA had not discounted UNITA as a military threat.

At a political level UNITA has continued its calls for the lifting of sanctions against the movement and for negotiations - although it has steadfastly refused to negotiate within the framework of the Lusaka Protocol, which it considers skewed in favour of the MPLA. The international restrictions on the movement of senior UNITA personnel and the formal closing of UNITA offices have especially hampered its ability to garner international support.

It remains to be seen how much regional sympathy in Sub-Saharan Africa remains for UNITA after the death of its leader. However, the old supply lines, mainly by road (through Zambia) or in some cases still by air, that Savimbi had consolidated, still remain.<sup>48</sup> UNITA's mobility; collusion and support from local communities (either voluntarily or through extreme coercion and intimidation); linkages with regional networks based on familial, tribal and clan ties - especially in Zambia); the over-abundance of weaponry in Angola; collusion between FAA and UNITA forces on the ground in terms of control and access to areas; the lack of infrastructure and an absence of communications; provide a fertile breeding ground for the continuance of the current UNITA war effort. It is entirely

---

<sup>44</sup> IRIN Angola Review of 2001, *op. cit.*

<sup>45</sup> McClelland, *op. cit.*

<sup>46</sup> 'Who blinks first?' in *Africa Confidential*, Vol 42, No 11, 1 June 2001.

<sup>47</sup> 'Later rather than sooner' in *Africa Confidential*, Vol 42, No 24, 7 December 2001.

<sup>48</sup> Interview with Jakkie Potgieter, SaferAfrica in January 2002 who related an instance where supply trucks to UNITA were monitored entering Angola through Zambia and who pointed out that the current level of aerial surveillance of Angola, allows planes to fly with relative ease under the radar umbrella into the territory.

feasible that the conflict could continue, through the low-intensity guerrilla tactics that have helped UNITA to survive through most of its existence.

Indeed, most Western analysts have assumed that only the decisive and forcible removal of one of the two main protagonists, i.e. Eduardo Dos Santos, but preferably Jonas Savimbi, would bring about a positive outcome to the social, political and economic challenges facing Angola and would end the current conflict. A recent study on civil wars from 1945 – 1993, revealed that 76 per cent of civil or internal conflicts have usually ended when one side had decisively gained the upper hand.<sup>49</sup> However, Rafael Marques, a prominent Angolan human rights activist, pointed out that the death of Savimbi has not been the reconciling event it was expected to be.<sup>50</sup>

In fact, the possibility exists that Savimbi's death could result in the growth of many 'smaller' Savimbis to fill the void created by his absence and the deterioration of the current conflict into a political turf struggle around the powerful generals on both sides of the political divide. Such a scenario would not necessarily be clothed in a political or ethnic divide, but would represent the clear underlying motivations for the continuance of war as a business. This would be far more detrimental to movements towards peace.

Indeed, the situation is ripe for an increase in organized banditry and the emergence of several smaller warlords, especially in view of the abundance of weapons, the weakness of state structures (which encourages illicit activity), the complete neglect of the hinterland and its population, and the fact that troops from both sides are often left to their own devices for survival. Warlordism, as exemplified by a 1992-95 'Somalia' type scenario, is undeniably the worst possible scenario for Angola and its people.

In addition, there is a clear danger that the Angolan conflict, which has already taken on a more regional profile (Dos Santos' involvement in the DRC aimed to deny UNITA its supply lines running through that country), could widen (specifically pulling in Namibia, Angola, Zambia and possibly the DRC and Zimbabwe) in view of the porousness of national borders and the ethnic and tribal associations linked with sympathies between political elites as in the case of the Great Lakes conflict.

Thus the announcement by the Angolan government on 13 March 2002 that it would pursuing a ceasefire and intends to engage in talks with UNITA commanders in the bush and with UNITA *Renovado* members in Luanda, is to be welcomed. However, the situation remains highly fluid: no clear leader has emerged from the armed wing of UNITA (UNITA in the bush). In addition, any attempt at sustainable peace will have to include negotiations with the political wing of UNITA. The government has conveniently left them out of the most recent announcement. Being seen to negotiate with UNITA-*Renovado* may on one level provide some legitimacy to the process; the fact remains, however, that UNITA *Renovado* is perceived by most mainstream UNITA members as 'bought over' by the MPLA. Moreover, the offer for peace talks has been once again couched within the context of the Lusaka Protocol, which is rejected by the external/international wing of UNITA and UNITA *Autonome*. (See page 29 for a further elaboration of the different factions within UNITA.)

---

<sup>49</sup> Please refer to William Reno's argument in 'The real (war) economy of Angola' in Cilliers, *op. cit.* where he quotes a survey by Roy Lickfelder, 'The Consequences of Negotiated Settlements in Civil Wars, 1945 – 1993', *American Political Science Review*, Vol 89, No 3, September 1995. He noted that of the 24 per cent that were negotiated settlements approximately a half collapsed leading to a resumption of conflict.

<sup>50</sup> Remarks made at Conference on Conflict resolution in Africa, Pretoria Campus, 13 March 2002. He pointed out that there are many examples in the region where the death of a dictator or rebel leader has not led to peace, especially as exemplified by the replacement of Mobuto by Kabila in 1997.

#### 4.2. MPLA: In Search of a Military Victory and Political Legitimacy

Most observers would argue that the MPLA government has succeeded in convincing the international community that UNITA is the only party to carry the blame for the failure of peace in Angola. Indeed, successive public statements by the Troika, the United Nations, the OAU, SADC and individual states put the blame for the failure of peace squarely at the door of UNITA, and more particularly, UNITA's leader Jonas Savimbi.

The strategy developed by the MPLA government towards UNITA since the collapse of the Lusaka Protocol in 1998 has been two-pronged and has focused on isolating and destroying the movement both militarily and politically.

On a *political* level several initiatives were undertaken both internationally and nationally.

Internationally, the Angolan government initiated the international sanctions campaign against UNITA with a twofold objective:

- to cut off the Movement's supply lines (introducing an arms and fuel embargo and restricting the sale of UNITA diamonds, thus affecting its means of income); and
- to isolate it politically (by restricting the movement of senior UNITA officials, closing down of UNITA's international offices, calling on the international community to have Savimbi declared an international war criminal, and exerting military and political pressure on states in the region who are supportive of UNITA.<sup>51</sup>)

At the same time the Angolan government has deliberately engaged and disengaged with the Angolan peace process depending on its own internal agenda. By initially prohibiting any direct contact between the UN and Savimbi, and enforcing the scaling down of the UN mission in Angola, it has taken firm control of the pace of the UN process. The invitation to the Secretary General Kofi Annan to visit Angola in January 2002 is thus part of a carefully crafted strategy to ensure continued support and international legitimacy for the Angolan government's 'peace' initiatives.<sup>52</sup>

On a *national level*, the MPLA government launched a range of initiatives to isolate UNITA politically.

- First, it expelled all the UNITA deputies from the Angolan parliament in August 1999 and insisted that they should renounce Savimbi's leadership. *UNITA Renovado*, a small group of UNITA parliamentarians that renounced Savimbi, was subsequently recognised by the government as the only legitimate representatives of UNITA in parliament. The rest of the UNITA MPs were eventually allowed to return to parliament while Savimbi was declared a war criminal by the MPLA at the same time;

In effect, UNITA has been split by these government actions into three wings, namely *UNITA Renovado*, which represents the MPLA-sponsored group of UNITA parliamentarians under

<sup>51</sup> Angola for example publicly expressed reservations about Togo hosting the OAU Summit in 2000 in view of its support for UNITA. See Angola: Luanda says Togo should not host OAU Summit, UN Integrated Regional Information Network, 16 May 2000.

<sup>52</sup> See 'Angola invites Kofi Annan to visit January', *Agence France Press*, 12 December 2001. The invitation was conveyed to UN Deputy Secretary General for African Affairs, Ibrahim Gambari during his visit to Angola in December 2001.

Eugenio Manuvakola, *UNITA Autonome* under Abel Chivukuvuku, who describes himself as an independent Angolan parliamentarian, and *UNITA Savimbi or Mainstream UNITA*, the military wing of UNITA under Savimbi.<sup>53</sup> Whereas the Angolan government's actions have managed to divide UNITA ranks - thus weakening the organization - the resultant impact on the already weak and precarious legitimacy and credibility of the country's democratic institutions, has been far worse. The government has seriously undermined the independence and oversight function of the Angolan parliament and other democratic institutions. The fracture of UNITA into several factions will now also make it very difficult to ensure coherence and adherence in terms of possible peace negotiations after the death of Savimbi;

- Second, the MPLA government decided to proceed with the redrafting of the constitution and to begin preparations for elections - a further attempt to consolidate the legitimacy of the government (especially in the eyes of the international community) and to counter and appease the pro-peace movement in civil society, which has become increasingly vocal in its demands for a mutual ceasefire and negotiations between the MPLA and UNITA.

A 44-member Constitutional Commission, elected by the National Assembly according to the proportional support of each party in parliament has been established to draft the constitution. The Commission is presided over by a president nominated by the majority party and supported by four vice-presidents representing the four majority parties in Parliament. The MPLA has 25 members; UNITA has 14 members; and the PRS, FNLA, PLD, AD-Coligacao and PAJOCA have one member each.<sup>54</sup> Decisions about the constitution are arrived at through consensus and in the absence of consensus by a simple majority of 51 percent. This has the effect that decisions by the ruling party can be steamrolled through the commission without any regard for minority positions. This makes a mockery of an inclusive approach directed at achieving national reconciliation. (See Annex 2, for a list of the Constitutional Commission members.)

At the same time the government has clamped down on any hint of opposition amongst its own members and in the media - removing MPLA members perceived to be adopting a moderate tone towards UNITA, from their positions. The previous Chief of Staff of FAA, Joao de Matos, is such an example. He expressed support for a 'more gradualist approach' to UNITA and argued that FAA should adopt a 'hearts and minds' campaign in ex-UNITA areas.<sup>55</sup> This statement probably made it easy for Dos Santos to make de Matos the scapegoat in the Angolagate arms scandal with its links to the highest echelons of the Angolan elite. Dos Santos has gone further to consolidate his own position in the MPLA by merging the position of Prime Minister and President into one. The government also ordered a halt to the broadcast of the parliamentary debates citing it as too costly, but in effect ensuring that any dissent with regard to government policy is not aired.

---

<sup>53</sup> Africa Confidential identifies two additional wings of UNITA, namely *UNITA Luanda* under the leadership of Colonel Almerindo Jaka Jamba, previously the UNITA Secretary for Education and Culture. *UNITA Luanda* is loyal in principle to mainstream UNITA, but has become increasingly disaffected with Savimbi's militarism. The other wing is *UNITA International*, consisting of the former foreign representatives of UNITA, like Jardo Muekila in Washington and Brigadier Isaías Samakuva in Paris. The impact of sanctions have been severe on this group forcing many of the former UNITA senior officials abroad to abandon their political work for UNITA - at least officially. Some officials had asked for political asylum and are experiencing serious cash-flow problems. See 'Who Blinks First?' *op. cit.*

<sup>54</sup> Please see the official website of the Constitutional Commission at <http://www.comissao-constitucional.gv.ao/>.

<sup>55</sup> See 'Ciao Joao' in *Africa Confidential*, Vol 42, No 2, 26 January 2001.

On a *military level* the FAA has been involved in an all-out offensive since 1999 to drive UNITA from its traditional strongholds, to capture Savimbi and to eliminate UNITA as a fighting force. The most alarming effect of this strategy has been the impact on the rural population especially in the Central Highlands, Moxico, Huambo and Bie provinces where humanitarian organizations are reporting a scorched earth policy as mentioned above.

However, despite the military successes of FAA, the government has not succeeded in extending and consolidating its authority in these ‘newly liberated’ areas. Neither has the security situation improved substantially. Freedom of movement remains severely restricted, with FAA local commanders expecting pay-offs to secure safe transit through contested areas.

Even where the Luanda government has been able to sweep away the stranglehold of UNITA in its traditional heartland, it has not followed through with any effort to win the hearts and minds of the local population, nor is there any evidence that government efforts are under way to improve the lot of the people. The general government tardiness towards maintaining the runways,<sup>56</sup> which represent a crucial lifeline for the local population as the only means to obtain essential humanitarian assistance is wholly indicative of the Luanda approach. Therefore, very little has happened on the ground especially in terms of social services delivery to the population. This has been left largely to humanitarian organizations. The assistance rendered by the international donor community prevents a popular uprising against the government and the donor community thus becomes an active agent in aiding and abetting the conscious and deliberate government neglect of the Angolan population. The fundamental humanitarian principle to ‘do no harm’ requires urgent reassessing within the Angolan context.

Thus a military stalemate prevails in Angola despite the death of Savimbi. UNITA’s capacity to inflict damage on the Angolan infrastructure still remains uncontested, and its ability to strike at will, has not been significantly reduced. Large tracts of Angolan territory remain outside the effective control of the Angolan government. However, the government has repeatedly made claims that a great number of UNITA troops are in the process of defecting and have accepted the amnesty offered by the MPLA government for ‘all those who abandon unjust war and opt for democracy.’<sup>57</sup>

The decision by Eduardo dos Santos not to stand in the next presidential election will have substantial implications for the MPLA and the peace process. Although some observers dismiss this as

---

<sup>56</sup> Several humanitarian organizations have complained that the Angolan government is not doing enough to repair the airports and runways. More than 60 percent of food and medical supplies are brought in by air because of security concerns and the breakdown of the general infrastructure. The latest complaint has come from the World Food Programme that pointed out that the government should provide more humanitarian relief in 2002. See ‘WFP Says Angolan Government Must Do More to Help War Displaced’, *Agence France Press*, 5 December 2001.

<sup>57</sup> The Amnesty bill was first approved on 29 November 2000 by the Angolan Parliament. See ‘Pretence of Normality’, in *Africa Confidential*, Vol 41, No 24, 8 December 2000. In February 2001 the government introduced a US\$ 20 million Peace and Reconciliation Fund (Fundo para Paz e Reconciliação - Fuprena), which dispenses funds to coach UNITA members and their families away from Savimbi with some success. See ‘Talking to Jonas’, in *Africa Confidential*, Vol 42 No 9, 4 May 2001.

a ploy to pander to the recent debates in the region on the so-called ‘third termers’,<sup>58</sup> others observe that he might be willing to step down. A positive decision in this regard could provide the long-desired impetus to the Angolan peace process to move forward. In the short term, however, it is contributing to the moral authority and international legitimacy of Dos Santos.

Nevertheless, irrespective of whether Dos Santos is serious about stepping down or not, his announcement will lead to a realignment of and a jockeying for position within MPLA ranks. Already speculation is rife about who might be a possible successor, ranging from Roberto D’Almeida, presently speaker of the Angolan parliament, to Nando dos Santos, the Minister of the Interior. Joao de Matos, previously the military chief of FAA, and Lopo de Nascimento, a previous Prime Minister, are also regarded as possible candidates. Their legitimacy derives precisely from the fact that they were dismissed by Dos Santos because they were considered to be supportive of a more moderate stance towards Savimbi and UNITA.

It is undisputed that Dos Santos will have a critical role to play in the choice of a successor. Crucial to those deliberations on the candidates will be whether Dos Santos’ (and his family’s) substantial business interests and enormous personal wealth would be protected by a successor. In view of the endemic corruption attached to the persona of Dos Santos, this does not bode well for a less corrupt government in future.

#### **4.3. Angola and the Region: Seeking out Allies and Throwing Around its Weight**

The Angolan internal conflict is not only sustained by regional support systems in terms of classical political alliance-building (in some cases through clan/ethnic affiliation and marriage), but also by supply networks that have sprung up across Sub-Saharan Africa to sustain the military battle for supremacy in Angola.

Regional governments have rendered political, military and economic support to both parties at various stages in the Angolan conflict. Support to UNITA has been forthcoming at both government level and/or private/individual level from South Africa, the former Zaire, Morocco, Zambia, Togo, the Ivory Coast, Burkina Faso, Congo Brazzaville and Rwanda. Even Mozambique and Malawi have been accused by the Angolan government of rendering covert support to UNITA through the provision of access to UNITA supply aircraft from their various regional airports.

The MPLA in contrast has solicited support from Namibia and Zimbabwe and has not hesitated to intervene militarily in Congo Brazzaville where it actively assisted in toppling the democratically elected government of Pascal Lissouba. It also intervened in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) in support of Laurent Kabila.

---

<sup>58</sup> The debate on third-termers refer to political leaders in sub-Saharan Africa who are attempting to prolong their stay beyond the constitutional limits on their terms in office. Within the context of developments in SADC in 2001, Frederick Chiluba of Zambia attempted to seek a third term but was successfully dissuaded after large scale public protests in Zambia, Bakili Muluzi of Malawi announced that he would not seek a third term as has Joachim Chissano of Mozambique. (However, both leaders have since qualified their positions that should the ‘people’ request a continuance of their service in public office, this might warrant reconsideration of their position. Robert Mugabe, in contrast, has not bothered to indulge in these semantics and is seeking a further term at whatever cost to Zimbabwe or the region.)

#### 4.3.1. Zambia

Relations with Zambia have been particularly precarious with allegations of an Angolan supported failed coup attempt in October 1997 against the government of Frederick Chiluba. The Angolan ambassador to Zambia at the time, Augusto Emanuelle, warned that:

‘Zambian territory is being used in many ways by people who support UNITA ... to supply arms to UNITA, and some Zambian citizens are involved in this. We are very concerned that now the supply of arms to UNITA is mainly by road and that we are not yet seeing the results of any measures by the Zambian authorities to stop this.’<sup>59</sup>

On the same occasion the Angolan ambassador issued a warning that ‘we do not want what happened in Congo Brazzaville and the former Zaire to happen in Zambia.’

The borders between Zambia and Angola are long, porous and unpoliced. Angolan communities supportive of UNITA have long found refuge in Zambia's Western Province and trade between UNITA and Zambian business people, has been tolerated by the Zambian government for more than 20 years. The UN Experts Panel on sanctions named Xacier Chungu, the Director General of the Zambia's Intelligence Service, as having regular contact with UNITA, and indeed there are personal and business links going up to the highest level in Zambia.

Although the Angolan, Zambian and Namibian governments set up a tripartite Mechanism for Political Security Cooperation between the three countries in February 2001, border problems have continued. Relations remain strained, especially because of the fact that Angolan forces do not hesitate to cross the Zambian border in hot pursuit of UNITA rebels. Several incidents have been reported along the Zambian border where Zambian citizens have become embroiled in the crossfire and have suffered fatalities. A recent incident in November 2001 reportedly entailed abductions and military action by Angolan military forces against Zambian communities on the border. Zambia, unlike Namibia, does not allow attacks against UNITA from within its borders.

The relationship with Zambia is also complicated by the number of Angolan refugees currently residing in Zambia. The UNHCR recently announced that 214,524 out of the 247,000 refugees currently hosted by Zambia are Angolans.<sup>60</sup> In this regard the position of the Nangweshi refugee camp at Shang'ombo is problematic both in terms of the number of refugees that have recently sought refuge there and allegations that the camp is being used to harbour UNITA rebels who are regrouping before counter-attacking. The change of political leadership in the recent elections in Zambia in December 2001 is not expected to have a substantial impact on the level of support rendered to UNITA.<sup>61</sup>

#### 4.3.2. Namibia

Namibia has similarly become embroiled in the Angolan conflict through the permission it has granted Angolan forces to enter Namibia in pursuit of UNITA rebels and to launch attacks against UNITA from Namibian territory. The result has been the destabilization of the entire northern border of

<sup>59</sup> See ‘Angola Warns Zambia over UNITA Support’, *Reuters*, 5 March 1998.

<sup>60</sup> Angola: Humanitarian Impact of Government Offensive, IRIN, 12 December 2001.

<sup>61</sup> See ‘Bitter Borders’, in *Africa Confidential*, Vol 42 No 24, 7 December 2001 and Interview with Hannelie de Beer, SaferAfrica, Pretoria, 14 November 2001.

Namibia: several landmine incidents have been reported in northern Namibia, as have abductions and the killing of Namibian civilians. The effect on the local economy and tourism industry has been devastating. Namibia similarly hosts approximately 20,000 Angolan refugees, some of whom are considered legitimate UNITA targets by the Angolan government.

The Namibian intervention in the DRC is discussed more fully under SADC. It should be noted, however, that the Namibian government has found the intervention in the DRC a very costly affair – both in political and in economic terms. With the implementation of the Lusaka Accords on the DRC, Namibia withdrew its troops late last year.

#### *4.3.3. South Africa*

The political relationship between the South African government and the Angolan government, especially at presidential level, is regarded as cool.<sup>62</sup> The South African approach to the Angolan conflict is considered with huge suspicion by both parties to the conflict, especially by the MPLA.

South Africa has maintained that the only way to resolve the conflict in Angola is through negotiations. However, the previous National Party government's links to UNITA and the new ANC government's unwillingness to condemn UNITA unequivocally have contributed to this distrust.

Various UN reports on sanctions-busting against UNITA in Angola have implicated many South African individuals. The MPLA firmly believes that the South African government is not doing enough to curb such support rendered by its nationals. In March 2000 during the Foreign Affairs vote in the SA Parliament, Foreign Minister Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma admitted that the South African government was aware of the involvement of some South Africans in efforts to undermine the UN sanctions. She said that firm action would be taken against them. She reiterated that South Africa supported all the UN sanctions against UNITA.

However, it is probably the strong South African position on negotiations as a means to achieve peace in Angola that is problematic for the MPLA, despite the carefully nuanced formulation of the South African government: 'South Africa will continue to advocate for a political solution to the conflict in Angola as we remain convinced that there can be no lasting military solution. We urge UNITA once again to abandon war and embrace peace.'

Notwithstanding the difficult relationship between the two states, the South African Minister of Defence, Mosiuoa Lekota, visited Luanda in July 2001 to enhance military cooperation. A recent interesting development in bilateral relations is the decision by the South African government to source oil from Angola. Angola is a natural partner in this regard and this brings a new dimension into the bilateral Angolan/South African relationship.

On the other hand, UNITA is highly suspicious of any South African contact with the MPLA government.

#### *4.3.4. Zimbabwe*

Zimbabwe has grown into a close political and military ally of the Angolan government.<sup>63</sup> Thus, internal political developments in Zimbabwe around the political future of President Robert Mugabe are a central concern to the Angolan government. Given Angola's willingness to directly intervene in

---

<sup>62</sup> Interview with Official of the South African Department of Foreign Affairs, Pretoria, November 2001.

<sup>63</sup> Kindly note the section under SADC.

Congo-Brazzaville and Congo-Kinshasa and to threaten to intervene in Zambia, it is not entirely impossible to see Angola step in to assist Mugabe in the aftermath of the March 2002 poll. Intervention is not anticipated in conventional military terms but might include offering Mugabe a safe haven. There is no direct evidence to suggest this scenario is under consideration in Angola, but in terms of regional strategy it deserves attention.

The Angolan army has access to the latest and best military technology and hardware in the region and in terms of size of its armed forces it is second only to South Africa in Sub-Saharan Africa. It is the nature of the intervention and support to Mugabe should he fall that is a matter of concern for regional observers.

#### *4.3.5. Mozambique*

Although the relationship between Mozambique and Angola is cordial there is a distinct rift between the Angolan and Mozambique political leadership. Angolans tend to look down on their poorer regional cousin, although there are ironically many parallels between the political and economic development of both countries that is supported by a shared colonial past and linguistic heritage.

However, the Angolan government regards Mozambique in many instances as a proxy of the South African state. The reasons for this are linked mostly to the following:

- the economic dominance that South Africa exerts over Mozambique as its biggest foreign investor and as a substantial trading partner since 1994;
- The political influence that South Africa exerts over the government of Joaquim Chissano. South Africa and Mozambique are considered natural allies in the region and have adopted common positions in almost all regional fora – especially in SADC. Joint cooperation between South Africa, Botswana and Mozambique as the regional representatives of Sub-Saharan Africa on the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) is another development setting Mozambique apart from its regional cousin. Together with South Africa and Botswana, Mozambique is regarded as progressive, forward-looking and reformist.

Whereas the bilateral influence that Mozambique can exert on Angola is very limited, the accession of Mozambique as the next Chair of the SADC Organ on Politics, Defence and Security could have important repercussions for Angola from a regional perspective. However, Mozambique's influence will be determined by the amount of political support that it can summons from other SADC states to engage more directly in the Angolan conflict.

#### *4.3.6. Democratic Republic of Congo*

Angolan intervention in the DRC is discussed comprehensively under the SADC subsection. It is important to note that Angolan intervention in the DRC was motivated by political considerations. Unlike Namibia and Zimbabwe, Angola has not become involved in extensive mining activities in the DRC and has thus been able to withdraw its troops a great deal quicker than the Namibian and Zimbabwean forces. However, its involvement in the DRC has meant that FAA has been stretched to the limit in terms of its deployment along the DRC, Zambian and Namibian borders and sometimes within these countries, alongside the nationwide deployment of FAA troops in Angola itself.

#### 4.3.7. Southern African Development Community (SADC)

The Southern African Development Community (SADC) established in 1992 is the most important regional organisation in Southern Africa.<sup>64</sup> The Angola conflict has been a standing matter on the SADC Summit agenda since its inception.

However, it was only with the intervention of Zimbabwean, Namibian and Angolan forces in support of Laurent Kabila in August 1998 in the DRC, under the so-called auspices of the SADC Organ on Politics, Defence and Security (OPDS) and under the highly controversial OPDS chairmanship of Zimbabwe, that SADC was galvanised into action. For the ‘SADC’ intervention in the DRC came without any formal mandate or endorsement from the other members of the 14-member regional body.<sup>65</sup>

The intervention in the DRC was the result of a unique series of events. The Angolan government realised that the combination of Sam Nujoma’s chairmanship of SADC, and Robert Mugabe’s chairmanship of the OPDS would provide a golden opportunity for intervention in the DRC under the guise of SADC assistance to a fellow SADC government. The DRC provided incentives for intervention in the form of a promise of a share in the mineral wealth of the DRC to Namibia and Zimbabwe and oil rights to Angola. For Mugabe the war also offered the potential to deflect attention from his increasingly controversial domestic policies by appearing as the saviour of a fellow SADC member. The war became deeply unpopular in Zimbabwe as the economy stumbled, but Mugabe’s desire to once again play the role of regional leader was a clear factor promoting intervention.

The intervention in the DRC was heavily criticized in SADC and led to a complete overhaul of the organization itself and a restructuring of the decision-making structures of the OPDS.

In terms of its original mandate, the Organ was to prevent, manage and resolve conflicts in the Southern African region. The intention was to maintain the flexible approach of the former Frontline States grouping, which the Organ effectively replaced. (See [Annex 3](#), for an elaboration of the purpose of the Organ.)

President Robert Mugabe had been chairman of the OPDS since the Organ’s establishment through a *communiqué* following the 28 June 1996 SADC Summit meeting in Gaborone. SADC initially made no provision for changing the leadership of the OPDS but simply continued the Frontline States policy, which placed the longest-serving head of state in charge of the security function. Since then the OPDS has been riddled by regional and political rivalry. Despite demands from Nelson Mandela that the SADC chairman should control the OPDS, Robert Mugabe refused to relinquish control after the lapse of his first one-year term. These problems were compounded by the absence of clear and unequivocal guidelines on how SADC should respond to domestic developments in member states that are contrary to the spirit of the SADC treaty.

---

<sup>64</sup> SADC consists of 14 members, namely Angola, Botswana, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zimbabwe and Zambia.

<sup>65</sup> Nor was the decision to intervene in the DRC endorsed by the Angolan parliament. In a parliamentary debate in April 2001 initiated by the opposition party, PRS, under the leadership of Bernardo Tito, the intervention was called illegitimate and unconstitutional. The response of the MPLA government was that the intervention was prompted by ‘state reasons and imperatives of national security’ and that the action occurred in response to the continued destabilization of Angola through direct or indirect aggression. See Angola Parliament pursues debates on troops in DRC, ANGOP, 25 April 2001.

At the Blantyre Summit from 27 - 30 August 2001 under the SADC Chairmanship of Bakili Muluzi, the President of Malawi, the SADC Summit decided that the originally envisaged rotating structure of the OPDS should be reactivated and implemented. The Organ has now been expressly forbidden from declaring war or intervening militarily under any circumstances without the full approval of all the SADC members at a special Summit meeting. In addition, the membership on the OPDS troika may not coincide with membership of the SADC Summit troika. A Protocol on Politics, Defence and Security Co-operation was signed that will make provision for the development of a mutual defence mechanism to promote peace and security in the SADC region.

The Blantyre Summit formally removed Mugabe as Chairman of the OPDS. At the same time President Joaquim Alberto Chissano of Mozambique was elected as the next Chair of the OPDS for a term of one year and President Benjamin Mkapa of Tanzania, was elected as Deputy Chairperson. This development meant that the doves within SADC are in the ascendancy and that the traditional hawks as personified by Zimbabwe and Namibia have been sidelined.

This development had far-reaching implications for the MPLA government's position in the region in view of the fact that despite the lip service paid at each SADC Summit to isolating UNITA and repeated support expressed for the UN sanctions against the movement, SADC members are divided on how the Angolan conflict should be resolved. It is therefore not surprising that Angola has offered to host the next SADC Summit in August 2002 in Luanda. This means that Eduardo Dos Santos has assumed the position of vice chair of the SADC Summit Troika (with outgoing Chair Sam Nujomo and incumbent Chair Bakili Muluzi). He will thus assume the role of the next Chair of SADC in mid-2002 and will have the ability to influence regional policy on the Angolan situation quite substantially.

For the MPLA government it would be important to retain the perception of 'honest, peace-seeking, reformist and compromising' government. Thus the timing of the Dos Santos announcement that he would not be standing in the next election is well poised. In this regard he has attempted to associate himself with the reformist camp in SADC.

However, for SADC, as recent developments in Zimbabwe have demonstrated, international observers do not seem to differentiate between the domestic governance and internal stability of individual states versus SADC as a region. This realisation, that individual states are measured by the perceived successes or failures of the region, has probably been the most significant recent driver of regional integration and co-operation. And thus it becomes important that old problem areas that remain, notably the situation in Angola, the DRC, Zimbabwe and, potentially, the so-called 'third-termers' are decisively addressed.

The Angolan conflict has thus truly assumed the dimensions of a regional stumbling block. Its potential to harm the entire region's prospects for economic growth and stability has been recognized by most members of SADC. It should also be noted that Angola's reach into the region is sustained by its enormous oil wealth. Its ability to intervene militarily at will has been demonstrated repeatedly. Thus the decision by the Angolan government to serve as the next Chair of SADC is a clear indication of emerging tensions between the Political Organ controlled by the more moderate members of SADC and the Summit.

#### 4.4. Growth of Civil Society: The Saints amongst the Spoilers of Peace?

The statement, the ‘rise and growth in civil society is possibly the most important development in Angola the last two years’ is almost a consensus opinion amongst all the individuals the author interviewed. However, the statement made by High Commissioner Kishore Mahbubani from Singapore at the Under Secretary General’s briefing on Angola to the Security Council on 21 December 2001, perhaps best encapsulates international insight into the role of Angolan civil society. He noted that great emphasis had been placed on the role of civil society and the churches in Angola’s peace process during the UNSC briefing. However, until the announcement by France at the meeting that the Sakharov Peace Prize of the European Parliament had been awarded to Monsignor Zacarias Kamuenho, the Archbishop of Lubango and the President of the Inter-Church Committee for Peace (COIEPA) on 12 December, ‘the Angolan church and civil society had been largely faceless and nameless.’<sup>66</sup>

The growth in civil society could be attributed to a variety of factors of which the establishment of multi-party democracy in 1991 in Angola has probably been the most significant factor. At this time the government passed legislation that recognised the rights of political parties, freedom of assembly, association and movement, the right to strike and press freedom. It led to a mushrooming of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and by late 1991 two networks had been established, the Forum of Angolan NGOs (FONGA) and the Committee of Nongovernmental Organizations in Angola (CONGA). However, a note of caution is warranted. Most of the NGOs have remained weak and wary of antagonising the Angolan government. Human Rights Watch has reported several cases of harassment and intimidation of individuals and NGOs by the Angolan internal security services, Servico de Informacao (SINFO). Others have been co-opted by government.

Angola watchers such as Christine Messiant, for example, are dismissive of so-called civil society organizations which are integrated into the official patronage networks of the MPLA elite – particularly as part of the clientelism spawned by the Eduardo dos Santos Foundation (FESA) – established in 1996. She suggests that FESA is not only the end product of a system of clientelist domination, but that it becomes an instrument to reinforce presidential power and to convey legitimacy to its patron. Indeed she suggests that the government, and more particularly the President, has realized that, ‘it is necessary to neutralize the civil elites as independent social and political actors and to mobilize in his own interest those networks – private and associational, national and international – which have been assembled by his style of clientelism.’ Messiant thus offers a warning that the ‘independence’ of civil society in Angola has to be viewed with circumspection.<sup>67</sup>

The only group that has managed to speak out relatively freely about the political situation, without constant harassment, has been the churches. The Church began speaking out on human rights issues as early as 1989 when it called on both the MPLA and UNITA in a public letter to stop the war and hold free elections. Indeed initiatives such as the launch of the *Movimento Pro Pace* by the Catholic bishops in January 1999 and the establishment of the ecumenical peace committee in April 2000 (*Comite Intereclesial para a Paz em Angola* – COIEPA) – both with links to civil society

<sup>66</sup> See 4444th Meeting of the Security Council, SC/7250 of 21 December 2001.

<sup>67</sup> See Messiant, C. ‘The Eduardo Dos Santos Foundation: or, How Angola’s Regime is Taking Over Civil Society’ in *African Affairs*, Vol 100, 2001. pp. 287 – 309.

catapulted the Churches into the public eye as the only Angolan institutions that are willing to question the dynamics of the Angolan conflict.<sup>68</sup>

The churches and associated members of civil society are now calling for a full national dialogue involving the main protagonists, the churches and other members of civil society. The appeal for peace is receiving widespread and growing support. A rally in support of peace arranged by COIEPA in Luanda in June 2000 attracted more than 5,000 people, according to *Africa Confidential*, the largest turnout for a mass demonstration since 1992. Human Rights Watch reports that church membership has grown across Angola since 1991. The peace message is disseminated through the estimated 700 churches spread across Angola and through over 100 registered parties.<sup>69</sup>

The boldness of the churches has received support from human rights activists such as Rafael Marques of the Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa, the publisher William Tonet and the leader of the FNLA, Roberto Holden. Other voices in support of a ceasefire include ex-Premier Marcolino Moco, and the MPLA's respected former MPLA Secretary General Lopo de Nascimento, who left the party when it returned to a hard-line approach in the face of the collapse of the Lusaka peace protocol. Another group, the *Amplo Movimento dos Cidadãos* (AMC) founded in April 2001 as a 'multi-ethnic citizens movement', is also calling for peace talks and more political rights for NGOs. Jaka Jamba from UNITA *Luanda*, Abel Chivukuvuku of UNITA *Autonome*, MPLA dissidents such as Vicente Pinto de Andrade have joined AMC. Although the peace movement is presently still 'limited to Luanda's middle class sabons and has little support or organisation beyond the capital' the fact that the Angolan government is so Luanda-centered implies that the peace-movement looms large as a possible political threat.<sup>70</sup>

More specifically, Fatima Roque noted that civil society has begun to demand that both the MPLA and UNITA conclude a national peace accord, reach agreement on national reconstruction and that national reconciliation forums are established throughout the country, that the Angolan armed forces are withdrawn from neighbouring states, and that a constitutional conference be established with substantial civil society participation.<sup>71</sup> This has become even more pertinent with the death of Savimbi.

The MPLA response to this development has been muted and has been directed at integrating some of the peace movement's demands with its own agenda, thus legitimizing its actions by adopting the guise of responding to civil society demands. Consultation with the constitutional commission, announcements about the possibility of elections and amnesty to demobilized troops, represent clear examples of efforts by the government to pacify civil society without really addressing their core demands. The Constitutional Commission that is presently drafting the new constitution of Angola, for example, has made provision for civil society input in the form of presentations to the Commission.<sup>72</sup> However, the dominance of the MPLA on the Commission and the limited access provided for civil society does not correspond with the level of participation that is envisaged by the peace movement.

<sup>68</sup> See Human Rights Watch Report, *Angola Unravels: The Rise and Fall of the Lusaka Peace Process*, September 1999 under Chapter XI, Angolan Civil Society and Human Rights.

<sup>69</sup> 'War against peace' in *Africa Confidential*, Vol 41, No 16, 4 August 2000.

<sup>70</sup> 'Who Blinks First?' *op. cit.*

<sup>71</sup> See in Roque, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

<sup>72</sup> Civil society may make presentations to the President of the Commission who will decide how to proceed with the presentations made. – See <http://www.comissao-constitucional.gv.ao/>.

The response of UNITA to the role of the churches and civil society has been positive throughout 2000 and 2001, as an immediate and joint ceasefire would serve the interests of UNITA. Indeed various press releases issued by the Movement laud the position taken by the Churches and Savimbi wrote a letter to the Catholic Bishops Conference requesting their intervention in the interest of dialogue in 2001.<sup>73</sup> A meeting between a UNITA delegation and the leadership of COIEPA under the auspices of Archbishop Kamuenho on 8 September 2001 in Paris reiterated UNITA's support for a central role for civil society in the peace process.<sup>74</sup>

However, the concept of civil society within the Angolan context needs to be considered with great circumspection. The Angolan civil society movement is not a broad-based mass movement. Indeed there are several factors mitigating against the development of a popular mass movement in Angola:

- The Angolan population is deeply traumatised, dispossessed and landless, has no political voice and even less economic clout. Fully 30 percent of the population is internally displaced and 60% of the population lives on less than US \$1 a day;
- The Angolan population is concentrated in isolated urban enclaves or refugee camps (sometimes outside Angolan borders) with the resultant 'draining of the rural population from the land';
- Infrastructure has almost completely collapsed, hampering freedom of movement, association, contact and communication;
- The government maintains a wide range of repressive policies that prevent any glimmer of opposition or alternative viewpoint on the causes of the conflict. It also enforces draconian media laws, which severely restrict press freedom, and forcefully prohibits any mobilisation of the population.

One thus has to ask from where the moral authority and the legitimacy of the Churches and some members of civil society as peace instigators derive, and secondly, why is the Church positioned to play this role? The answers are relatively obvious. The Angolan government has very little interest in providing basic social services to the population and as Messiant notes, 'care for the population as a whole has been left to the churches, international bodies and non-governmental organizations.' Churches have thus stepped into the role of caretakers of the population. Of the above-mentioned organizations the churches are the least dependent on the goodwill of the government or its financial largesse and are ostensibly considered the least threatening by government due to their traditional apolitical role.<sup>75</sup>

Secondly, the network that the Churches have established throughout Angola, also in areas that are in the midst of conflict, implies that the Church has the ability to influence and harness public opinion countrywide. The reinstatement of Radio Ecclesia has been an important development because

<sup>73</sup> Please note 'Letter to the Representatives of the Catholic Church of 13 May 2001' on <http://www.kwacha.org/>.

<sup>74</sup> See UNITA Position on the September 20, 2001 UNSC Declaration, no 17 of 24 September 2001 on <http://www.kwacha.org/>.

<sup>75</sup> International humanitarian bodies and NGOs in contrast are directly dependent on government goodwill to operate in Angola and are thus a great deal more circumspect about their political role. However, both OXFAM and Medecin Sans Frontieres have not hesitated to criticize the government for the action that it has failed to take in providing basic humanitarian relief to the Angolan population.

it is a medium that influences and gives a voice to the Angolan population and the peace movement. In many cases the church is also the only organisation with the means and the credibility to access areas that are considered unsafe or dangerous.<sup>76</sup> One Angola watcher compared the state of Angolan civil society and the role of the churches with that of East Timor in 1996.

Other civil society members in contrast sometimes command respect and stature purely by virtue of being dismissed and rejected by the two main protagonists in the conflict, as is the case with several MPLA and UNITA members (although this does not include *UNITA Renovado* members who are widely perceived as being bought over by MPLA government).

Thus the Churches are uniquely placed to play a leading reconciliatory role in the interest of the Angolan people in a future peace process – with other legitimate members of civil society.

Civil society is also for the first time raising its voice to insist that it receives an equal voice in the peace negotiations. In a meeting between civil society and the UN Special Representative on African Affairs, Ibrahim Gambari, in December 2001 in Angola, civil society demanded that they wanted ‘to see a mechanism immediately created for the integration of national NGOs and civil society in the dialogue process.’<sup>77</sup> It is exactly in this development that the prospects for peace become more feasible. One could argue that the participation of a third, non-partisan actor, despite its obvious weaknesses, is a positive development in moving away from a zero-sum game between two main belligerents. This view is echoed by the *Africa Confidential*, which notes: ‘In a society that has been dominated by two politico-military conglomerates, [the development of an open debate of what ails Angola and the wrongs in its society] must be progress.’

---

<sup>76</sup> Interview with Justin Pierce, BBC correspondent in Angola, 18 January 2002.

<sup>77</sup> ‘Demands for Immediate Ceasefire’, UN Integrated Regional Information Networks, 14 December 2001.

## V. Conclusion and Recommendations

The most significant development in Angola since the second failed attempt at peace has been the tentative development of a more vocal, active civil society – albeit primarily in the urban areas.

Today civil society, and more specifically the churches, is increasingly becoming the moral voice of the Angolan conflict. As a moral voice, it also carries with it much needed legitimacy that has been absent from the debate around the Angolan peace process.

However, civil society in a country as devastated by conflict as Angola, is highly dependent on the goodwill and moreover, the financial and institutional support of the international community. Angola's regional cousin, Mozambique, has only succeeded in its transformation from war zone to peaceful co-existence after an enormous and sustained commitment of international financial resources to conflict-resolution mechanisms, the support of good governance, civic education, transparency, economic growth and accountability. And it remains an ongoing process as exemplified by the commitment of the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy of over \$1.5 million for party capacity-building in Mozambique in 2001.<sup>78</sup> One could argue that the success of the South African political transformation was and remains equally dependent on the goodwill and support of the international community that sustains its homegrown civil society institutions.

Angolan civil society can only play a constructive role if the international community assumes a more assertive and proactive position beyond the immediate confidence-building measures, such as an immediate and unconditional ceasefire, discussions with all factions of UNITA, and guaranteed access to IDPs and refugees for emergency aid delivery in areas 'liberated' from UNITA. More concretely, the international community should consider the following measures over the long-term:

- Supporting the development of a more active and influential civil society, by ensuring that the Angolan population becomes aware of their political rights through civic education and human rights programmes and insisting that the MPLA government increases and guarantees the exercise of civil liberties in Angola, thus encouraging the creation of political space for civil society to operate more effectively;
- Insisting that civil society is given a substantial voice in negotiations by providing a platform and forum for the expression of their opinions – this requires direct and public engagement with members of civil society by the international community and support for the position of civil society that the Lusaka Protocol which embraces negotiations only amongst the main belligerents, is expanded to include substantial civil society participation. It is important that the government include not only those elements of civil society that are aligned to it, but adopts a more inclusive approach in this matter. The international community should be appraised of this and be willing to take a hard line on it;
- Revisiting its support for humanitarian social delivery in Angola and insisting that the Angolan government plays the role of a responsive and responsible government towards all its

citizens (especially in the marginalized hinterland of Angola), and that government programmes are more focused on social delivery, especially in the field of health and educational services, housing and job-creation (this would require a thorough rethink of the way that humanitarian donor agencies and especially the UN related agencies operate in Angola). The flow of humanitarian aid to assist crisis areas in the hinterland of Angola, has allowed the MPLA elite to absolve itself of responsibility for social delivery through oil and diamond revenues, thus allowing it to spend large amounts on military build-ups;

- Insisting that the MPLA government adopts more responsible and transparent economic policies beyond the demands and needs of the small and well-connected elite of the Angolan enclave economy;
- Readjusting the role of the UN in sanctions to also include the monitoring of the use of oil revenues in Angola (Rafael Marques suggests that the UN monitored sanctions against Iraq offer valuable lessons and a precedent for possible engagement with Angola by the international community);
- Insisting that a true compromise be sought by the MPLA with UNITA and all its factions (not solely UNITA *Renovado*), in the interest of the Angolan population. (The death of Savimbi presents an historical opportunity to move forward on the political stalemate that has characterised the Angolan conflict for so long);
- Exerting pressure on all UNITA's factions to reenter dialogue and to allow free political association in its heartland. In this regard, the international community should review its policy of sanctions against UNITA, especially in the present circumstances following the death of Savimbi. Employing only the stick in the case of UNITA has clearly not been successful. The use of carefully crafted 'carrots' may be more beneficial in securing concessions regarding participation in Angolan political life. In fact, the continued use of the 'stick' could contribute to the splintering of the armed wing of UNITA into a series of local warlords, now that there is no unifying figure in the movement;
- Insisting that external business interests play a more constructive role in Angola or risk exposure and sanction - this relates specifically to the oil and diamond sectors and the various arms industries that supply the Angolan war machine on both sides of the political divide (it requires that other oil companies emulate the example of British Petroleum in revealing the amounts of 'additional fees' paid to secure and maintain oil exploration rights in Angola and greater transparency in general in business dealings with Angola);
- Actively supporting voices of moderation in both the MPLA and UNITA and the growth of alternative political choices (for example supporting the right of especially rural and regional based parties to have a say in Angolan political life.)

Another window of opportunity has opened to seek peace in a conflict that has gone on for far too long in Angola. Peace will only be achieved if the international community adopts an even-handed and more transparent approach towards the conflict in Angola: if it admits that both belligerents in the conflict carry equal amounts of blame for the suffering of the Angolan people and that the solution to the Angolan conflict cannot be left to the spoilers of peace.

---

<sup>78</sup> See 'Dutch Party Support', Mozambique Political Process Bulletin, AWEPA, Issue 27, 7 December 2001.

The international engagement in the Angolan conflict has so far focused predominantly on curbing the inappropriate use of resources that sustains the conflict. However, this has been done in a highly selective way. The Angolan conflict cannot be solved by reducing its causes to those related to resources, although this is undeniably a very important motivator and sustainer of the conflict. Nor can it be explained solely as a power struggle between two movements/two individuals, various ethnic groups or a rural impoverished and urban-rich motivated conflict. Nor can the Angolan conflict be reduced to only the machinations of external interests, despite the fact that external actors have not always pursued an honourable or responsible route in Angola. It is a combination of all these factors which has continued to express itself in absolutist, hard-line terms. It requires a multi-faceted response.

The great challenge in Angola today is to give the voices of moderation on both sides of the political divide a chance to develop a 'third way'. The question the international community should ask itself is how it can best strengthen their position, for it is only by finding common ground and by achieving consensus amongst all the stakeholders on what constitutes the middle ground that the process can move forward.

## Annex 1

### Underlying Reasons for the Angolan Conflict:

Fatima Moura Roque in a thoughtful study on peacebuilding in Angola, suggests that the underlying reasons for the conflict are a range of interrelated political, economic and social factors:<sup>79</sup> Namely that the hostility between UNITA and the MPLA 'reflects one of the great 'unacknowledged' truths of Angolan history - [namely] the pain, the humiliation and resentment suffered by rural Angolans as a result of inferiority and exclusion imposed on them both in the colonial era and after independence. No less important is the deep-seated fear of the urban populations - mainly the Luanda elite - that has governed Angola since independence, of possible reprisals if UNITA gains power.' (To this could be added the policies of a future rural based or regional party vis-à-vis the urban elite.)

Chivukuvuku presents a more succinct definition about the hard-line political considerations that have driven and sustained the Angolan conflict over 40 years:

- 'The deep-seated rivalry over the control of political power and economic resources between the main politico-sociological groups and associated interests;
- The mutually exclusive ideological and political mentalities of the 'generation of utopia' as the fathers of independence are called in Angola;
- The MPLA's decision in 1975 to impose the creation of a nation-state under the slogan 'one nation-one people' in a multi-ethnic, multi-racial and multi-cultural society;
- The profound economic and social imbalances between various groups and regions of the country today, aggravated by a clear line dividing the more affluent coastal provinces and the neglected hinterland.'

Added to this is the unhelpful role that external actors (individual governments, the international community - as exemplified especially by the United Nations, the Troika, and business interests) have played in the political war economy that is driving the Angolan conflict.

---

<sup>79</sup> Roque, FM. *Building Peace in Angola: A Political and Economic Vision*, Lisbon: Edicoes Universitarias Lusofonas, 2000. p.63. Her breakdown of the different factors according to political, economic and social categories presents one of the most inclusive detailing of the reasons supporting the Angolan conflict. The suggestions contained in her volume regarding the solution of the Angolan conflict – especially its inclusive political nature related to decentralization and greater regionalism/devolution of power - warrants serious consideration as a way to address the underlying tensions in Angolan society.

## Annex 2

| Composition of the Constitutional Commission |                            |                    |              |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
|  | Member                     | Function           | Party        |
| 1  | Joao Lourenco              | President          | MPLA         |
| 2  | Bornito de Sousa           | 1st Vice-President | MPLA         |
| 3  | Aniceto Hamukwia           | 2nd Vice-President | UNITA        |
| 4  | Lindo Bernardo Tito        | 3rd Vice-President | PRS          |
| 5  | Benjamin da Silva          | 4th Vice-President | FNLA         |
| 6  | Carlos Magalhaes           | 1st Secretary      | MPLA         |
| 7  | Severiano Pambasangue      | 2nd Secretary      | UNITA        |
| 8  | Analia Victoria Pereira    | 3rd Secretary      | PLD          |
| 9  | Joao Vieira Lopes          | 4th Secretary      | AD-Coligacao |
| 10   | Dino Matrosse              | Member             | MPLA         |
| 11   | Franca Van Dunen           | Member             | MPLA         |
| 12   | Lopo FF do Nascimento      | Member             | MPLA         |
| 13   | Paulo Jorge                | Member             | MPLA         |
| 14   | Augusto Tomas              | Member             | MPLA         |
| 15   | Diogenes Boavida           | Member             | MPLA         |
| 16   | Noberto dos Santos         | Member             | MPLA         |
| 17   | Alfredo Junior             | Member             | MPLA         |
| 18   | Maria de Assuncao Vahekeny | Member             | MPLA         |
| 19   | Ventura de Azevedo         | Member             | MPLA         |
| 20   | Vitoriano Ferreira Nicolau | Member             | MPLA         |
| 21   | Generoso de Almeida        | Member             | MPLA         |
| 22   | Guilherme Prata            | Member             | MPLA         |
| 23   | Joao Melo                  | Member             | MPLA         |
| 24   | Mateus de Brito Junior     | Member             | MPLA         |
| 25   | Mario Afonso de Almeida    | Member             | MPLA         |
| 26   | Fernando da Costa Andrade  | Member             | MPLA         |
| 27   | Rui Pinto de Andrade       | Member             | MPLA         |
| 28   | Bernarda H da Silva        | Member             | MPLA         |
| 29   | Isabel Dala                | Member             | MPLA         |
| 30   | Efigenia Lima              | Member             | MPLA         |
| 31   | Juliao Antonio             | Member             | MPLA         |

|    |                           |        |        |
|----|---------------------------|--------|--------|
| 32 | Almerindo Jaka Jamba      | Member | UNITA  |
| 33 | Abel Chivukuvuku          | Member | UNITA  |
| 34 | Armando Moiseis Cassessa  | Member | UNITA  |
| 35 | Malheiro Chitungo Elavoko | Member | UNITA  |
| 36 | Augusta Maliti Valentim   | Member | UNITA  |
| 37 | Madalena Ruth Dachala     | Member | UNITA  |
| 38 | Pedro Morais Veira        | Member | UNITA  |
| 39 | Bento Kangulu             | Member | UNITA  |
| 40 | Adelino Antonio           | Member | UNITA  |
| 41 | Evaristo Ramon Chitumba   | Member | UNITA  |
| 42 | Evaristo Chicolomuenho    | Member | UNITA  |
| 43 | Afonso Mbidingani         | Member | UNITA  |
| 44 | Alexandre Sebastiao Andre | Member | PAJOCA |

Source: [www.comissao-constitucional.gv.ao](http://www.comissao-constitucional.gv.ao)

## Annex 3

### Purpose of the OPDS:

Like the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the OPDS is *potentially* an organisation with a *comprehensive approach to security and peace*, based on military confidence, economic development, social justice, democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights and the rights of minorities. However, in the absence of convergence of common political values in SADC, the institution only pays lip these goals.

The Organ's ambitious objectives can be grouped into five main categories<sup>80</sup>:

- *Military/Defence*: To protect against instability; to develop a collective security capacity; to conclude a Mutual Defence Pact and to develop a regional peacekeeping capacity;
- *Crime Prevention*: To promote closer co-operation to deal with cross-border crime and to promote a community-based approach towards crime prevention;
- *Intelligence*: To ensure close co-operation and early warning;
- *Foreign Policy*: To promote co-operation and common political value systems and institutions to deal with cross-border crime; to develop common foreign policy; to facilitate conflict prevention, management and resolution; to mediate in inter- and intra-state disputes; to engage in preventative diplomacy; early warning; to encourage and monitor international arms control/disarmament conventions and treaties; to co-ordinate participation in peace operations; and to address extra-regional conflicts which impact on the region;
- *Human Rights*: To develop democratic institutions and practices; to encourage observance of universal human rights; to encourage and monitor international human rights conventions and treaties; and early warning.

---

<sup>80</sup> Objectives cited in Malan, M and Cilliers, J (Figure 2) 'SADC Organ on Politics, Defence and Security: Future Development', *ISS Papers*, No. 19, March 1997, Institute for Security Studies.