

Strengthening States and Building a Security Community in East Africa

Mohamed J. Mwinyi

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

In

Political Science and International Studies

Priya Dixit, Committee Chair

Paul Avey

Yannis Stivachtis

February 2, 2017

Blacksburg Virginia

Keywords: Security, International Relations, Political, Economy, East Africa, Participatory
Budgeting, EACSO

Mohamed Mwinyi

Strengthening States and Building a Security Community in East Africa

ABSTRACT

One monumental problem the East African Community faces today is implementation of its proposed bill known as the East African Community Security Protocol on peace and security. This bill was crafted upon the basis of existing scholarship which examines security and community either from the top-down/state-centric approaches (neorealism/neoliberalism/constructivism/etc.) or as vernacular security--bottom-up. Both of these approaches are inadequate in that they still a) prioritize the state/relate to the state/central authority, b) are Eurocentric (based on/dominated by European points of views), and c) do not adequately explain security collaborations in areas such as East Africa (EA). Therefore, this thesis develop a “responsive security community” approach which does not only ties top-down and ground-up approach, but it also advocates for development of strong states before the creation of a security community. This thesis argue that different states have their very different historical backgrounds and legacies. Hence, in order to have effective security community in EA there need be responsive, human security oriented states which embrace participation and inclusion in sub-national and national level. This would ensure the protection of the vital core of all their citizens’ lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment. To discuss this responsive community approach, this thesis analyzes the theories of security community post WW II in conjunction with the development of the East African Community Security Protocol. This thesis also employs the theories of Participatory Budgeting (PB) and ground up approach as

models for strengthening state and East African Civil Society Organization Forum (EACSOF).

This thesis concludes that responsive security community in EA requires strong states which combine a focus on traditional notions of security with human/individual security.

Abstract for General Audience

One problem the East African Community faces today is implementation of its proposed bill known as the East African Community Protocol on peace and security. This bill was crafted upon the basis of existing scholarship which examines security and community either from the top-down/state-centric approaches (neorealism/neoliberalism/constructivism/etc.) or as vernacular security--bottom-up. Both of these approaches are inadequate in that they still a) prioritize central authority, b) are dominated by European points of views, and c) do not adequately explain security collaborations in areas such as East Africa (EA). This thesis develop a “responsive security community” approach which does not only ties top-down and ground-up approach, but it also advocates for development of strong states before the creation of a security community. This thesis argue that different states have their very different historical backgrounds and legacies. In order to have effective security community in EA there need be responsive, human security oriented states which embrace participation and inclusion in sub-national and national level. To discuss this responsive community approach, this thesis analyzes the theories of security community post WW II in conjunction with the development of the East African Community Security Protocol. This thesis also employs the theories of Participatory Budgeting (PB) and ground up approach as models for strengthening state and East African Civil Society Organization Forum (EACSOF). This thesis concludes that responsive security community in EA requires strong states which combine a focus on traditional notions of security with human/individual security.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction, Theories of Security Community	1
Chapter 2: Development of Security Community in Africa and East Africa ...	18
Chapter 3: Strengthening Institutions in the National/State Level in East Africa	24
Chapter 4: Conclusion: Toward An Effective Security Community in East Africa	47
Bibliography	58

Preface

The East African Community (EAC) is a regional intergovernmental organization consisting of six partner States: the Republics of Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Republic of Uganda, and the recently joined new member state, South Sudan. The EAC headquarters is in Arusha, Tanzania. The EAC is home to 150 million citizens, of which 22% is currently urban population. With a land area of 1.82 million square kilometers and a combined GDP of US\$ 146 billion (EAC Statistics for 2016), its realization bears great strategic and geopolitical significance in the region and across the globe (Overview of EAC, 2017). Most states in sub-Saharan Africa are endowed with vital resources; but a plethora of them are, for one reason or another, engulfed in conflict. This makes the question of security a priority in the region.

In Tanzania people are concerned with death by car accident rather than piracy as many accidents are caused by the lack of enforcing the driving rules on the highways and streets. Police accept more bribes than writing tickets and citations against people for breaking the rules (Ernest, 2011). It is a norm to have something with you when you are stopped by the police so you can navigate your way out, but these behaviors risk people's lives' when someone can ride without a license, much less insurance. Until 2016, the municipal and regional government hospital's corruption was at a record high (Muhondwa, Nyamhanga and Frumence, 2008). In these hospitals care is provided for free, but who speaks the language of money would receive service. These security concerns in Tanzania are mirrored elsewhere in the region. For example according to Transparency International survey of 2010, Kenya and Burundi are most corrupt in EA (Transparency International, 2010). Data for South Sudan were not available as the state was

still part of greater Sudan, The recent survey-Corruption reporting in East Africa posited that Rwanda and Burundi also are corrupt countries (Mafabi, 2017). Lumumba cited that corruption in African countries is so significant that it affects the physical development of the states and regions of Africa (Lumumba, 2017). Also there are other areas of security concern in the region other than corruption. For example, extra-judicial killings in Kenya, silencing of voices of dissent in Uganda and Rwanda, and while people are being massacred in Burundi as the president has abruptly extended his term in power without the people's consent. All of these fears the Tanzanian people and other states in the regions faces amount to the question of human security. According to United Nations Commission for Human Security, the term human security refers to -- protecting the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment. Human security means protecting fundamental freedoms – freedoms that are the essence of life. It means protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations (CHR, 2003).

This thesis motivated by the question of security, not in a statist term and how it is conceived in International Relations, but through the perspective of human/individual security. Therefore, the building of security should start on subnational level and proceed to the national level. When the state is strong and responds to people's concerns fully through participation and inclusion, other arrangements can be pursued of insuring security in the region. I am not against the new East African Community Protocol for peace and security that addresses security issues, which ordinary people are less concerned about. Each country in East Africa has its own security challenges and more so, it is a question of human security. When states can address these issues, a strong and responsive security community can be built and embraced by all community members.

Chapter 1: Introduction

In 2012, the EAC proposed a security bill known as the East African Community Security Protocol (EACSP) for peace and security. This bill was set to be ratified by all community members for immediate implementation. The bill aimed to address issues of cross border conflict, counter-terrorism, piracy in the Indian Ocean, prevention of illicit drugs and the spread of illegal arms. Consequently, the prognoses proposed in the EACSP to address the concerns of security challenges were: the community will provide a well-equipped standing army, and create joint security coordination across the community (Karuhanga, 2017). According to the bill, following ratification the protocol would form a single defensive territory, meaning that an attack on one would be considered an act of aggression against all members (Lagimi, 2015).

This thesis argues that the EASP bill has left out the root causes of the security concerns in the region. These concerns encompass all political, economic and social issues preventing a life mostly free from risk and fear (Hussein, Gnisci, & Wanjiru, 2004). The EACSP has several problems, first it draws on a Eurocentric mindset – meaning that the subsequent understanding of a peaceful change is viewed through a Western prism of security community, hence, inadequately addresses a non-Western peaceful change. According to Tucisisny, focusing on the states and state cooperation, theories of security communities did little to consider the general public (Tucisisny, 2007). Secondly it ignores local, indigenous perspectives like local community relations and participation on decision making even in limited frameworks. Thirdly,

it does not take into account other ways of defining “security” and “community” locally, particularly in East Africa.

In order for the East African Community Protocol for peace and security to work and propel the development of security community, it is crucial that member states work toward strengthening their national institutions. This will ensure the protection of the vital core of all their citizens’ lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment by using processes that build on people’s strengths and aspirations by employing a ground up approach to supplement the working of an already functioning top down arrangement (CHS: 2003).

Methods

This thesis on “top down” analysis will use security community to provide an overall understanding of security in international relations (IR) and how it affects different regions respectively. In chapter one the bulk of the literature for this comes from the proponents of dominant theories of security community from schools of thought ranging from neoliberal, neorealist, constructivist, and rationalist. This thesis will use Karl Deutsch’s concept of security community as a foundation for understanding driving factors for Western Europe’s vision of peaceful change. In so doing, this thesis will further take into account the recent debate of security community on how the concept of security has evolved by employing literature from Adler and Barnett, Acharya, Emmerson and others. The observation on this first chapter is that, literature on security community evolved out of a particular historical and political context. For this matter, the concept of security community is in the context of post WWII Europe.

Chapter two will focus on the development of security community in Africa in general and East Africa. This chapter will examine the historical background of security community in Africa as well as the current development of security community in East Africa. In doing so this chapter will analyze Africa's post-colonial transition of East, Central and Southern Africa as these regions' decolonization struggle formed alliances and regional cooperation. Also, in the East African security context, this chapter will look into key policies and institutionalization with regard to the recent East African Community Protocol for peace and security and how it evolved. The underlying matter for this chapter is that, the current process of security community does not work in East Africa because its political and historical context is very different from post WWII Europe. This is especially the case with the different member states and their very different historical backgrounds and legacies. Therefore, what is needed is more effective/stronger (different) states that are responsive to the security concerns of their populations.

Chapter three of this thesis focuses on strengthening national level/states members. I argue that the national level/states need ground-up inclusion and participation. Therefore, theories of Participatory Budgeting (PB) practiced from Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, Brazil are used as illustration. In addition to the PB, this chapter will address the theories of ground-up approach using East African Civil Society Organization Forum (EACSOF). The EACSOF addresses human insecurity and introduces people focused participatory arrangement including the participation of civil society in conjunction with national government responses that listen and work with civil society on essential matters. Finally, chapter four, will conclude with the discussion on how security community in EA can be inclusive and promote human security

oriented states. The essential point in this chapter is that security community in East Africa has to be responsive to the needs of different regions and needs more responsive/participatory states.

Theories of Security Community (Top down Arrangement)

An ugly historical background of European states' wars and massive destruction of over a century created an aspiration for the search of a new paradigm of peace and security for Western Europe. In 1957, Carl Deutsch introduced security concept known as "security community" – this is a region in which a large-scale use of violence (such as war) has become very unlikely or even unthinkable. Hence, the community would resort to peaceful means to settle their differences (Deutsch, 1957). Carl Deutsch introduced two types of security communities: "pluralistic security community" and, "amalgamated security community. The major differences between these two forms of security community are as follows: "pluralistic security community" -- states members retain their sovereignty; "amalgamated security community" -- states do not retain their sovereignty, but contained in a federalist system (Deutsch, 1957).

Unlike amalgamated security community, pluralistic security community has gained popular support among scholars and practitioners of IR. Although there are several security communities across the globe, the earliest formal institutional structure of a security community was in the formation of NATO in 1949. However, in 1957, the treaty of Rome created the European Economic Commission (See history of EU). Scholars of contemporary security community today have built their theoretical analysis from Karl Deutsch's concept of peaceful change. It is not that all scholars agree entirely with Deutsch's theoretical approach (See Adler

and Barnett, 1998), they have also expanded the concept to illustrate levels of security community development – i.e., nascent, ascent and matured. This chapter aims to analyze theories of pluralistic security community through the scope of neoliberals, neorealists, constructivists and rationalists. These four schools of thought are essential for the development of pluralistic security community since major debates surrounding security revolve around them (See Emmerson, 2005). In conjunction with these theories, this chapter will draw on the EU--NATO applications of these theories. Other modes of security arrangement like Association of South East Asian Nations-- ASEAN will be examined in relation to EU—NATO theoretical framework.

Why theories of Security Communities?

One of the reasons for studying theories is that – theories inform action and action inform theories. Looking back in history, some theorists were able to invent the concepts which help us navigate the world today. To mention a few, the concept of Specialization by Adam Smith, Capitalism by Carl Marx, Modern Macroeconomics by Keynes, Colonial and Post-Colonial violence by Fenon, neoliberalism by Brown and security communities by Deutsch. For this matter, theories are not opposite to reality. Thus, we use theories to navigate and negotiate reality. Also, through theories we impose our understanding onto the world and act according to that understanding. As Immanuel Kant put it, we produce the knowledge (conceptual understanding) through synthesis in three faculties: faculty of sense, reason and imagination

(Rastovic, 2013). So how do these three faculties inform our understanding of theories of a particular concept, in this case, security community?

The faculty of sense is how we receive signals from the world. The world can be viewed as the surrounding community we live in, either regional or transnational. If a sense of anarchy and uncertainty is what engulfs the community, they can choose to move away from this sense. According to Carl Deutsch (1957), sense of anarchy in Europe is what aspired for new vision of order and need for conceptualization of new security experience. Thus, faculty of reason become an integral part in shifting the paradigm of anarchy. According to Emmanuel Kant, reason itself is structured with forms of experience and categories that give a phenomenal and logical structure to any possible object of empirical experience. The proposition of the concept of security community by Carl Deutsch had dual objectives: one was articulation of Europe's past experience, and second, the architect of forcible order, in this case, the idea of peaceful change (Deutsch, 1957). The faculty of imagination is what underpins communities' reflexive thinking of past experiences in conjunction with a new paradigmatic state. The consequence is the community can project values and predict behaviors of its members for better change (Deutsch, 1957; Adler and Barnett, 1998).

Defining Security Community

According to Carl Deutsch, security community is when a pluralistic community becomes integrated to a point where they have a sense of being one community, which assures that they will settle their differences through means other than war (Deutsch, 1957). Waever

(1998) views pluralistic security community as “non-war community” (See also Adler and Barnett 1998, 71). Adler and Barnett define pluralistic security community as a transnational region comprised of sovereign states whose people maintain dependable expectations of peaceful change. Or what Wendt would think as a Kantian Social Structure – actors stop treating each other as security problems and start behaving as friends (See Buzan and Waever, 2003)

More recently, contemporary scholars of IR, such as Adler, Barnett, Emmerson, and Acharya have utilized Deutsch’s concept of a security community to analyze peaceful change and international order. Adler and Barnett (1998) identified conceptual weaknesses on Deutsch’s conceptualization of security community and offered three categories by which, in theory, development of security community (nascent, ascent and mature) can be evaluated (Adler and Barnett, 1998). Acharya went deeper than Adler and Barnett to argue that security community is strengthened by norms and constant interaction between members states (Acharya, 2006). Although Acharya agrees with certain theories of security communities proposed by Deutsch, he critiques “transnationalism” by pointing that--even if two way flows shows interdependence, such finding need not imply peace (Emmerson, 2005). Emmerson evaluated different theoretical frameworks of security communities’ vis-à-vis the question of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). In his evaluation he focused on the basic components which make a regional/transnational organization a security community (see Emmerson, 2005). Deutsch’s concept of security community has been an integral part for the creation of the NATO and the European Union, along with theories behind the practice of peaceful change. Focusing on the states and state cooperation, theories of security community did little to consider the general

public (Tucisisny, 2007). In other words, local and indigenous security concerns are mostly ignored in these theories.

Neorealist, Neoliberal, Constructivists and Rationalist Theories of Security Community

According to Acharya (2003) neo-realists perceive that change occurs as a consequence of a shift, often violent, in the distribution of the balance of power. Deutsch's concept of security community comes as a response to the realist traditional dominance policy making, which in essence, had gone unchecked until the late 20th century (Adler and Barnett, 1998). Accordingly, Deutsch's suggestion that states can overcome the security dilemma and recurring fear assumed by realist theories is less shocking than it once was. Security Dilemma refers to a situation in which certain actions by a state are intended to heighten its security, such as increasing its military strength or making alliances, and can lead other states to respond with similar measures (Jervis, 1978). Deutsch views that these causal mechanisms could be found in the development of social networks and the quickening of transnational forces, which is attributed with the return of international relations theorists to a sociological model (Adler and Barnett, 1998). The realist based model of security has become less popular since Carl Deutsch's proposition of security community. More and more scholars have looked into alternative thinking of security where the emphasis for peaceful change is increasingly analyzed through the scope of neoliberals and constructivists. According to Adler and Barnett (1998), others have noted that the realist paradigm is better realized in theory than in practice, as states are not as war prone as it was believed. Many security arrangements once inferred to derive from balancing behavior in fact depart significantly from realist views (Adler and Barnett, 1998). In essence, the failure of neorealist theory to reconcile future uncertainties for the regions and transregional settings gave

a way to neoliberal theory, which currently dominates security theoretical understanding across much of the globe.

The quest for putting an end to international anarchy was Deutsch's driving force for developing the concept of security community and the theories which explain them (Adler and Barnett, 1998). The neoliberal theories consider security community as one sure way towards institution-building. Thus, in every level of cooperation they insist on formal structural arrangement as a way of securing the multidimensional interests of stakeholders (Acharya, 2003). They accept that peaceful change can occur through the working of international institutions (Acharya, 2003). Thus, many scholars have linked neoliberal values such as liberal democracy and free trade with stable security arrangement (Emmerson, 2005). Neoliberals view institutions as facilitators of cooperation by providing information and reducing transactional costs (Adler and Burnett, 1998; Acharya, 2005).

According to Adler and Barnett, the working of security community-building institutions such as the OASCE, the EU and NATO, also confirm the neoliberal argument that international institutions matter because they help states coordinate their exogenously developed interests by easing costs of transaction and speeding up information exchange (Adler Barnett, 1998). Taking theories of security community beyond Deutsch's analytical framework, Adler and Barnett (1998) presented a framework for analyzing the emergence of security community, which revolve around three "tiers". The first tier consists of precipitating factors, which gravitate states toward coordinating their policies (i.e., threats of war/collective security concern.) Second tier

consists of “structural” elements of power and ideas and a “process” for an element of transaction and international organizations. Third tier is the development of trust and a collective identity formation (Adler and Barnett, 1998). Of all three categories, the second tier is what describes the neoliberal project. The structural element of powers has become a central authority to which all states depend on for regional/transnational cooperation. Therefore, transactional cost diminishes greatly, which often than not, plays into the interests of the stake holders of the security community (Deutsch, 1957; Acharya, 2003; Adler and Barnett, 1998). Neo-realism relies on the language of force and deterrence. Neo-liberal institutionalism, though sharing with neo-realism many key assumptions, takes a more optimistic view because of its attention to the conditions under which states might establish a stable set of norms and institutions to further their shared interests (Adler and Burnett, 1998).

The constructivists have gone beyond neorealist and neoliberal thinking to analyze the question of peaceful change. Their analysis of security community focuses on norms and interactions between members of the community (Acharya, 2003). Constructivists believe that people make up the social world, which is meaningful in the minds of people. In other words, at the heart of the constructivist work is that our social environment defines who we are, our identities as social beings (Karakasulu, 2007). As for Acharya, security community has “shared identities, values and meanings” (Adler and Barnett, 1998). Acharya, as a constructivist scholar, views that cooperation among states is understood as a social process that can have positive and even transformative effects on their relations through internalizing regulative norms (Acharya, 2003). Far from denying a reality to the material world, constructivists claim that how the material world shapes, changes, and affects human interaction depends on prior and changing

epistemic and normative interpretations of the material world (Adler and Barnett, 1998). This observation suggests that there are many possible explanations for the absence of war between community members. According to Emmerson (2005), Acharya's analysis of the theories of security community suggests that even ASEAN can also be classified as a security community. Emmerson argues that the minimal definition of security community involves the question of shared norms, identity and frequent interaction among community members qualifies ASEAN as a security community (Emmerson, 1998). The downside of constructivist scholarship is according to Emmerson, it privileges elite declarations over mass behavior. Emmerson argued that the constructivist understanding of peaceful change reflects on history rather than on empirical documentation (Emmerson, 2005).

For rationalists, compliance mechanisms are individualistic like coercion, cost-benefit calculations and material reasons (Karakasulu, 2007; Acharya, 2006). Thus, rationalist ideas of security community come very close to the theories of neoliberals' transactional thinking, which underpins the cooperation of actors on the ground of trade interests. The rationalist paradigm considers as a rule only the external threats to security, although there has been a recent trend towards applying the concept to internal conflicts as well (Vayrynen, 2000). Some arguments have been made by scholars like Posen (1993) to export the theories of the international security dilemma and use it to analyze the question of inter-ethnic conflict. Robert Mandel in contrast states that internal threats are serious and need to be approached in other ways than just the security community concept (Mandel, 1994). This detour is not to detract from the pluralistic security community theory, but to inform that there has been some warning on the limits to Carl

Deutsch's concept and others who built their argument from this concept; especially the neoliberals, whom view the security community concept as a one size fits all tool.

Other ways of conceptualizing theories of security community and peaceful change can be viewed through the analysis of "materialists" and "societal" thinking. According to Vayrynen (2000), the distinction between materialists and societal thinking are pinnacle to security studies. Vayrynen describes that the materialists' approach views security as a result of identifiable factors; i.e., the distribution of economic and military power or the nature of political systems. However, he asserted that the societal approach puts more emphasis of political participation and social transformation, and in that sense, social construction of security (Vayrynen, 2000). In essence, precedence of the "external" reality in materialists models on one hand, leads to the view that security has to be maintained by the threat of instability and resort to enforcement. On the other hand the "internal" nature of reality in societal models stresses more on the relevance of mutual norms and their self-enforcement (Vayrynen, 2000). Of all four schools of thoughts, neoliberal, constructivists and rationalists consider "materialists" and "society" components are the recipe for greater integration.

Of all these schools of thought, none clearly analyze peaceful change in a way other than the top down understanding of security arrangement. The neorealist subscribe to a self-centric approach and are too naïve to accept the world of cooperation as proposed by the neoliberal scholars. The constructivists, despite their vision of norms and consistent interaction among community members, seem to privilege elites over the masses. Additionally, the scholarship

which theorizes peaceful change with regards to materialism and societal thinking can still fall in the group of neorealist and neoliberal theories of security community. Therefore, the ground up theorization of security community which takes into account the indigenous and local understanding of security is missing. Apparently relations in all of the above analyses focus on the cooperation between states and international cooperation. Hence, literature on security community evolved out of a particular historical and political context, and for this matter, these concepts of security community developed within the context of post WWII Europe. In order for security community to work in East Africa the aspiring member states need stronger national institutions.

Proliferation of Security Community to Developing Regions

Major analyses of security communities by Western scholars had used the concept of security communities and the theories behind it to explain the question of peaceful change in a general sense (Barkawi and Laffey, 2006). For example, the use of the Western model of security community as a standard model against all non-Western which aspired/formed security communities, i.e., ASEAN. As a result, developing regions which adopt the concept of security community altogether fall short in a practical sense as the theories have been patterned according to western security and cannot address security challenges effectively in those developing regions. Thus, Barkawi and Laffey (2006) radically argued that “understanding security relations now requires that we discard Eurocentric assumptions about the world and how it works.” By

this they mean that, looking at the world in one particular way of understanding undermines other possibilities of understanding of the same particular issue. The contemporary challenges of security issues involves not only the threats of interstate wars or foreign threats to the community, but also non state actors, economic inequality, excessive use of violence by a state apparatus on civilians, and the lack of the education. The threat of conflict in developing regions is often than not rooted in ethnic disputes like the Rwandan genocide, and/or political strife like the 2007 killings of civilians in Kenya amid the national election (Mueller, 2011). Since different regions have different historical, cultural, political and economic experiences, so are the approaches for the creation of peaceful change. What makes the Western security community concept unfit to developing regions in a larger sense is that the greater policy making and cooperation is negotiated top down. East Africa's leaders hold their grip in power no matter what cost it would bear. With this mindset, top down security arrangement becomes advantageous for them to strengthen their grip on power. This is why Mandel pointed that there is a "need for a different conceptual 'tool kit of security arrangement to deal with internal threats'" (Mandel 1994). Besides the Barkawi, Laffey, and Mandel propositions of a new conceptual framework and divorce from Eurocentric mind regarding security communities, Fanon, a post-colonial humanist posited that:

“Come, comrades, the European game is finally over, we must look for something else. We can do anything today provided we do not ape Europe, provided we are not obsessed with catching up with Europe....Let us decide not to imitate Europe and let us tense our muscles and our brains in a new direction. Let us endeavor to invent a man in full, something which Europe has been incapable of achieving.”

(Fanon, 2004)

In essence, Fanon as well, proposes that there should be an alternative way of thinking with regard to how the world works. He is taking a humanist trajectory to make his point. However, like Barkawi, Laffey, and Mandel, Fanon is critical toward imposition/adoption of the Western point of view as a mode of understanding how the world works.

Adler and Barnett sought to expand their analysis of security community as they viewed Deutsch's concept to have two problems: (1) the concept was resistant to precise operationalization because it was fuzzy and ill defined, and (2) Deutsch's theory could not detect a greater sense of the cohesion and the community based on mutual responsiveness, value orientation, and identity. Adler and Barnett derived three phases, in which describes grounds for peaceful change in the security community. They assert that security community can be empirically identified as nascent, ascendant and mature (Adler and Barnett, 1998). They further distinguished matured security communities according to loosely and tightly coupled. The minimal nascent security community definitional component is a transnational region with sovereign states whose people maintain dependable expectations of peaceful change (Adler and Barnett, 1998). In this initial stage, we expect to see various diplomatic, bilateral and multilateral exchanges along with missions that determine the level and extent of cooperation that might be achieved (Adler and Barnett, 1998). Additionally, Deutsch posited that war or a common threat is a sufficient or necessary condition for generating an interest in a security community (Deutsch, 1957). Hence, nascent stage of security community has two trajectories, one is economic, which is fostered by cooperation and security, both of which emerge from interstate war or a common threat. Adler and Barnett further point that the trigger for security community is likely to have material and normative bases. This can include:

“rapid shifts in the distribution of military power; cataclysmic events that produce changes in material structures, mindsets and sensibilities, and new ways of thinking about organizing political life; and, transnational, domestic, or international processes that generate common interests. In other words, a security community "gets out of the gate" because of either push or pull factors that cause states to reconsider how to organize their relations.”

(Adler and Barnett, 1998).

Phase II is ascent security community, according to Adler and Burnett. It is defined by increasing dense networks, the emergence of new institutions and organizations which solidify military coordination and cooperation and/or diminished fear that represent the threat. This is contributed to the sense of togetherness and deepening of the mutual level of trust (Adler and Burnett, 1998). In this stage of ascent security community, common ideas of material progress and security are linked to the key shared expectation, thus, the resources (military and/or economic) are only guaranteed among the members of the community (Adler and Burnett, 1998). Phase III is matured security community, it is such that the more the expectations of “ascent security community” are institutionalized in both domestic and supranational settings--the prospect of war in the region becomes unthinkable (Adler and Burnett, 1998). Hence, in the third phase of security regional stakeholders’ identify together in similar values, norms, and symbols. This shared identity in a pluralistic society contributes to depending upon each other in promoting peaceful change and a security community which comes into existence.

The structural form of Europe's security community has all the elements of matured community. It also come two fold though: on one hand the nature of dealing with external threats, which security maintains through sufficient material capacity with an ability to resort to an enforcement action; while on other hand, the internal nature of reality in societal models is promoted through mutual norms and their self-enforced nature(Adler and Burnett, 1998; Vayrynen, 2000). However economic integration has by and large been the key factor for increasing cooperation in the European Security Community. The Marshall Plan played a significant role for the integration by infusing the EU's major source of their economy (Milestone: 1945 - 1952). According to Adler and Burnett (1998), the prospect of economic integration in the creation of security community expands trade relations and fosters trust among states members (Deutsch, 1957; Adler and Barnett, 1998). It also improves the flow of information and social norms and interactions among states become entrenched (Acharya, 2006; Vayrynen, 2000). These experiences have been the driving force for sustaining development of security community of the EU. However, when looking through the prism of developing areas like East Africa, shared norms and interactions among states members in the region can mean nothing to the common citizen. Hence, literature on security community has so far evolved out of a particular historical and political context, and for this matter, the concept of security community is within the context of post WWII Europe. In order for this to work in East Africa it needs strong national/states which are strengthened from the ground up and responsive to human security matters.

Chapter 2

Development of Security Community in Africa and East Africa

There were security collaborations in Africa in the past but most of these were racially segregated and fostered white supremacist goals and were linked to the colonizers (Booth & Vale, 1995). The avalanche of support for Western Settlers in Africa, particularly South Africa, Zimbabwe – formally Rhodesia, Mozambique, and the Democratic Republic of Congo – formally Zaire, and Angola were unconditional and this was captured well in the Simontown Agreement. The processes of cooperation were founded upon an Orientalist vision which conceived of security in terms of “us” the white settlers’ vs “them” the black locals/indigenous populations (Booth & Vale, 1995). This historical illustration is not meant to exaggerate the dominant position of Western concepts of security, but to inform one of the continuous ignoring of non-Western conceptions of security by the West (Barkawi and Laffey, 2006).

Putting this into context, the ruling minority of the Southern African region led by the South African Apartheid regime opted to create a white bloc security alliance to counter the wave of African states’ nationalist movements and to ensure the interests of Southern African white supremacy was intact (Booth & Vale, 1995). Another mode of collaborative arrangement was enacted by General Jan Smuts’ British-centric Commonwealth. Smuts believed in independent African states, racial segregation, and the supremacy of the white race (Booth & Vale, 1995). This was associated with the Simonstown Agreement and African Defense Organization. The Simonstown Agreement was intended to grant Britain permission to get involved in any military mission associated with the South African Apartheid Regime (Navy,

2010). In essence this stands as a form of a security collaboration/alliance. The white South African security alliance had regional and international influence (Booth and Vale, 1995).

On the other hand, the newly independent states in Africa formed the Economic Commission for Africa's (ECA) East and Central Africa. According to Booth and Vale (1995), the inception of this organization reflected the serious early intention to develop a regional security structure. ECA as a new regional grouping was aiming to link social, diplomatic, military, and economic initiatives which would incorporate Angola, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe and Black Liberated States (BLS) which were subjected to a strangle-hold by South Africa. In its fifth summit, the ECA was endorsed by the Organization of African Union (OAU) in 1969 in what was commonly known as the Lusaka Manifesto. The approach of the ECA to Southern Africa was described by the late Julius Nyerere, the first president of Tanzania, as a "statement of principle, not an outline of strategy." It certainly represented a firm, unified and coherent standing by the 'black' bloc and showed a willingness to deliberate difficult issues whilst also being prepared to challenge the actions of the 'white' regimes (Booth and Vale, 1995). The structure of the security community was also described as an alliance of Front Line States in the 'black' bloc (Booth and Vale, 1995).

Development of Security Community in East Africa: East African Security Protocol Bill

In 2013, the East African Community (EAC) took a giant step to introduce the East African Security Protocol (EASP), which aimed to address the question of peaceful change in the region of East Africa. Like other top down security approaches, the East African Community

Protocol on Peace and Security has focused on relations between states and international cooperation. Thus, under Article 124 of the Treaty, the Partner States agreed that peace and security are pre-requisites to social and economic development within the Community and vital to the achievement of the objectives of the Community. Moreover, throughout the protocol the community members are encouraged to jointly work together to address issues ranging from the challenges of terrorism, piracy, cross border conflicts, the illicit drug trade, illegal arms proliferation, etc. The biggest disappointment of this protocol is that it left out the key actors like civil society and NGOs who work closely within the community on sub-national, national and the international level. According to Otondi, civil society and NGOs are vital actors in insuring the modes of development and accountability (Otondi, 2016).

The EACSP derives its processes of institutionalization from the theories of neoliberalism, constructivism and rationalism. This is evident from the EACSP's Article four and Article seven. Article four requires member states to resolve conflicts among member states through peaceful means. Article seven stresses more on member states' cooperation and joint practices of resolving security matters. The protocol argues for community members to form a joint force and address the challenges of security collectively. The protocol also stresses further interaction among community members to address terrorism, piracy and other security related matters like cross border crimes and disaster warnings (EAC, 2013). However, the driver forces for integration envisioned by EACSP are not aligned with Deutsch's theories of security community. For example, Deutsch's key factor for integration is to prevent threat from within and outside the community. In the case of European integration through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the major motivator was to deter the threat of war against member

states (Deutsch, 1957). In addition to that, Deutsch states that a mutual threat from a foreign government can also serve to solidify the community and its security integration. These two threats were sufficient concerns to foster integration for the states of Europe. In the EAC, security integration came via the EACSP. All members do not share the same threats of security and therefore, there can be disagreement among member states about their national threat priorities. Hence, there is no clear-cut threat as was the case in post-WWII Western Europe

Another fundamental problem for the “top down” approach, especially in regional integration like the East African Community, is that the national governments tend to influence whom to represent the state in the regional legislative assembly. In the 2012 Election for the EALA, all member states’ ruling parties had picked representatives affiliated to the parties at home (Kasiime, 2017). The EALA’s main function is not much different from those of the national assemblies of the partner parties, for which it has to maintain a constant lease on matters pertaining to the EAC, such as debating and approving the annual budget of the community (Ubweni, 2017). This makes the politics of the region an extension of the national states’ policies interest. Thus, even the EACSP has been a subject of contention as member states disagree on issues of security matters and the methods of implementation to resolve these security matters.

As far as it is concerned, the EACSP has focused mainly on the assumption of securitization – designation of issues as existential threats, eliminating the possibility of questioning how these security challenges come about and how to address them from the ground level. The issues which are quite problematic in this protocol are: counterterrorism projects and the question of piracy in the waters of Indian Ocean, which according to the protocol are of high concern. The protocol reiterated that these issues can be addressed through state’s joint

cooperation in the region. This implies that the community should mobilize resources and form either a standing army or police force to address the challenges. However, in the EAC, only two members have maritime borders on the Indian Ocean (Tanzania and Kenya). Therefore, three out of five states do not have maritime borders on the Indian Ocean (Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi). In addition to that, a state which has piracy issues is Somali, a failed state and not a member of the EAC as it does not currently meet the criteria to be one (Farah, 2016). The threat of maritime piracy exists in the Horn of Africa as a result of the desperate situation in Somalia and the devastated political economy along the coastline (Kraska & Wilson, 2009). Therefore, addressing piracy issue with armed forces are France, the United States, Denmark, Malaysia, India, The United Kingdom, Russia and Iran. This external involvement is counterproductive for the East African Community. Instead the process of restoration of political stability should be the highest priority to insure long lasting stability in the Indian Ocean Waters of the coast of the Horn of Africa. Note, South Sudan has not been included in most cases as they are a very recent member of EAC

Also, one out of five countries in the region has experienced substantial terrorist activities. Kenyan critics cited that their interventionist policy in Somalia and the presence of Kenyan troops in Somalia is what heightened tension and increased terrorist attacks in Kenyan Soil (Weizberg, 2014). Similarly, the recent bombing of Ugandan towns, according to Atsiaya, the region of East Africa has more problems with regards to social and economic issues, where much resource allocation and political will are needed (Atsiaya, 2014). Lumumba, a lawyer and political scientist from Kenya, cited that corruption in African countries is so significant that it affects the physical development of the states and regions of Africa (Lumumba, 2017).

Lumumba's views on corruption in African leaders suggests that the regional integration would not be immune to corruption itself. Therefore, with no mechanism for accountability or checks and balances, corruption and policy implementation which do not impact ordinary people, but governments and elites, would prevail. Thus, the absence of strong language in the East African Security Protocol bill with regards to corruption, greater contribution of civil society and NGOs informs one that the community is led top down and citizen interests are not factored in fostering integration. This begs for closer evaluation of the EACSP and a questioning of the procedures with which the EAC undertook to derive the EACSP. Once this is accomplished the proposal of the incorporation of ground up approach/methods could address the deficit constituted in this protocol.

The development of security community arrangements in Africa during decolonization was fueled by nationalist movements across the continent the quest for self-determinations. The Organization of African Union (OAU) was in support of all these movements and provided political support, although the OAU was not as strong (Munya, 1998). Many of the security concern from early 1969s were addressed in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and the part of pressing concerns was the Apartheid region's resistance for South African States' self-determination (Munya, 1998). The South African Development Community, according to Booth and Vale, it is a product of Black Bloc in Southern African hemisphere (Booth and Vale, 1995). The states in Africa become independent the more regional communities were formed and focused primarily in economic issues like Economic Community Organization of West African States (ECOWAS). In East Africa – there is East African Community (EAC) and in Southern hemisphere there is SADC (Booth and Vale, 1995). This thesis focuses on the EAC. The next chapter discusses a ground-up method of incorporating security issues that will strengthen states involved in EAC.

Chapter 3

Strengthening Institutions in the National/State Level in East Africa

Of all scholars who subscribe to the security community concept, there is one inherent problem; the current academic mode of analysis reflects upon the relationships between certain elites of member states and international cooperation. This results in the regimes of analysis focusing on security community, mainly from western scholars, to be top down. Hence, it overlooks local challenges to security, thus, it becomes problematic in its operationalization. Barkawi and Laffey (2006) have argued that “understanding security relations now requires that we discard Eurocentric assumptions about the world and how it works.” Mandel, with regard to constant infusion of western analysis, making them universally viable analytical frameworks, suggested that there is a “need for a different conceptual tool kit of security arrangement to deal with internal threats” (Mandel 1994).

This chapter is neither going to discard Eurocentric assumptions about the world and how it functions, as Barkawi and Laffey put it (2006), nor calling for a new conceptual tool kit. This chapter will analyze existing theories of security arrangement; “ground up” security in particular. This chapter will reveal how the ground up arrangement can be structured, practiced and sustained over time. Also, it is crucial to shed light on challenges and opportunities presented in a ground up approach. In so doing, this chapter will analyze two case studies which represent the ground up approach; the East African Civil Society Organization Forum (EACSOFF) and Participatory Budgeting (PB) of Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, Brazil. The PB and EACSOFF

views a top down arrangement as ineffective for that it ignores the majority of stakeholders. Particularly local communities are affected the most by policies which are done over their heads and do not reflect upon their real daily challenges (Sauza, 1997).

For instance, despite significant obstacles, the EAC has made progress toward its process of integration within the realm of economic integration, albeit with state actors being the significant players. The economic measures have led to increased trade across the region thus augmenting EAC member states' intra-regional trade, which stood at 71.8 % of the total share, among the thirteen countries classified within the Eastern Africa cluster by the African Development Bank between, 2008 and 2009 (Otondi, 2016). However, this prosperity does not easily translate to the people's benefit in the region. This is because the practice of policy making in a top down and pro trade environment renders the community integrational process meaningless as local people are entrenched in poverty and struggling to meet basic human needs. This, often than not, transcends into security issues within states and across states. For example, revolts and riots erupted as a result of the Kenyan election of 2007 and was the manifestation of the common Kenyans' discontent for their corrupt leaders, the blatant inequality, their deep poverty and the Kenyan governmental disregard of human rights (Xan Rice, 2008). These riots led to more than 1,200 deaths. Thus, the regional integration in East Africa has had a limited impact to bringing about stability in the region and promoting human rights. Civil society organizations and NGO's emerge as prominent actors who advocate for people centered policies. In 2007, the East African Civil Society Organization Forum was formed to promote citizen participation in the regional integration.

Similarly, the practice of Participatory Budgeting in Brazil comes as a response to top down decision making by the national government. According to Sauza (1997), moving away from their authoritarian past, the locals in urban centers of Brazil demanded more citizen centered policies that would take into account their interests. Though it was a trial and error form of practice, over time it achieved local and national recognition. One of the primary justifications for these decentralization policies is they strengthen democracy by increasing participation, especially by those social groups at the local, non-state level, which have traditionally been excluded from the government decision-making process and policy implementation (Sauza, 1997). Many regions in Brazil have come to adopt the processes of PB. (Castro, 1988; Ferreira, 1991; and Sauza, 1997). There were a number of municipalities governed by a segment of the then MDB (Brazilian Democratic Movement), who adopted participatory policies by a way of putting pressure on federal and state controlled entities by the military. Thus, the socioeconomic and historical challenges of Brazil, with regard to its military regime, inspired the development of PB. This situation is similar to what inspired the emergence of the East Africa Civil Society Organization Forum. The analysis of ground up governance of socio-political economy and security through EACSO and PB can help us understand the operationalization of the ground up concept.

Participatory Budgeting (PB)

Many cities across the globe have adopted Participatory Budgeting procedures to inspire accountability, participation of the excluded, deliberating expenditure through ways of prioritization, and an attempt at creating a just society (Sauza, 1997). The conversation about PB also comes at a timely moment internationally – in 2016, Portugal announced the world's first

PB on a national scale. This is not surprising given that PB has fast become a movement across the globe – having been adopted by cities such as New York, (championed by progressive mayor Bill de Blasio), Toronto, Paris and Seville (Patel, 2016). This section will only cover two cities, Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, Brazil. One of the aspects of PB which makes it a rich, but challenging field of study is that no experience is exactly like another (Cabannes, 4004). In order to understand the theories of PB and how it reflects the ground up approach, this section will discuss the effectiveness of PB regarding increasing participation, more pro-poor expenditure, and greater local government accountability. These three components are reflected in every PB city. In other words, participation, pro-poor expenditure and greater accountability are the sole reason why many cities of Brazil adopted PB in the first place (Sauza, 1997; Bruce, 2004). The proposed conceptual framework of UN-HABITAT which gives the guideline for adopting and improving PB identifies three levels of PB; minimum, medium and advanced arrangement. These revolve around the participation, deciding expenditure and greater accountability (Cabannes, 2004). Thus, no matter what the differences of PB are in different cities, the reason for wanting PB is rather the same -- improving ordinary people's livelihood by making them part of the decision making process.

Defining Participatory Budgeting

Participatory Budgeting is the process of democratic deliberation and decision making, a type of participatory democracy, in which ordinary people decide how to allocate part of a municipal or public budget (Patel, 2016). Other scholars view PB as a decentralization project in promoting democracy. Some of the literature has adopted a positive view of decentralization, stressing its merits with respect to “reinventing the government”, bringing the government closer

to the community, building bridges between private and public demands, and improving local governance (Figueiredo, Rubens and Lamounier, 1996). The International Association for Public Participation (AIP2) in Canada views PB as public participation (Nelischer, 2016). Their definition for public participation is that “It promotes sustainable decisions by providing participants with the information they need to be involved in a meaningful way, and it communicates to participants how their input affects the decision.” (Nelischer, 2016). In this case I will adopt the first definition proposed by Patel (2016). It covers all ranges of participation and decentralized assumption of participatory democracy with clarity. Thus, participatory budgeting and the so called decentralized/participatory democracy are local since it happens on a subnational and local level. Through these practices, we can understand the ground up approach.

It might seem like a confusing statement that the ground up approach has not received much attention from the scholars of IR, yet, looking through the scope of PB, so much has been discussed with regards to public participation and people centered decision making. Before this chapter went on to touch upon practices of PB in Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, Brazil, it is important to mark a distinction on what has been interrogated the most and what has not. On one hand, much of the literature in IR has not invested enough on ground up security analysis. The trajectory of analyzing peaceful change has been through top down analysis. On the other hand, there have been volumes of public participation, particularly with regard to local socio-political economies. However, given the success of PB and public participation in certain cities across the globe, it is compelling that theoretical frameworks of security and regional integration could be derived from the ground up. Thus, people can deliberately become part of the decision making for what matters the most in their daily lives. The UN-HABITAT program officially adopted the

concept and theory pertaining to PB, and proposed a researched guideline for cities across the globe (Cabannes, 2004). Additionally, the UN-HABITAT has incorporated scenarios which describe better procedures to avoid shortcomings. Thus, as a practice, PB has also been nominated by both the World Bank and the United Nations Development Program as a ‘best practice’ for democratic innovation (Patel, 2016).

The Significant Contribution of Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre and Belo, Brazil

Unlike other countries across the globe, the PB in Brazil came into full front during the transition period from the military regime to a democratic government (Sauza, 1997). Scholars who focused on PB in Brazil before the transition to democracy have pointed that there were elements of grassroots mobilization, which demanded for the greater inclusion for the marginalized communities. According to Sauza, even while the military régime was still in power, a few municipalities governed by a segment of the then MDB (Brazilian Democratic Movement) adopted participatory policies as a way of putting pressure on federal and state entities controlled by the military (Sauza, 1997). Citizen participation at the start of this experience was best characterized as a consultation, rather than an opportunity to taking an active role in decision-making. In 1980, a number of committees were created, including the Citizens’ Budgetary Committee, in which popular organizations had both seats and votes. Thus, the Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte became the most studied cities, not because they are the only cities that adopted PB, but because these two cities had been a flash point for protesting policies of the central government and was the first region to practice PB (Sauza, 1997; Bruce, 2004). Scholars who viewed PB as a decentralization program pointed that the primary justifications for these decentralization policies is that they strengthen democracy by increasing

participation, especially by those social groups at the local level which have traditionally been excluded from the government's decision-making process and policies (Sauza, 2016).

Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte

To understand the PB of Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, Brazil, one needs to have better knowledge of the actors. According to Sauza, Moyars and the leftist party in Brazil played a major role in advancing PB (Sauza, 1997). In Porto Alegre, the PT (Workers Party) had won the last four mayoral elections and governed the city without extensive collaboration with other parties. In Belo Horizonte, the PT was the leading party of a leftist coalition in the 1992 election; however in the 1996 election, the PT lost its leadership to the PSB (Brazilian Socialist Party). Nevertheless, the PT quickly became the dominant faction of the governing coalition and has kept its leadership in PB (Sauza, 1997; Bruce, 2004). In essence, the people of Belo Horizonte could not accept anything less than PB because of the participatory movement, which had been taking root decades earlier (Bruce, 2004). This is the reason why even though the Mayors from the party championing for PB did not win the election, the success of PB was the compelling factor for keeping it intact. According to Patel, PB is not “what you do, but how you do it”. She states that, a properly deliberative process urges people to educate themselves, to build their ability to consider and make decisions, as well as to understand other values and perspectives. It enables people to understand and engage directly with trade-offs – and it teaches compromise (Patel, 2016). However, this process takes place gradually, and sometimes for the community to realize the benefits of PB can mean a lengthy process of trial and error.

Methods of gathering information and including stakeholders

The central program of PB are the district and thematic plenary assemblies that gather in different areas of the city to participate in the budget - writing process (Sauza, 1997). In the first round of assemblies, local government officials present the audience with general information about the city budget. After closure of the first assembly, meetings are held in each neighborhood where residents draw up their lists of priorities for investment in infrastructure (Sauza, 1997). People develop their knowledge about the topic through debate and exchange of information. This not only directly changes their ability to decide by giving them more information, but it can also cause them to use more intelligent criteria for making decisions. (Feld and Kirchgässner, 2000). In the second round of the assembly, two members are elected from each district and two alternate members for the city-wide municipal budget council (Sauza, 1997). Sometime later, the delegates of the district negotiate the budget and come up with priorities so investment can immediately take place. This type of PB is practiced in Porto Alegre.

The Belo Horizonte experience is not quite similar with Porto Alegre. Sauza has well described it as different form of participatory budgeting, though it has similar objectives.

“PB in Belo Horizonte now starts with two rounds of assemblies in each of the city’s nine administrative sub-districts instead of the original three rounds.(28) As in Porto Alegre, at the first meeting, officials from the municipal government’s district offices and from its secretariats for planning and finance explain the revenue and expenditure situation and the amount left for PB. The following two

meetings are used to agree on priorities, to put together the demands of each sub-district and to choose the delegates for the district forum, known as district PB. After the district delegates have been elected, “priorities caravans” are organized. The aim is to give the delegates an overview of each district, stimulating a broader perspective of other districts’ problems. It also aims to counteract the tendency of district delegates to choose demands that are either too specific or too fragmented. The district forum is the deliberative phase of PB and is where the list of priorities is drawn up. It is at this forum that the members of the committee in charge of following up and overseeing the works to be implemented are chosen. The last phase is the municipal forum, in which PB is formally presented. In 1994, Belo Horizonte also introduced thematic forum which worked together with the district assemblies with the aim of broadening the issues discussed in PB.(29) These fora, unlike in Porto Alegre, were of a more consultative type and, because of this, the thematic fora were replaced by only one, for housing.”

(Sauza, 1997)

These two case studies show two different approaches which represent the same objectives. The differences in these approaches also come with differences in population size, which directly affect their participation and PB procedures (Sauza, 1997). But the basic idea is simple and radical. It is to transfer the power to decide how the city’s money is spent, away from the technocrats in city hall and the elected politicians in the council chamber and into the hands

of the population, meeting in open public assemblies (Bruce, 2004). Since Porto Alegre is small (approx 1.3 million in 1989) in size, participation estimated to be around 16,000 attributed to 300 grassroots movements. According to Navarro's account, the number of participants rose exponentially between 1991 -- 1997. Participation rose from 3,694 to 16,016. Santos pointed that if the number of people attending the assemblies is taken into account, the total calculation could come up to 100,000 (Navarro, 1997).

In Belo Horizonte the population size is (2.3 million), slightly bigger than Porto Alegre. Although the city adopted PB later than Porto Alegre, records show in 1994 15,716 people participated in PB. It doubled and then quadrupled in time. In 1995 the numbers of participants rose to 52,900, representing 800 grassroots movements. Also, if the number of participants is to be calculated from all sources it could total up to 200,000 people who already participated (Navarro, 1997).

Since PB of one place is not the same PB project of another city, procedure and outcomes vary accordingly. Souza (1997) presents a significant theory, which many of the definitions of PB have not taken it into account entirely. She describes that for PB significance to be understood, we need to know that the entire budget is not affected by PB participation, but generally by decisions on infrastructure and investment. In Souza's understanding, budgeting in Brazil is only an authorization for an expenditure on priorities, which can or cannot be fulfilled by executive board elected by the assembly (Souza, 1997).

Overall, PB practices across the globe are concerned with local government and the means for resources allocation which call for citizen centered decision-making. The experience in Brazilian cities indicates that there are many tracks to achieve greater outcomes in PB. Although the processes entail some practical drawbacks, like the protracted time span for the process projects taking place, UN-HABITAT has made giant steps toward promoting PB across the globe, and detailing the theories' blueprint for other cities to adopt. Pros and cons have also been included with statistical analysis (Cabannes, 2004). With other cities adopting PB, the odds are that despite the shortcomings of PB, it is a promising structure for community development and inclusion. Through PB, many concerns can be addressed, particularly the question of security and peaceful change from the ground up.

East African Civil Society Organization Forum (EACSOF) Ground Up Approach

Unlike the PB concept which focuses on local participatory projects with the purpose of inclusion for local peoples in the process of decision making, EACSOF has the similar objectives; however, it also employs a broader scope of functionality. Participatory Budgeting is concerned with towns, cities and provinces, whereas, EACSOF goes beyond town, cities, and provinces to include sub-national, national, as well as international. This section is aimed to analyze EACSOF by looking at how it came into being, its mission, vision, challenges and areas of success. The EACSOF has dual tracks as mentioned above; local and international. The significance of EACSOF is that some of its methods entail characters of the ground up approach. For that matter, this section will analyze them with regards to the prospect of understanding the ground up security scope.

As this section solely focuses on the East African Community (EAC) with regards to EACSOF, it is best to understand the historical background of the region. The EAC is by and large a reflection of its colonial past as regional cooperation has been envisioned by the British in its EA colonial reign (Best and Christiansen, 2011). Before World War I Great Britain had two colonies in East Africa, Kenya and Uganda. With the victory of World War I, Great Britain took the colony of Tanganyika from Germany. Hence, the initial efforts of the EAC integration process began in 1917 with the formation of a customs union by the British, which later expanded to include Tanganyika in 1927. Amid the independence, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania formed East African Common Service Organization which became EAC in 1967 and collapsed (Best and Christiansen, 2011). However, the EAC collapsed as a result of various challenges, with ideological differences being the main bone of contention, at the height of the Cold War, the first post-independence integration efforts crumbled in 1977 (Otondi, 2016). It was reinstated officially in 1999. The current EAC integration process, is more ambitious in a manner that not only aims at regional economic integration, but has as an ultimate goal, the formation of an EAC political federation within a clearly stipulated deadline (EAC-Treaty, 1999; Otondi, 2016).

The 1999 integration of the EAC attracted new members, Rwanda and Burundi, which joined the community endeavor a decade later. The irony of the integration of the contemporary EAC is that relations are between state elites and international cooperation (Otondi, 2016). The policies and decisions are exercised top down, similar to Western regional integration. EAC locals and sub-nationals have experienced few benefits from regional integration. As governments in the region become more and more authoritarian, human rights abuses have taken

a toll, and the social and economic development in the region has left out the majority, who are severely impoverished. According to Otondi (2016), to ensure that the EAC harnesses its full potential, it's imperative that the EAC guarantees participation to both state and non-state actors as stipulated in articles 127(4), and 5(3)(e) of the EAC treaty (EA-Treaty, 1999). Up to 2007, NGO's and Civil Societies in East Africa were operating within national boundaries, with an exception of a few international NGO's, like the African Human Right Commission. Despite the guarantee of participation for non-state actors in the EA-Treaty of 1999, the relationship between NGOs and civil societies on one hand, and national, regional governments on the other are antagonistic. This renders into reality as national governments like Kenya introduced a NGO's and Civil Societies bill which limited foreign contributions to Kenyan non-state actors to 15%. Also, the Kenyan government de-registered more than 500 organizations on grounds of non-compliance and racketeering violence (NGOs Coordination Board, 2017). The inception of EACSOF was a response to such kinds of marginalization of non-state actors in regional government integration. The following section analyzes the EACSOF mission, vision, methods, challenges and areas of success with regard to the ground up approach.

Example of Ground up Approach in EA: East African Civil Society Organization Forum

Initial regional workshops for civil society organizations in the EAC took place in 2005, as part of the EAC's plan under its mandate to provide a forum for Civil Society Organization engagement under Article 127(4) of the EAC Treaty (Kinyunyu, 2009). The inaugural workshop recommended that EACSOF be established as an autonomous body to serve as an umbrella for all NGOs and CSOs in the region mandated to facilitate avenues for active engagement between Civil Societies and community organs (Kinyunyu, 2009).

In 2007, the second forum was held under the theme “Elaborating on the Human Rights System of the East African Community” which discussed and detailed the need for a strong human rights system in the EAC. The year 2009 brought with it the third forum on the theme “Strengthening Civil Society in the EAC: Sharing Experiences with other RECs” (Kinyunyu, 2009). The forum of civil society which is still in its nascent stage, sought to evaluate its current progress and understand how best to formulate effective strategies to influence the development of the EAC. It is against this background that it was deemed essential to learn from other CSOs engaged in similar work with Regional Economic Communities (RECs) in Southern Africa and West Africa (Kinyunyu, 2009).

Since its founding, EACSOFF has been working to strengthen the institutionalization of the relationship between East African CSOs and the community, (EAC). It also works to build a critical mass of knowledgeable and empowered civil societies in the East African region. This is intended to foster their confidence and capacity in articulating grassroots needs and interests in the East African Integration Process. Additionally, it also works to ensure that East African citizen organizations play a substantial role in the integration organization process via building strong citizen organizations which respond to citizen needs.

EACSOFF’s vision is “An integrated community in which Citizens fully participate in all processes that affect their lives” and their mission statement is “To provide an inclusive platform

for civil society to promote good policies and democratic governance for the wellbeing of East Africans” and are further reflected in the goals and objectives (EACSOF).

EACSOF’s work focuses on the following components: Citizen Empowerment, Policy Engagement and Institutional Development with the main objectives to:

- Strengthen the citizens’ civic competence and confidence by enabling citizens to know their rights and obligations and to support them to organize into effective CSO’s as well as national platforms through which they would be able to assert those rights.
- Ensure Citizen Centered Policy Development and Implementation at National and Regional Levels in regards to Democratic Governance; Peace and Security; Social and Economic Justice; Agriculture, Natural Resources, Environmental Protection and Climate Change; and Mainstreaming Science and Technology
- Support EACSOF’s Institutional Capacity building at national and regional levels.

These frameworks put in place by EACSOF contribute to the ground up approach to ensure that subnational national and regional organizations are strengthened to respond to people’s needs. As Otondi argues the top-down state-led regional integration project has fallen short in fulfilling its objectives in the eradication of poverty, inspiring peace and security, and promoting citizen inclusion in local national and regional decision making (Kinyunyu, 2009; Otondi, 2016). Otondi further argues one of the challenges of top down arrangement is that state elites and international cooperation tends to respond to the needs of business communities, as opposed to the needs of ordinary people (Otondi, 2009). The organization of East African Business Community (EABC) has been granted an observer seat in the EAC integration process,

whereas, EACSOFF has not, despite numerous inquiries and follow ups (Kinyunyu, 2009; Otondi, 2016).

Opportunities and Challenges the EACSOFF Faces

EACSOFF has established chapters in each of the member states and each organization draws its national members from sub-national and national NGOs and civil societies. As part of its mission and objective, EACSOFF has inspired subnational and national forums to discuss issues ranging from human rights and political economy, to issues of security on the local level. According to an EACSOFF 2015 report, (See eacsoff.net), the dialog concerning the above issues are discussed on the sub regional level, and then taken further to be discussed on the national level. Through this process, the national chapter hosts a number of forums to discuss issues raised on the sub-national level and other issues deemed to be of concern. The forum, according to EACSOFF, consists of a myriad number of actors and members of national parliaments, alongside national representatives of the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA). The purpose is to have, on one hand, members of the national parliamentary assembly to take the interests of people and discuss them in the parliament. On other hand, the members of EALA can also raise matters of interest in the EALA. This dual track has by large promoted citizen centered policies (EACSOFF, 2016). This is what PB has been championing on the local level, and on the national and regional levels EACSOFF has taken a similar state. These two understanding to citizen centered policies relate, except, PB has a local focus and EACSOFF has local, national and regional focuses.

However, it would be more beneficial if EACSOFF could be granted observer status (Otondi, 2016). Although EAC's plan under its mandate to provide a forum for CSO engagement under Article 127(4) of the EAC Treaty (Kinyunyu, 2009), the execution of this particular policy signals otherwise. In the EAC guideline for Civil Society participation it indicates that the regional community would rather engage with stratified organizations, than one which ties up all organizations in one basket like EACSOFF. The analysis of the Odhiambo and Chitiga informs that EACSOFF has had differences in ideological point of views with the EAC - Secretariat (Odhiambo and Chitiga, 2016). This comes as further proposals were lobbied for an annual meeting of CSOs as part of the EAC Calendar of Activities and the introduction of consultative status for CSOs, "which do not have to be subjected to the requirements of the observer status criteria" (Odhiambo and Chitiga, 2016). Recognizing that this could impact CSO participation negatively, the civil society under the auspices of the EALA began the process of putting together EACSOFF as a civil society-driven platform. The EALA also provided hosting for EACSOFF before it became an independent institution in 2012. Therefore, despite all the efforts to become an observer, EACSOFF has seen no progress in that route. Thus, hinders the prospect of citizen participation in East African integration.

How PB and EACSOFF Inform Ground up Theory

The experience of PB drawn from Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, Brazil has benefited despite the challenges which entails the conception framework of PB. Although PB does not mean decision making on all aspects of the budget, which are channeled to the localities, PB does assist in projects with regards to infrastructure, sewer systems, health centers, education and security; which has had a positive impact to the local communities (Sauza, 1996). Participatory

Budgeting is a local based program and the local people can relate due to traditional and cultural gatherings. PB takes on an organic shape as people express their concerns and what needs prioritization, as opposed to orders for development from central authorities (Patel, 2016). Since the theory of PB and its application has been adopted all over Brazil since its introduction in Porto Alegre, the country wide acceptance is credited to the effectiveness and positive impact generated by PB programs (Bruce, 2004). The theory of PB resonates with the ideas of the ground up approach because it starts at the local level. Even though PB never had national vision in Brazil, the most important thing is citizen centered decisions were exercised on the local level. According to ground up approach theory, which reflects on local town to town relations, citizen formed NGOs and CSOs, and women movements, PB qualifies as a ground up approach.

The East African Civil Society Organization Forum, on other hand has gone beyond Participatory Budgeting to address citizen concerns. It has local policies as described earlier, but also, it works ground up from sub-national, national, regional and international levels. Although the EACSOF model had broader vision and includes multitudes of NGOs and CSOs, the objective remains to address the question of citizen centered policy from all levels of operationalization (Otondi, 2016). For example, when the European Union introduced a trading bill in the EAC, EACSOF translated the proposed trade bill from English to Swahili (a widely spoken language in East Africa) so ordinary people could understand how the bill would affect their daily lives (See eacsof.net). Additionally, EACSOF went further to review the bill alongside local and national chapters, which provided recommendations to which the national government could consult with before ratifying it. Something like this would have been

unthinkable decades ago when the EAC was still undergoing an integration process. Decisions like these would have occurred without the inclusion of civil society organizations.

Power and Human insecurity on a State Level

In International Relations, scholars and political practitioners view power in many ways (Barnett & Duvall, 2005). The argument presented by Barnett and Duvall “that scholars of international relations should employ multiple conceptions of power and develop a conceptual framework that encourages rigorous attention to power in its different forms,” complement the view of “responsive security community” with regard to power and how power should be addressed. Payne defines power as “the ability to get others—individuals, groups, or nations—to behave in ways that they ordinarily would not.” Viotti & Kauppi define power as “the means by which a state or other actor wields or can assert actual or potential influence or coercion relative to other states and non-state actors because of the geographic, political, technological, military, economic and financial, social, cultural, or other capabilities it possesses” (Viotti & Kauppi 2013). Hard power is commonly associated in IR with realism: it is about power politics, force, and violence. Hard power is, to a certain extent, the oldest recognized form of power; it is connected to the idea of an anarchic, untamed international system, where countries do not recognize any superior authority (Pallaver, 2011). A state, an organization, or a single person can exercise power with means other than violence and force such as through persuasion, or

seduction. These are the resources of soft power. Also, according to Nye, smart power lies somewhere between hard and soft power (Nye, 2009).

The question of power is crucial for this thesis as (in) security issues are originated on the state level, especially in EA. Therefore, before addressing the challenges of security on a regional level, this thesis suggests that the state should be reformed and strengthened to respond to its population's security concerns. Why the state? Sabine defines states as makers and enforcers of the law, a body of rules, which has behind it an organized power acknowledged to have the right of coercion as against recalcitrant individuals (Sabine, 1920). If all of these apparatuses of the state are used independently of any individual, group or interest of establishment group, then the state government upholds itself on the standards of democracy and rule of law (Robertson, 2014). In the East African Community, member states are not conforming to these democratic standards as they, more often than not, misuse state power (Kalyango, 2008). The question of practicing power at the state level is a challenging issue and can amount to general domestic insecurity. Here is where stronger institutions on the state level, and a responsive security community, are needed to insure state powers are not abused by increasing participation and making decision that takes into account peoples concern. The Amnesty international report (2016/2017) on Kenyan human right abuses states that:

“Security forces carried out enforced disappearances, extrajudicial executions and torture with impunity, killing at least 122 people by October. Some abuses were committed by security agencies in the context of counter-terror operations, others by unaccountable police officers and other security agencies. Police used excessive and lethal force to disperse demonstrators calling for fair election

practices. Political opposition, anti-corruption groups and other civil society activists, as well as journalists and bloggers, were harassed. Families in informal settlements and marginalized communities were forcibly evicted from their homes”

(Amnesty International – Kenya 2016/17)

This demonstrates how state security apparatuses can act contrary to their stated objectives to protect people and insure liberty and rule of law. In Tanzania, there is a saying in Swahili “Serikali ya Tanzania haishindi kesi ya uwekezaji” meaning that – The Tanzanian government never wins a case against investors. This references the corruption in the state judicial system which reached a record high in 2015 before President Magufuli’s administration took power (Scala, 2017). Scala quoted president Magufuli addressing that “Some 28 magistrates were prosecuted (in Tanzania) last year for various criminal offenses, mostly corruption, but 28 of them were acquitted” and added that “it is hard to believe that all 28 of them were not guilty.” Scala stated that the corruption of this kind happens when juries are bribed to let go of cases brought by the state against investors who don’t pay taxes and do not follow environmental rules (Scala, 2017). Similar cases were pointed out by the local news agencies concerning the Tanzanian people’s dissatisfaction with their judicial system (Makoye, 2012). It indicates that some juries in Tanzania are masters of manipulating judicial procedures while maintaining an image of impartiality at the same time (Misa, 2009). Arvidsson and Folkesso (2010) pointed that a non-corrupt judiciary is a fundamental condition for the endorsement of the rule of law and the ability to guarantee basic human rights in the society. The Rwandan government has been accused of silencing voices of dissent by assassinating them one by one (Rever and York, 2014). According to Rever and York, the government of Rwanda uses army generals to do the work by

promising rewards. Mr. Kagame, the president of Rwanda, permits no serious opposition (Rever and York, 2014).

This is just a glimpse of how states in the East African Community handle state power and it demonstrates how power politics is played out within the state. This is far different from power politics of international relations where states use power to exert their will over other states (Nye, 2009). Also, the three instances of mishandled state power in Kenya, Tanzania and Rwanda inform that the respective judicial systems of these three states are not subscribing to national human rights laws nor the democratic rule of law. As mentioned below, the misuse of state apparatuses and power affects human security and contributes to human insecurity. In “responsive security community” the question of security is of high concern and the means to address it lies on the understanding of state internal practice of power and the consequences it entails.

Overall, for Security Community to work in East Africa, it is crucial to focus on building stronger states. Stronger states which address human security or insecurity at the local level with participatory arrangements, including participation of civil societies as well as responsive governments that listen and work with civil societies, are essential. Thus, the working of PB is the foundational approach toward strengthening state institutions from the ground up. If the people can decide what to prioritize for their local expenditures the same method can be employed to unravel security concerns on the local level and address them accordingly. Since the theory of PB and its application has been adopted all over Brazil, since its inception in Porto Alegre, the country wide acceptance is credited to the effectiveness and positive impact

generated by PB programs (Bruce). The accomplishments of EACSOE are another way of ensuring inclusiveness in addressing security issues on the state level. If these two implementations are employed, the mission of strengthening the states institutions in the EAC will be served successfully. Therefore, when it comes to addressing the question of security regionally, the policies enacted would be responsive to all forms of security threats on all levels of government.

Chapter 4

Conclusion: Toward An Effective Security Community in East Africa

The analysis of “top-down” and “ground-up” approaches on the national level regarding socio-economic development and peaceful change indicates that these two approaches can support EA security integration effectively if put to work. The level of collaboration between top-down and bottom-up approaches, when significant on the national level, actors on the regional level will project participatory and inclusive values to promote policies in favor of the people. In this light this last chapter will analyze what an effective security community may be like when states have strengthened their institution through participatory values and inclusion to respond to the needs of their citizens.

When member states in East Africa undertake a trajectory of promoting citizen centered decision making by utilizing the ideas of PB and EACSOF, there will be a sufficient driving force for building a security community. Karuhanga states that in the current EACSP there is no political will to further an effective integration and it will further induce complications on the process of peaceful change (Karuhanga, 2017). Karuhanga’s words are valid for the EACSP bill has not been agreed upon by all member states. As stated in Chapter 1, only three member states out of six ratified the bill and formed a Coalition of the Willing (CoW). This term CoW was once used by the Bush administration in March 2003, to refer to those countries that supported Operation Iraqi Freedom and the U.S. presence in post-invasion Iraq (Carney, 2012). However, in EA, this term refers to states which support the EACSP and other economic agreements (Masinde, 2016). Karuhanga remarks, it is clear that the political will for the creation of an

effective security community should be built from the ground up, where the need of individual states would be taken into account.

Different states in East Africa have varied security challenges. As pointed out earlier, Kenya has experienced terrorist attacks. Political commentators like Simon Allison from *The Guardian* branch in Kenya suggested the Kenyan government invited these attacks on its soil after deploying troops to Somalia in support of the AU mission in Somalia. In October 2011, 4,000 Kenyan troops were deployed across their border into Somalia with a mandate to hunt down and destroy al-Shabaab, the same Islamist militant group that has promised a massive, bloody revenge against Kenya for their troop deployment (Allison, 2013). In conjunction with this security challenge in Kenya, civil societies, NGOs and human rights groups in Kenya have called for the government to respect the United Nation Human Rights advisory action and conform to the democratic rule of law. This comes as the Kenyan government has been exercising its power excessively to the point where extrajudicial killings had reached a record high in 2016 (Ombuor, 2016). Since these are human security issues and are related to national interests, these challenges can only be addressed first on the state level.

Tanzania has also its own challenges which has to do with their judicial system and extreme corruption within the government. Tanzanian citizens do not feel safe as they are penalized if they cannot prevent acts of corruption by bribing their way out. Therefore, the rights of an individual depends upon the person's willingness to act accordingly with the corrupt system (Makoye, 2012). Similarly, Uganda and Rwanda have been accused to silencing voices of

dissent and political opposition by assassinating people who are perceived to be rebellious by each respective regime (Rever and York, 2014). Mr. Kagame, the president of Rwanda, permits no serious opposition due to these actions (Rever and York, 2014). These differences are what have made the EACSP bill not effective.

Strengthening States for A Responsive Security Community

When states on the local level employ PB and allow for citizens at the city, county, and district levels to work hand in hand with their local governments, the values of participation and inclusion in the decision making process will prevail (Sauza, 1997). This process of deliberation builds stronger local communities where local matters are deliberated by the local populace and their leaders. When this is done in Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda, Tanzania, Burundi and South Sudan, it will help address the challenges patterned to their local settings. According to Sauza, the practice of PB cannot be exported exactly the same for each community, as each community has its own challenges (Sauza, 1997). In Brazil the experience of PB was not identical in every city, country, district and town (Sauza 1997). Therefore, in East Africa, the member states would be able to benefit as individual states, as each experience different security challenges.

In addition to direct PB experience, UN-HABITAT has provided a manual which provides insight on how to implement PB, given that each state has its own unique set of challenges (Cabannes, 2004). According to Cabannes, local settings like the Citizens Movement Council, in a rather unique way, is conceptualized as being the point of coordination and orientation of citizens' movements, as well as the focal point of participation within (Cabannes,

2004). As participation and inclusion is built ground up from the locals, there is the prospect of addressing local challenges sufficiently.

In East Africa the practice of inclusion through civil societies and NGOs has already begun working hand in hand with national governments in the region. The EACSOFF has national chapters which draws its leaders from local civil societies and NGOs. Hence, these leaders come to work in the national chapter with prior experience of working in local settings. As pointed in chapter three, EACSOFF works with individual civil societies and NGOs from the local level and brings their challenges to the attention of each national legislative assembly (EACSOFF, 2016). The EACSOFF evaluates current policies in motion in individual nations where each resides and proposes constructive feedback to select members of parliament to help reevaluate certain policies if they are deemed detrimental to the people of their respective state. Therefore, employing PB and civil societies and NGOs like EACSOFF covers the means to create an atmosphere of participation and inclusion in decision making on the national level. For these actions to take hold in East Africa, the question of extrajudicial killings must be addressed in conjunction with counterterrorism activities in Kenya. Tanzanian corruption and its judicial system must be restored to genuinely protect the people. Once no one is concerned with their disappearance or killed due to their political beliefs in Uganda and Rwanda – when peace comes to South Sudan and Burundi, the prospect of moving on to a responsive security community will be viable.

Responsive Security Community

The responsive security community in East Africa will be a reality once the states develop the security bill with full participation of civil societies and NGOs. In this case the values of participation on the national level would be the driving force for collaboration between the regional government and civil societies for better integration. According to Otondi, the EAC has already laid out the framework of EA economic integration. Otondi pointed that, to ensure that EAC harnesses its full potential, it is imperative that it guarantees participation to both state and non-state actors as stipulated in articles 127(4), and 5(3)(e) of the EAC treaty (Otondi, 2016). He further explains that it is important to note that one of the pitfalls of the first EAC, other than ideological differences, was that the initial integration was exclusively steered by regional state actors and devoid of the involvement of regional CSOs and other interest groups (Otondi, 2016). In this light, there already is a policy springboard to refer too when it comes to regional security community and the right of inclusion for civil societies and NGOs. This would not only signify the working of a “top-down” approach but also the contribution of a “ground-up” approach.

There are already some promising occasions where EAC worked with EACSOF in addressing the controversial bill of the Economic Partnership Agreement between the European Union and East Africa. The collaboration between EACSOF and EALA on the EU trade deal, signaled the beginnings of an amicable relationship upon which a security community could build upon. This was the first high profile event for the EAC in terms of integrating a “ground up” approach with “top down” means, which created an example of responsive security community. Through the apparatus of creating an official organ of government within the EALA, organizations like EASCOF (NGO’s and SCO’s) would have the opportunity to

officially petition for a non-partisan position within the EALA beyond observer status. This would lead to a streamlined and official channel through which local ideas and solutions to security issues could be implemented through a classic “top down” structure within the official organs of government. Overall, this thesis is not entirely anti-institutionalist, it recognizes the capacity the “top down” arrangement conceives. However, this thesis treats institutionalist values as an incomplete set of arrangements. Therefore, to strike a balance and create a more meaningful integration for the EAC through EACSP, the security community should be responsive, which insists on the incorporation of “ground up” arrangements.

The implication of relying on only pluralistic security arrangements for the EAC without building strong states in the region has already displayed negative effects, as member states in the region are divided over the bill. Moreover, even if the EALA manages to convince all state members to ratify the bill and go ahead with the implementation, it would further expand the gap between non-state actors and the regional government. Hence, the creation of an environment where increasing levels of local participation that are more pro-poor expenditure, and greater local government accountability would both be very unlikely future scenario's for the East African Community as it is today.

Chart Demonstrating Responsive Security Community

Responsive Security Community		
Governing Bodies	EAC (Top Down Arrangement)	EACSOE (Ground Up Arrangement)
1. Regional Level	EALA	EACSOE
2. State Level	State Legislative Assembly (SLA)	EACSOE – National Chapter
3. Sub-National Level	Local Governments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Government • District Government • County Government • Village Government 	PB/CSOE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory Budgeting • Civil Societies and NGOs
Citizens		

The chart above displays the blue print of responsive security community which is predominantly concerned with inclusive decision making and policies in conjunction with citizen participation. The chart focuses on three levels of decision making and policy provisions as primary concerns of citizen inclusion. Although the focus of this thesis has been strengthening states, the outlook of the chart represent overall framework on how the process takes place from the two level of the state ground up. Starting from the bottom up, there is the citizen which makes up all three levels of the governing body in both “top down” and “ground up.” Level three, which is the sub-national level, consists of local governments in the “top down” arrangement and Participatory Budgeting and Civil Societies and NGOs in the “ground up” arrangement. The model of PB in Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte Brazil indicates that the working of both “top down” and “ground up” is organic and the interaction of both have had a positive impact (Sauza, 1997).

On level 2 and 1 of policy making there are State Legislative Assemblies and Regional Legislative Assemblies on the “top down” arrangement. Since these two governing bodies decide the policies which affects citizens on all levels, the responsive security community would be that EACSOF be part of the process and as a non-partisan player and genuine amplifier of the people’s voices. The top down arrangement does not have enough resources (or the willingness to budget the resources) to establish independent bodies that would address and petition for the people’s interests. Hence, since EACSOF is willing and has enough resources and expertise to provide the free service to foster development in the integration of the EAC, it is of the utmost importance to utilize this opportunity.

Overall, the representation of the chart suggests that both bodies which forms the responsive security community works for the people's interest. Since the "ground up" arrangement is not designed for its agents to seek votes or have any partisan stake in the political scene, the "top down" arrangement has nothing to lose or worry about with regard to the question of power. Rather, EACSOFF would serve the interests of the people and the government in the "top down" arrangement simultaneously.

Unlike the Barkawi and Laffey idea of discarding the Western understanding of security and how the world works, responsive security community seeks to include ground up thinking in the already existing structures of top down arrangement. This way the ground up arrangement, complemented by PB, civil societies and NGOs, serves to constantly address even forgotten minor issues of social political economy and security concerns. The United Nations Commission for Human Rights in 2003 stated that human security goes beyond traditional understanding of security. The take from CHR is that the question of security should address human security/individual security (CHR, 2003). This is in conjunction to responsive security community, such as – to protect the vital core of human lives in ways that enhance human freedom and human fulfilment. Therefore, in Kenya, according to reports from EACSOFF on human rights, the state currently does not respect all aspects of human security. For instance, the practice of counterterrorism in Kenya and extra-judicial killings is detrimental to the security of its ordinary citizens. These constitute human rights abuses, which according to the definition of the human security initiative of United Nations (2011), are atrocities committed in Kenya in the name of security are related to organized crime and criminal violence against people. Hence the

strong state which encourages participation and inclusion of people and civil societies in day to day lives is vital for greater development of a responsive security community.

Additionally, Robert Mandell also suggested that there is a need for an entirely new conceptual tool to address the question of security and peaceful change (Mandel, 1994). He meant that the current concepts of security community, including the top down arrangement, are no longer viable ways of addressing the security challenges of the 21st century. This is not different from Fanon's calling of African states to not imitate Europe and suggest that "we can do anything today provided we do not ape Europe, provided we are not obsessed with catching up with Europe....Let us decide not to imitate Europe and let us tense our muscles and our brains in a new direction" (Fanon, 2004). However, it doesn't matter where people are coming from, peoples needs differ from place to place within Africa as well. This is true according to Sauza's analysis of PB in Brazil and Cabannes's PB tool kit for states across the Globe (Sauza 1997; Cabannes, 2004). Hence, supplanting the working of a top down arrangement with a ground up approach helps to unravel forgotten issues of human security in different parts of East Africa. Therefore, through participation and inclusion on the community level, states can be strengthened and the creation of a responsive security community can be viable.

Overall, this thesis took into account the concept of security community and the theories behind it. According to neorealist, neoliberal, constructivist, rationalist and other western schools of thought, the debates from all these schools has given a major importance to the top down arrangement, where relations are views from state to state perspectives and international cooperation. Thus, the biggest argument this thesis has conceived is that this type arrangement cannot create an environment of peaceful change in East Africa. The introduction of the EACSP has failed to be ratified as member states are divided on its contents. The odds are, if all

community members ratify the bill in the near future, according to Otondi, the premature creation of a security community will be disastrous. Or if the CoW continues working together while other member states do not, this will likely create a security dilemma. (Jervis, 1978).

In order to create strong states in East Africa, it is essential that the ground-up arrangement takes on an organic transformation via PB and EACSOA. If it is dictated to by the central government, the top down arrangement, the true interests of the people and their genuine concerns would be ignored.

Bibliography

- Abers, Rebecca (1998), "From clientelism to cooperation: local government, participatory policy, and civic organizing in Porto Alegre, Brazil", *Politics and Society* Vol 26
- Acharya, A. (2014). *Constructing a security community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the problem of regional order*. Routledge.
- Adler, E., & Barnett, M. (1998). *Security communities* (Vol. 62). Cambridge University Press.
- Atsiaya, A. M. (2014). *Challenges facing economic integration: a case study of Eastafrica community (EAC) 2000–2012* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Barkawi, T., & Laffey, M. (2006). The postcolonial moment in security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 32(02), 329-352.
- Barnett, M., & Duvall, R. (2005). Power in international politics. *International organization*, 59(01), 39-75.
- Best, E. and Christiansen, T (2011). *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to World Politics*, ed. John Baylis, Steve Smith & Patricia Owens, New York Oxford University Press, Fifth Edition, 2011, p.435
- Booth, K., & Vale, P. (1995). Security in southern Africa: after apartheid, beyond realism. *International Affairs* (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-), 285-304
- Bubandt, N. (2005). Vernacular security: The politics of feeling safe in global, national and local worlds. *Security Dialogue*, 36(3), 275-296.

- Buzan, B., & Waever, O. (2003). *Regions and powers: the structure of international security* (Vol. 91). Cambridge University Press.
- Cabannes, Y. (2004). *Participatory Budgeting: Conceptual Framework and Analysis of its Contribution to Urban Governance and the Millenium Development Goals*.
- Carney, S. A. (2012). *Allied Participation in Operation Iraqi Freedom*. Government Printing Office.
- Deutsch, K. W., Burrell, S. A., Kann, R. A., Lee Jr, M., Lichterman, M., Lindgren, R. E., ... & EACSOFF (2016). *Consolidated Strategic Plan for the Five Year Period 2016-2020*. Eacsof.net
- Emmerson, D. K. (2005, April). Will the real ASEAN please stand up? Security, community, and democracy in Southeast Asia. In *Southeast Asian Forum*, Stanford University. Available at http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/24126/Emmerson_04_05_2005.pdf (11 November 2015, date last accessed).
- Ernest, Sykvester. (2011). Tanzania Police Top Corruption List. Web. *The East Africa*. <http://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/news/Tanzania>
- Farah, H. (2016). Somalia denied from joining East African Community bloc. *Horseed Media*. <https://horseedmedia.net>
- Jervis, R. (1978). Cooperation under the security dilemma. *World politics*, 30(02), 167-214.
- Karacasulu, N., & Uzgören, E. (2007). Explaining social constructivist contributions to security studies. *Perception*, 27-48.

- Kinyunyu, S. (2009). The 3rd Annual East African Civil Society Organizations' Forum on the Theme: "Strengthening Civil Society in the EAC: Sharing Experience with other RECs" East African Civil Society Organizations' Forum. Report.
- Kraska, J., & Wilson, B. (2009). Maritime Piracy in East Africa. *Journal of International Affairs*, 55-68.
- Van Wageningen, R. W. (1957). Political community and the North Atlantic area (p. 36). na.
- Mandel, Robert. *The Changing Face of National Security. A Conceptual Analysis*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1994.
- Mafabi, David. (2017). East Africa: Uganda Trails Behind Rwanda, Burundi in Reporting Corruption – Survey. All Africa News. <http://allafrica.com/stories/201703290509.html>
- Makoye, Kizito. (2012). How bribery cripples justice in Tanzania courts. Thomson Reuters Foundation
- Milestone (1949-1952). North Atlantic Treaty Organization NATO, (1949). Office of the History. <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nato>
- Misa, J. (2009). Tanzania: Corruption in judicial system irks Kikwete. <http://thezimbabwean.co/2009/02/tanzania-corruption-in-judicial-system-irks-kikwete/>
- Mueller, S. D. (2011). Dying to win: Elections, political violence, and institutional decay in Kenya. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 29(1), 99-117.
- Munya, P. M. (1998). The organization of African unity and its role in regional conflict resolution and dispute settlement: a critical evaluation. *BC Third World LJ*, 19, 537.

MUHONDWA, E., NYAMHANGA, T., & FRUMENCE, G. (2008). PETTY CORRUPTION IN THE HEALTH SERVICES IN DAR ES SALAAM AND COAST REGIONS.

Nelischer, K. (2016). Conflict Management and Public Participation. International Association for Public Participation Canada.

Odhiambo, M. and Chitiga, R. (2016). The Guide Civil Society to Regional Economic Community in Africa. Published by African Mind on Behalf of Open Society Foundation.

Otondi, T. Sekau (2016). Civil Society Organisations in the East African Community (EAC) integration process. Life and Peace Institute. <http://life-peace.org/hab/civil-society-organisations-in-the-east-african-community-eac-integration-process/>

Ombuor, Rael. (2016). Kenya NGO Releases Extrajudicial Killings Report. VOA

Patel, R. (2016). Participatory Budgeting – It’s Not What You Do, It’s How You Do It. RSA (Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts). Web.

Payne, R. (2013). Global Issues. New York, New York. Pearson.

Posen, B. R. (1993). The security dilemma and ethnic conflict. *Survival*, 35(1), 27-47.

Rastovic, M. (2013). Kant's Understanding of the Imagination in Critique of Pure Reason. *E-Logos— Electronic Journal for Philosophy*, 1-13.

Rever, J., and York, G. (2014). Assassination in Africa: Inside the plots to kill Rwanda’s dissidents

Rice, X. (2007). Kenyans riot as Kibaki declared poll winner. *The Guardian World News*. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/dec/31/kenya.topstories3>

Speech By Kenyan's Prof. Lumumba At The Nigerian Legislature Conference On Anti-Corruption

<http://www.nairaland.com/2565944/corruption-africa-keynote-speech-professor>

Souza, C. (2001). Participatory budgeting in Brazilian cities: limits and possibilities in building democratic institutions. *Environment and Urbanization*, 13(1), 159-184.

Scala, Fabio. (2017). Tanzania's President Magufuli vows to toughen tax evasion crackdown. (Web) *Father Africa*.

Transparency International (2010). Kenya: Burundi Most Corrupt Country in East Africa as its Revenue Authority Tops List of Corrupt Institutions. *Transparency International Kenya News*.

Tusicisny, A. (2007). Security communities and their values: Taking masses seriously. *International Political Science Review*, 28(4), 425-449.

Väyrynen, R. (2000). *Stable Peace Through Security Communities?: Steps Towards Theory-building*. University of Notre Dame, the Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies.

Yusuf, M. (2016). Seven Convicted in 2010 Terrorist Attack on World Cup Fans in Uganda. <http://www.voanews.com>

See Annex to the EAC on Procedure for Granting Observer Status in the East African Community, 2001.

See Article 5(2) of the East African Community Treaty, 1999 NGOs Coordination Board (2017)

Feld, L. P., & Kirchgassner, G. (1999). Public debt and budgetary procedures: top down or bottom up? Some evidence from Swiss municipalities. In *Fiscal institutions and fiscal performance* (pp. 151-180). University of Chicago Press.

Cabannes, Y. (2004). *Participatory Budgeting: Conceptual Framework and Analysis of its Contribution to Urban Governance and the Millenium Development Goals.*

Bruce, I. (2004). *The Porto Alegre alternative: direct democracy in action* (Vol. 35). Pluto Press.

Souza, C. (2001). Participatory budgeting in Brazilian cities: limits and possibilities in building democratic institutions. *Environment and Urbanization*, 13(1), 159-184.

Know the World (2017). *Power (International Relations)*. Web.

<http://internationalrelations.org/history-of-international-relations/power-international-relations/>

Amnesty International Kenya Report (2016/17)

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/africa/kenya/report-kenya/>