Formulating a Military Doctrine for Humanistic Approaches to African Conflicts

Abraham Kidane

University of Asmara, Asmara. Eretrea

ABSTRACT : *The This article is framed within the urgent need for African military forces to effectively address the complexities of leading and participating in multinational military operations across the continent. The central research question that shapes this study is: What should the military doctrine for African forces entail in order to ensure seamless collaboration within multinational operations while safeguarding African interests? The article seeks to explore the formulation of a military doctrine that aligns with African interests while embracing the realities of multinational interventions. To achieve this, the study draws on theoretical insights into military doctrines, multinational military operations, and humanistic values intrinsic to African societies, providing a comprehensive framework to support the argument. By examining pre-colonial African military traditions, the humanistic and collaborative nature of contemporary military engagements, and the quest for a doctrine rooted in Africa's values, the research uncovers several critical findings. One of the primary conclusions is that Africa has developed a substantial body of indigenous military knowledge over centuries. This heritage offers a solid foundation for formulating an endogenous military doctrine, specifically designed to serve the needs of African people. Such a doctrine would be underpinned by key principles, including people-centredness, adaptability, collective responsibility, affordability, and institutionalization, ensuring that African humanistic values and continental policies are at the heart of strategic decision-making and operational execution. The article suggests that an African-focused military doctrine, built on these foundational principles, could significantly enhance the effectiveness of African forces in multinational contexts while ensuring that interventions remain aligned with the continent's humanistic values. In light of these findings, several practical recommendations are offered for the development and institutionalization of this doctrine.*

I.   INTRODUCTION

On March 19, 2011, a coalition of multiple states launched a military intervention in Libya to enforce United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973, aiming to protect civilians amid the country's escalating civil war. However, this intervention, which was framed as a humanitarian mission, starkly revealed Africa's continuing vulnerability in the face of external military superiority. Much like during the eras of slavery, colonialism, and the Cold War, African states were sidelined, their role marginalized as more powerful external actors took the lead in addressing conflict on African soil. Despite the fact that Libya is an African nation, the permanent members of the UN Security Council largely ignored the meaningful participation of African states, a trend that undermines both the sovereignty and agency of African countries in managing their own conflicts under the guise of humanitarian interventions.

A similar instance occurred in January 2013 when the French military intervened in Mali to combat Islamist insurgents. The failure of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to act decisively in Mali illustrated once again the continent's military fragility and dependence on external forces. Despite ongoing efforts to establish an African Standby Force (ASF), operational since 2003, the capacity of African states to independently address internal crises remains inadequate. This dependency is further highlighted in peacekeeping

---

Corresponding author: kidaneAbram@gmail.com   1

missions, where African forces often rely on external funding and logistical support, primarily from Western powers, creating a dynamic in which Africa remains beholden to external interests.

The core issue remains: African military forces are tasked with intervening in complex conflict situations across the continent, yet they often lack the necessary autonomy, resources, and strategic alignment to do so effectively. This imbalance raises a critical question—how can African military forces participate in multinational operations in a manner that both enhances their capacity and protects African interests? The answer lies in the development of a military doctrine that not only facilitates collaboration with international actors but also reflects Africa's unique geopolitical, cultural, and humanistic values.

In this context, the research problem guiding this article is as follows: What should the military doctrine for African forces be in order to effectively collaborate within multinational coalitions while upholding African interests? This inquiry necessitates a thorough examination of the potential for a distinctly African military doctrine that balances multinational military cooperation with the pursuit of African objectives and values. Such a doctrine must provide a strategic framework for intervention that does not compromise Africa's sovereignty or long-term stability.

To develop this doctrine, it is crucial to define what constitutes "African interests" in military contexts, particularly within the complex and often contradictory landscape of multinational military interventions. Furthermore, this requires an exploration of the foundational knowledge embedded in African military traditions, both historical and contemporary. By drawing on this indigenous military expertise, Africa has the potential to craft a homegrown doctrine that prioritizes the continent's humanistic values—such as people-centeredness, collective security, and flexibility—while ensuring resilience against external manipulation.

The argument put forth in this article is that Africa possesses a deep reservoir of military knowledge and experience, accumulated over centuries, which can serve as the basis for an endogenous military doctrine. Such a doctrine would empower African forces to better navigate the challenges of multinational intervention without losing sight of African priorities. The discussion begins with an examination of key theoretical assumptions related to military doctrine, intervention strategies, and African interests, establishing the conceptual framework for the subsequent analysis. The complexities and challenges of multinational military intervention are then explored in detail, followed by a review of the rich tradition of African military practice. This knowledge base offers critical insights that could inform the development of a new, Africa-centric military doctrine, one that is both adaptive and reflective of the continent's collective values and aspirations.

II.   THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS

Military Doctrine

Military doctrine can be understood as the guiding framework that shapes the strategies, tactics, and operational conduct of military forces. As Drew and Snow (1988, 168) succinctly define it, "Military doctrine is what we believe about the best way to conduct military affairs." This definition captures the essence of doctrine as a collective set of beliefs regarding optimal military conduct. However, the concept of military doctrine is far more complex and multifaceted. Lider (1983) expands on this by describing military doctrine as a comprehensive "system of views adopted by a given state as a programme for preparing and waging war, and the rationale of this." According to Lider, military doctrine encompasses not only wartime strategies but also preparations for potential future conflicts, the use of military force in peacetime to support foreign policy objectives, and even domestic military roles. This broader perspective positions military doctrine as both a tool for war prevention and a means of supporting state policy during times of peace.

Lider further argues that military doctrine goes beyond mere philosophical principles; it informs specific drills and tactical procedures at the operational level. These procedures are shaped by various factors, such as national goals, policies, the size and capabilities of a military force, threat perceptions, and the anticipated use of military power. Consequently, military doctrine must address not only how to wage war but also how to coordinate military and non-military instruments in both conflict and peace. It serves as a blueprint for aligning military operations with a nation's broader political objectives, including mobilizing public opinion and boosting the morale of both the armed forces and the general population.

The Soviet Dictionary of Basic Military Terms provides another perspective, defining military doctrine as "a state's officially accepted system of scientifically founded views on the nature of modern wars and the use of the armed forces in them" (Odom 1989). This definition highlights the dual nature of military doctrine, which consists of a socio-political dimension and a military-technical dimension. The socio-political aspect encompasses the ideological, economic, and social foundations of warfare, while the military-technical component focuses on the creation and organization of military forces, equipment, training, and the tactical execution of military operations. Both aspects must align with the state's political objectives, ensuring that the military's actions are consistent with broader national and international goals.

The United States Joint Chiefs of Staff (1988) offer another layer to this understanding by defining military doctrine as "the fundamental principles by which the military forces or elements thereof guide their actions in support of national objectives." The U.S. military also distinguishes between "combined doctrine," which refers to coordinated actions between two or more nations, and "joint doctrine" (or "multi-service doctrine"), which pertains to the cooperation of different branches of a single nation's armed forces. U.S. Army doctrine, in particular, is based on lessons learned from past conflicts, current military practices, and anticipated future developments, including technological advancements. While doctrine provides general guidance for military operations, it is also adaptable to diverse and evolving threats (USA, Headquarters Department of the Army 1993,).

Hough (2011, reinforces the idea that military doctrine varies significantly from one country to another, shaped by factors such as historical experience, available technology, ideological underpinnings, geographic terrain, weapon systems, and human resources. National policy and strategy serve as foundational elements for military doctrine, ensuring that it aligns with the broader goals of the state. On the international stage, military doctrine manifests in various ways, including through international law and treaties such as the United Nations Charter, which guide the conduct of military forces during multinational operations. However, the challenge arises when these international doctrines, created for global consensus, obscure the unique character of individual conflicts or fail to recognize the fundamental principles of military intervention specific to each region.

At the operational level, military doctrine informs the conduct of campaigns and operations, creating a shared understanding among military commanders of the principles that govern warfare. It also serves as the basis for training and preparation at the tactical level, ensuring that military personnel are equipped with standardized procedures and drills. This consistency allows commanders to plan and execute missions with a common strategic foundation, even when faced with highly dynamic and unpredictable battlefield conditions.

Based on the above assumptions, several key variables emerge regarding military doctrine. First, military doctrine is inherently normative, shaped by a set of beliefs grounded in historical experiences, current realities, and predictions about future conflicts. Ideally, military doctrine should be closely aligned with national policy, which itself must consider political, economic, social, technological, environmental, and legal factors, including international law. However, in practice, military doctrine often remains informal, evolving to meet the unique circumstances of each conflict or situation. It is not static; rather, it adapts to the specific needs of a nation and its military.

Moreover, military doctrine is concerned not only with wartime conduct but also with the role of military forces during peacetime. This includes external responsibilities, such as supporting foreign policy initiatives, as well as internal functions, such as maintaining national security and order. On a technical level, military doctrine directly influences critical aspects such as the size and structure of military forces, the types of equipment employed, the nature of training programs, and the operational procedures followed during missions.

Multinational Military Intervention

Frederick Pearson's seminal work in 1974 provided a foundational conceptual framework for understanding military intervention, which remains relevant today in the context of African conflicts. Pearson defines military intervention as the deployment of troops or military forces from one country, or a coalition of countries, across the borders of another sovereign state. This can also include actions by military forces already stationed in the host country. Such interventions can be categorized based on various factors, including the intent of the intervening forces—whether hostile or friendly—and the political circumstances under which the intervention occurs. Pearson further identifies motivations such as territorial acquisition, the protection of vulnerable populations,

and the promotion of ideologies or political systems as key drivers for intervention. In some cases, the internal conflict within a state may prompt another state to intervene, either out of concern for its own interests or as a way for its leadership to divert attention from domestic challenges. Additionally, fear of negative influences from neighboring countries can be used as a pretext to justify intervention, often in pursuit of the intervening state's strategic goals (Pearson 1974).

Dunér (1985) extended the theoretical discourse on military intervention by focusing on interventions in the 1970s, particularly among developing nations. His analysis of cases such as the interventions by South Africa, Cuba, and the Soviet Union in Angola, as well as the involvement of Zaire in Burundi, illustrates that even smaller, less developed countries can act as significant interveners, regardless of their limited military resources. Dunér's findings challenge the assumption that only powerful, well-resourced nations can be effective in military interventions. Instead, his research highlights how smaller states, often driven by specific geopolitical or ideological interests, play a crucial role in regional conflicts (Dunér 1985). This is particularly relevant to Africa, where the interests of neighboring states can significantly influence internal conflicts and the nature of interventions.

In the post-Cold War era, the nature of military intervention has evolved, with a growing emphasis on humanitarian objectives and conflict resolution. Military forces are increasingly being deployed in non-traditional roles, such as disaster relief, stabilization efforts, and peace building in war-torn regions. In some cases, combat troops are initially sent to end ongoing hostilities and then remain as part of peace-making operations, shifting their focus from active warfare to stabilizing the post-conflict environment (Hauss 2003). This shift has been particularly evident in Africa, where multinational interventions often seek not only to restore peace but also to address underlying humanitarian crises.

A key development in contemporary military interventions is the rise of multinational operations, which involve military forces from two or more nations working together under a coalition or alliance framework. These operations are frequently conducted under the supervision of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) such as the United Nations (UN), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) (USA Department of Defense, ix). Commanders involved in such operations are generally expected to follow established multinational doctrines and procedures, ensuring that their actions are in alignment with both international law and the national policies of the contributing countries. In the absence of ratified multinational doctrines, commanders are encouraged to assess and adhere to the doctrines of the coalition where applicable, provided they remain consistent with the legal and policy frameworks of their own nations.

In addition, coalition commanders are tasked with maximizing the contributions of their member forces by fostering cooperation through training assistance, resource-sharing, and collaborative strategic planning. This approach allows participating nations to pool their limited resources and capabilities, thereby overcoming some of the practical constraints that might otherwise hinder unilateral interventions (USA Department of Defense, xiii). Multinational coalitions thus provide a mechanism for resource-constrained countries to participate in interventions without bearing the full burden of the operation, a dynamic that is particularly important in the African context where many nations lack the military capacity to intervene on their own.

The interventionist nature of these military operations is noteworthy. Regardless of whether the intent is hostile or peaceful, military intervention is primarily driven by the interests of the intervening states, which are often not entirely aligned with those of other coalition members or the affected nation. This divergence in interests is understandable, given the differing political, economic, and security priorities of participating nations. However, the challenge lies in achieving consensus on the military doctrine that should guide such interventions. Although resource limitations may constrain the ability of individual states to intervene, coalition-building allows them to collectively overcome these challenges. Furthermore, while military intervention has traditionally involved hostile action, modern interventions in Africa are increasingly characterized by efforts to enforce peace, where multinational forces take military action against a particular group or groups in order to restore stability. These interventions are often justified by a shared policy stance among the international actors involved.

In recent years, however, military intervention has evolved beyond its traditional, hostile roots. Today, interventions are often motivated by more humanitarian goals, such as improving the living conditions of people in conflict zones or maintaining peace in regions vulnerable to instability. This shift towards humanitarian military

intervention represents a significant departure from the past, as modern military operations are increasingly geared towards safeguarding civilian populations and supporting post-conflict reconstruction efforts. In the context of Africa, this focus on humanitarian objectives and peacekeeping has profound implications for the future of military doctrine. As African nations continue to grapple with internal conflicts and external pressures, the development of a military doctrine rooted in humanistic values—centered on the well-being of people rather than purely strategic interests—will be essential for fostering stability and peace on the continent.

While traditional military interventions in Africa have often been characterized by external interests and hostile actions the future of military doctrine in the region will likely hinge on a more nuanced, humanistic approach. Multinational coalitions, driven by shared goals of peacekeeping and humanitarian intervention, will continue to play a pivotal role in shaping Africa's military landscape. As African nations work to develop their own military doctrines, they will need to balance the demands of multinational cooperation with the need to prioritize African interests and humanistic values, ensuring that military interventions serve the greater good of the continent.

African Values

Central to an African military doctrine is the emphasis on humanistic values that prioritize the well-being of individuals and communities. These values are often expressed through concepts such as Ubuntu in Nguni, Botho in Sesotho, and other variations like Umfowetho in Zulu and Mwana wevhu in Shona. Across diverse African cultures, these terms encapsulate a profound sense of collective unity and brotherhood, embodying a shared humanity that transcends individual interests. As Mbigi and Maree (2005) articulate, this universal bond fosters a spirit of sharing and interconnectedness, which serves as the spiritual backbone of many African societies. The notion of Ubuntu reflects ideals of compassion, solidarity, and communal responsibility—principles that have historically enabled African communities to thrive through collective care rather than individualism.

Faris (2011) posits that Ubuntu and Botho should be viewed as ethical frameworks that underlie both individual and societal values. These concepts provide a basis for developing holistic systems of conflict resolution that resonate with the lived experiences and needs of African societies. Nabudere (2002) expands upon this by arguing that the African Renaissance must emerge as a global humanizing movement, grounded in "global Ubuntu," which empowers individuals to advocate for human rights and emancipation alongside other marginalized communities worldwide. This perspective underscores the importance of collective action in addressing shared challenges, particularly in the realm of military intervention and conflict resolution.

Teffo (2011) reminds us that for too long, the generation and dissemination of knowledge, particularly in the last two centuries, have been dominated by Eurocentric narratives. As Africa reclaims its agency, it is imperative that the ideals of the African Renaissance are rooted in the authentic experiences of the continent's peoples and informed by indigenous knowledge systems. The call for an African-led approach to conflict resolution necessitates a departure from Western-centric paradigms, advocating instead for a balance between local perspectives and external frameworks.

Velthuizen (2007) further explores the tension between Western domination and African aspirations, emphasizing that contemporary peace and security initiatives often reflect a dominant Western worldview. For African societies to achieve true emancipation and empowerment, it is essential to integrate African perspectives with existing Western frameworks for conflict resolution. Achieving this balance requires collaborative engagement among diverse stakeholders, fostering a more comprehensive understanding of conflict dynamics and potential solutions. Velthuizen (2007) suggests that this balance entails a merger of global knowledge and indigenous wisdom, establishing a horizontal power dynamic characterized by equitable sharing and control. This complementary relationship is vital for effectively addressing and preventing conflicts in Africa.

An evaluation of these discussions reveals a foundational set of values that can inform a common military doctrine across the continent. The inherent bonds among Africans, underpinned by the principles of Ubuntu, collectively promote a spirit of compassion and cooperation. This shared value system can serve as a launching point for unified action, facilitating the development of a coherent policy aimed at resolving conflicts through humanistic approaches. Such a military doctrine would not operate in isolation from global peace initiatives; rather, it would emphasize a network of relationships that fosters collaborative decision-making among African and non-

African stakeholders regarding the deployment of military force. The ultimate goal would be to enhance the quality of life for African people, reflecting a commitment to humanitarian principles in the conduct of military affairs.

The integration of African values into a military doctrine designed for humanistic approaches to conflict resolution offers a pathway for addressing the unique challenges faced by the continent. By prioritizing collective well-being, fostering collaboration, and embracing indigenous knowledge, African nations can craft a military doctrine that is not only responsive to contemporary realities but also reflective of their rich cultural heritage. Such a doctrine has the potential to redefine military engagement in Africa, ensuring that interventions are conducted with empathy and respect for the dignity of all individuals involved.

III.   THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICAN MILITARY PRACTICE

This section explores the evolution of military practices in Africa, highlighting how military forces have historically conducted operations aimed at serving their populations. To facilitate a nuanced understanding, the military history of modern Africa can be analyzed through three distinct but interconnected phases: pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial. This classification is not meant to imply a rigid separation but rather to provide a framework for understanding the continuity and transformation of military practices across different contexts.

Pre-Colonial Origins of Military Doctrine

The roots of indigenous military systems in Africa can be traced back to notable empires such as Egypt and Carthage. These examples illustrate the significant mobilization of resources and personnel indigenous to Africa, with leaders and soldiers who were deeply rooted in their communities. Historical evidence indicates that military operations during this era ranged from minor skirmishes to extensive campaigns, utilizing a diverse arsenal that included missiles, edged weapons, bows, and poisoned arrows. Infantry and cavalry units played vital roles, and the introduction of horses and firearms marked a significant evolution in African military strategy (July 1975).

Mburu (2001) highlights the regional specificity of African military history, noting that different circumstances shaped military practices across the continent. North Africa, for example, engaged in military traditions intertwined with Mediterranean cultures, reflecting a broader narrative of classical antiquity. Despite these regional differences, traditional African armies exhibited sophisticated military structures and doctrines, informed by the dynamics of their respective societies. Davidson (1981) emphasizes that the nature of warfare in pre-colonial Africa was closely tied to social structures, governance models, economic conditions, and ideological beliefs. As colonial aggression escalated, the shift towards collective self-defense among entire communities became prevalent, with many early conflicts manifesting as guerrilla or people's wars aimed at resisting colonial rule.

The insights drawn from this historical context suggest that pre-colonial military doctrine, though perhaps not formalized, was fundamentally rooted in the communal interests of the populace. African societies developed military competencies tailored to their specific geographies and contexts, emphasizing collective safety and resilience.

The Development of Military Doctrine in the Colonial Era

Prior to 1800, Africa's military landscape underwent transformations that mirrored developments in other parts of the world. New military technologies were gradually integrated into indigenous practices, influenced by external trade and internal political dynamics. However, imported technologies, such as firearms, did not always dictate the outcomes of conflicts. Their adoption was often limited by logistical challenges, costs, and environmental factors. While gunpowder weapons enhanced the lethality of armies, their effectiveness was constrained by slow rates of fire and the tactical ingenuity of African fighters. Moreover, European naval and artillery capabilities frequently fell short against well-fortified African positions (Thornton 1998).

The understanding of African warfare during the colonial period reveals that military doctrine was not solely driven by technological advancements but rather by the political contexts and institutional frameworks within which these forces operated. Numerous small polities often outnumbered larger empires, leading to the formation of mass-recruited armies capable of considerable resistance. For instance, the Asante emerged as a formidable power

by leveraging large armies equipped primarily with traditional weaponry, introducing firearms only after establishing their military capacity.

African military systems during colonial times were characterized by their adaptability and diversity. Indigenous organizations employed various strategies, including the use of cavalry and naval operations. Distinct styles of warfare emerged, such as the tactical defense employed by the Basotho, the sophisticated formations of the Ashanti, and the guerrilla tactics practiced by forest-dwelling groups like the Lobi of Ghana. Different regions adopted unique approaches to warfare, as seen in the Kongo kingdoms, where a mix of heavy infantry and lighter contingents effectively countered invaders. The Zulu military system is another notable example, showcasing a streamlined organization that influenced neighboring groups.

Analysis of military doctrine during the colonial era underscores that the evolution of military practices was largely informed by local realities rather than mere technological progress. The necessity for flexibility in military strategy was paramount, with national institutions serving as crucial drivers of adaptive military doctrine. Nonetheless, it is essential to question whether humanistic considerations were adequately prioritized amid the prevailing culture of conquest and resistance that characterized the colonial experience.

The development of military practices in Africa reflects a rich tapestry of historical experiences shaped by indigenous values, social dynamics, and external influences. Recognizing these historical foundations is crucial for formulating a military doctrine that embraces humanistic approaches to conflict resolution. By drawing on the lessons of the past, African military strategies can evolve to prioritize collective well-being, ensuring that future military engagements are conducted with empathy and a commitment to improving the lives of the people they serve.

The Impact of Colonial Heritage on African Military Doctrine

The evolution of military practice in Africa has been shaped significantly by its colonial legacy, which established a bifurcation between those military forces aligned with French doctrine and those that followed British military principles (Malan, 2000). This divergence was amplified during the Cold War, as many African countries began to adopt Soviet or Chinese military doctrines. In some instances, particularly within warlord-led factions, the absence of a coherent military doctrine was evident. Nevertheless, this historical context has endowed Africa with unique experiences, having engaged with the military doctrines of four of the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. This positions African nations in a unique place to integrate these diverse doctrinal approaches into a comprehensive framework for multinational peace operations.

Post-Cold War, the ideological divisions established during the Cold War began to wane, leading to varied doctrinal developments across the continent. The geopolitical rivalry between the USSR and Western powers had previously imposed external military ideologies on African nations, often resulting in fragmented and incoherent military strategies. After the Cold War, most African armies were left under-resourced and predominantly light-armed, a situation complicated by the rise of non-state military actors, including terrorist organizations, guerrilla factions, and ethnic militias. These entities introduced new dimensions of instability characterized by asymmetric warfare, presenting acute challenges to military forces across the continent (McNamee, 2007).

An assessment of the Cold War's legacy on military doctrine reveals that Africa's military strategies were largely dictated by the political dynamics of Northern Hemisphere countries. With the withdrawal of external forces, African militaries faced reduced capacities and diverse domestic conditions, complicating collaborative efforts to establish a unified approach for multinational operations. However, the involvement of regional organizations such as the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the United Nations (UN) began to pave the way for more humanistic objectives in military engagement, even though their effectiveness was often hampered by the incapacitated states of member nations. The interaction with external military forces during the Cold War contributed to the proliferation of small arms and heavier weaponry, which are now wielded by various insurgent and criminal groups operating under warlord leadership.

Military Doctrine in the Era of Globalization

Since the late 1990s, Africa has increasingly engaged with the international community and adapted to globalization, participating in the competition for energy resources and embracing the role of international institutions such as the United Nations and the International Criminal Court (Edmonds & Mills, 2007, 2–22). This

---

era has witnessed the emergence of new international laws addressing terrorism and crimes against humanity, necessitating a reevaluation of military doctrines in the context of Africa's unique geography, demography, and colonial history.

The first step towards establishing a coherent military doctrine involves demilitarization and fostering constructive civil-military relations within democratic frameworks. This is crucial for attracting external investments and support. With international assistance, African states are encouraged to reconsider their defense priorities and embrace collective security principles as exemplified by the African Union (AU) and its Protocol on Peace and Security (PSC). The AU's establishment of the African Standby Force (ASF) underscores this commitment, affirming the principle of "African solutions to African problems."

However, authors such as Pieterse (2002) highlight the shift in globalization dynamics post-9/11, marked by the U.S.'s aggressive unilateralism and the transition from a multipolar to a unipolar world. While economic issues dominated pre-9/11 globalization, contemporary discourse emphasizes humanitarian interventions and geopolitical considerations. The complexities introduced by these developments underscore the necessity for a military doctrine grounded in global humanistic values, reaffirming the pre-colonial concept of community-oriented military engagement. Such a doctrine must ensure a flexible and affordable military capacity capable of adapting to diverse terrains and situations.

Multinational Military Intervention in Africa

Recognizing the need for cohesive military strategies to address common security threats, the AU adopted the "Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council" in July 2002, which sought to create a military staff committee tasked with advising on military and security matters. This protocol led to the formation of the ASF, enabling the Peace and Security Council to conduct peacekeeping missions and intervene when necessary in conflict scenarios.

In January 2004, African Ministers of Defense and Security endorsed a Draft Framework for a Common African Defense and Security Policy, emphasizing the importance of developing an ASF and early warning systems to prevent conflicts and facilitate rapid humanitarian relief during crises. The AU Assembly formalized this policy in July 2004, establishing a blueprint for achieving peace, security, and stability across the continent (Neethling, 2005). The Common Defense and Security Policy encourage African nations to harmonize their national defense strategies and eliminate inter-state rivalries.

Regional mechanisms have also emerged to support peacekeeping operations. For example, ECOWAS has cultivated a belief system for military interventions based on years of collaborative peace operations in West Africa. The Southern African Development Community (SADC) is working on a common doctrine for peace support operations, while the Eastern African Standby Force (EASF) aims to address regional crises, including civil conflicts and terrorism. Both the U.S. Africa Command (Africom) and British Peace Training teams have played supportive roles in these developments (Etnhjornal.com, 2009).

Despite the strategic frameworks established, challenges remain evident, as demonstrated during the Malian crisis of 2013, which highlighted the operational limitations of AU-led forces. Reports emphasized the need for urgent measures to enhance the operational readiness of the ASF (AU, 2013). The inability of the African-led International Support Mission to Mali (AFISMA) to fulfill its mandate due to logistical and financial constraints underscored the necessity for robust operational capabilities at the continental level.

In response, the AU introduced the African Immediate Crisis Response Capacity (AICRC) to facilitate rapid military interventions in conflict situations. The AICRC aims to establish a highly reactive force capable of addressing emergencies and supporting larger AU or UN peace operations when required. The success of the AICRC hinges on the development of military capabilities, resources, and a streamlined decision-making process among relevant AU bodies (AU, 2013).

In a concerted effort to restore stability in the Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), leaders from eleven African nations signed a Peace, Security, and Cooperation Framework in February 2013, deploying a Neutral Intervention Force (NIF) with a mandate for aggressive peacekeeping operations. The UN subsequently proposed the deployment of a UN Intervention Brigade, leveraging SADC troop contributions to neutralize armed groups and bolster state authority in the region (Roux, 2013).

The aforementioned developments reflect a growing consensus among African leaders that future military doctrines must align with multinational frameworks in a globalized context. However, the responsibility for safeguarding the well-being of African populations rests with the continent's governments, which must defend against both state and non-state aggressors. A collective military establishment dedicated to defense and protection is crucial to prevent involvement in international conflicts, thus avoiding the pitfalls of becoming embroiled in the "war on terror" or relying on former colonial powers for intervention.

In conclusion, as Africa seeks to navigate its military future, it must embrace humanistic principles that prioritize the welfare of its people, ensuring that military interventions are conducted with the overarching goal of achieving lasting peace and stability across the continent. By developing a military doctrine that resonates with these values, Africa can reclaim agency in its security matters and assert its role in the global arena while safeguarding its resources and sovereignty.

Critical Reflections

The quest for peace and security in Africa cannot be overstated; thus, military doctrine must evolve to reflect this imperative. It is crucial that such a doctrine embraces multilateral obligations under the auspices of the African Union (AU), yet prioritizes the safety and well-being of African populations. Support from northern hemisphere initiatives should only be considered when they align with shared human interests. A military doctrine rooted in African realities must resist the historical patterns of colonial proxies that were reinforced during the Cold War and further complicated by market-driven globalization. The emergence of new social-democratic forces across the developing world necessitates a re-examination of military doctrine to better align with the contemporary demands for humanistic and democratic governance in Africa.

A significant challenge lies in reconciling the expectations of both African societies and the broader global community. There is a pressing need to develop an integrated military doctrine grounded in humanistic principles—one that emphasizes collective humaneness, universal human rights, peace, restorative justice, and transformation. To realize this vision, it is essential for African scholars and military strategists to delve into indigenous practices from the pre-colonial era, examining how conflicts were managed and wars were conducted. This exploration should also include beneficial practices gleaned from colonial powers and international peace missions.

The complexity of this task is heightened by the influence of doctrines brought by the United States and its allies, which often prioritize national security interests. While these alliances may incorporate humanistic considerations in their engagement with Africa, they can inadvertently skew military decision-making processes. It is critical for African nations to leverage their historical experiences with military doctrines from major world powers and integrate this knowledge with indigenous wisdom. The goal is to formalize a viable military doctrine that fosters collective action aimed at achieving peaceful coexistence across the continent.

IV.   CONCLUSION

This analysis set out to explore the potential for a distinct African military doctrine that aligns with the continent's interests in the context of multinational military interventions. Through theoretical discussions on military doctrine, humanistic values, and multinational engagement, significant insights have emerged. The primary finding is that Africa possesses a rich reservoir of military knowledge accumulated over centuries, sufficient to develop an endogenous military doctrine that genuinely serves its people. Such a doctrine would emphasize African humanistic values and policy frameworks at the forefront of strategic decision-making.

Key principles for a formalized military doctrine have been identified: people-centeredness, flexibility, collectiveness, affordability, and institutionalization. People-centeredness entails prioritizing the welfare of African communities, drawing from the spirit of 'Ubuntu,' which champions collective action in defense of all. Flexibility involves the capability to respond rapidly to emergencies across diverse geographical conditions—whether desert, savannah, forest, or coastal environments. This agility is intrinsically linked to the principle of collectiveness, which underscores the importance of collaborative capabilities among African nations. However, affordability emphasizes the need for sustainable, locally-sourced military capacities that utilize cost-effective technologies rather than

expensive foreign equipment that demands high maintenance. Lastly, institutionalization requires robust African institutions to develop coherent policies, strategies, and decision-making frameworks that guide military operations in partnership with international allies.

Recommendations

In light of these principles, the following practical measures are recommended:

1. **Develop a People-Centered Doctrine**: The African military should prioritize the protection of communities by structuring, equipping, and training its forces accordingly. Such development necessitates dedicated budgets for timely procurement and training, ensuring that forces remain flexible and ready for rapid deployment.

2. **Focus on Intelligence Collaboration**: Multinational forces should leverage existing capacities for intelligence operations in partnership with the local populations they aim to protect. Reliance on high-tech solutions like electronic surveillance or drones can burden logistical capabilities and often prove ineffective in African operational contexts.

3. **Establish a Collective Command Structure**: It is advisable to establish a command center in Africa, led by Africans and in close collaboration with local authorities. While allied commanders should participate in decision-making, prioritizing African values and policies is essential for effective military interventions.

4. **Create a Centralized Military Doctrine**: The African Union should spearhead the development of a common military doctrine, engaging military establishments across the continent to ensure a focused and cohesive strategy for multinational military interventions aimed at restoring peace in Africa.

By adopting these recommendations, African nations can cultivate a military doctrine that not only addresses the complexities of contemporary security challenges but also honors the continent's rich heritage of collective resilience and humanistic values. This approach will contribute significantly to establishing a more secure and stable Africa, rooted in dignity and respect for all its peoples.

REFERENCES

1. African Union. 2004. Solemn declaration on a common African Defense and Security Policy Heads of State and Government of Member States of the African Union, Second Extraordinary Session. Sirte, Jamahiriya, 28 February.

2. African Union. 2013. Report of the Chairperson of the Commission on the operationalisation of the Rapid Deployment Capability of the African Standby Force and the establishment of an 'African Capacity for Immediate Response to Crises'. 6th Ordinary meeting of the Specialized Technical Committee on Defense, Safety and Security, Addis Ababa, 29–30 April 2013.

3. Malan, M. 2000. Towards an Integrated Doctrine for Peace Support Operations in Africa. Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies.

4. Dersso, S.A. 2010. The role and place of the African Standby Force within the African Peace and Security Architecture. ISS Paper 209. January 2010. Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies.

5. Neethling, T. 2010. Shaping the African Standby Force: Developments, Challenges, and Prospects. Military Review May-June 2005. 68–71.

6. Drew, D. M. and D. M. Snow. 1988. Making strategy: an introduction to national security processes and problems. Alabama: Air University Press.

7. Hauss, C.C. 2003. Military Intervention. Beyond Intractability. G. Burgess and H. Burgess. eds. Conflict Information Consortium, Boulder: University of Colorado. http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/military-intervention (accessed 24 September 2013).

8. Edmonds, M. and G. Mills. 2007. The African Military in the 21st Century: Report of the 2007 Tswalu Dialogue: May 3–6, Whitehall Report Series. London: The Royal United Services Institute for Defense and Security Studies.

9. McNamee, T. ed. 2007. The African Military in the 21st Century: Report of the 2007 Tswalu Dialogue: May 3–6, Whitehall Report Series. London: The Royal United Services Institute for Defense and Security Studies.

10. Dia, M. 1996. Africa's management in the 1990s and beyond. Reconciling indigenous and transplanted institutions. Washington: World Bank.

11. Maree, J. and L. Mbigi. 2005. The spirit of African transformation. Randburg: Knowres Publishing.
12. Thornton, J. 1998. Africa and Africans in the making of the Atlantic world, 1400–1800. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. July, R. 1975. Pre-Colonial Africa. London: Charles Scribner.
14. Davidson, B. 1981. The People's Cause. Essex: Longman Group.
15. Odom, W. E. 1988/89. Soviet Military Doctrine. Foreign Affairs, Winter p. 114–134.
16. Pearson, F.S. 1974. Foreign Military Intervention and Domestic Disputes. International Studies Quarterly September 18(3): 259-289.
17. Vandervort, B. 1998. Wars of Imperial Conquest in Africa: 1830–1914. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 61–72.
18. Hough, M. 2011. The concept of Military Doctrine with specific reference to the South African National Defense Force. Strategic Review for Southern Africa, June. 86–104.
19. Lord, C. 1999. Integrated military doctrine: A progress report. Paper presented at an international workshop on Towards a global consensus on peace support operations: The African dimension, ISS and the Institute for International Relations (Prague), Pretoria, 21–23 October 1999.
20. Ramuhala, M.G. 2010. Military intervention in Africa after the Cold War. Master's thesis in Military Science, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch.
21. Velthuizen, A. G. 2007. The Management of Knowledge: A Model for the African Renaissance. Doctoral thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria.
22. Nabudere, D. 2002. The epistemological and methodological foundations for an all-inclusive research paradigm in the search for global knowledge. Occasional Paper, 6 (1): 1–45 October. Pretoria: African Association of Political Science.
23. Teffo, L. 2011. Epistemic pluralism for knowledge transformation. International Journal of African Renaissance Studies–Multi-, Inter- and Transdisciplinarity. 6(1): 24–34.
24. Ethjournal.com. 2009. AU on mission to develop an East African military force. Tuesday, 22 December (accessed 5 October 2011).
25. USA, Headquarters Department of the Army, Preface and Chapter 1. 1993. FM 100–5, June 1993, 1.
26. USA, Joint Chiefs of Staff. 1988. The Official Dictionary of Military Terms. Washington DC: Hemisphere Publishing Co, p. 7612.
27. ____. 2013. Multinational Operations. Joint Publication 3–16.