

TRANSCRIPT

"THE FUTURE OF INTRASTATE CONFLICT IN AFRICA: MORE VIOLENCE OR GREATER PEACE?"

A Conversation With Jakkie Cilliers

Moderator: Sarah Pray

ANNOUNCER:

You are listening to a recording of the Open Society Foundations, working to build vibrant and tolerant democracies worldwide. Visit us at OpenSocietyFoundations.org.

SARAH PRAY:

My name is Sarah Pray. I work-- in Africa advocacy down here in Washington, D.C. Obviously, the organization for which Jakkie works, the Institute for Security Studies, is well known-- for those of us that-- that follow Africa. So it's really-- a privilege and a pleasure to be able to-- to moderate this.

I think what-- what-- what we're going to-- to hear today from Jakkie is-- an outline of-- of his report, which was s-- circulated around. But if you haven't-- if you haven't gotten it yet-- you can get it from the I.S.S. website. But *On the Future of Intrastate Conflict in Africa*. Some of the findings there on the changing nature of conflict.

And, you know, one thing that jumped out at me-- before coming to O.S.F. almost four years ago, I worked for Publish What You Pay, which-- advocates for transparency and accountability in the oil, and gas, and mining industry. And we sort of took it as axiomatic that if you lived in a country that had natural resources, you were-- therefore more-- prone to be-- living in-- in a conflict zone.

And that was-- you know, there was some research. And, you know, that was one of our key arguments, is that, you know, natural resources lead to conflict. So it was

really-- that was one thing that struck me in this paper, was about the-- the changing nature of that and, you know, all of these different factors, and-- and how they come together, and external influences.

So I-- I am-- I am thrilled that Jakkie's gonna be able to explain-- the findings. So-- just by way of introduction-- Dr. Jakkie Cilliers is executive director of the Institute for Security Studies. As I understand it, he is right now at Columbia-- on a sabbatical. Born in-- in really one of the most beautiful places in the world, Stellenbosch, South Africa.

And, you know, as I mentioned, I.S.S. is-- a world-renowned-- organization that really is at the-- a leader in this-- in this field of research on-- ma-- a host of things but in particularly on-- on conflict. So Jakkie, turn it over to you for your--

(OVERTALK)

SARAH PRAY:

--presentation.

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

Sarah, thanks very much. Nice to meet you. And thanks for-- Martin (PH), for the opportunity. I-- I'm on a sabbatical at the moment. I am only back at the I.S.S. on the first of October and working on long-term future issues, which I have been working on for-- for quite some time.

So what I am going to present is a very-- is a v-- I'm going to speak to the paper, *Future of Intrastate Conflict in Africa*. But I am going to use a few different pictures and graphs just to make it a little bit more exciting and-- and interesting. I always start with this picture because I think it's very important to situate where we are globally-- in our global development trajectory.

Looking from around 1960 to about nine-- to about 2040-- where we expect global growth to go. We see that-- we are the global-- the size of the global economy is about \$55 trillion in 2013. We expect it to be about \$75 trillion in 2023 and about \$102 trillion by 2033. This is on one side hugely exciting.

But it is also hugely concerning. There is-- a path of where we expect things to go. It is also completely unsustainable. You only have to live in New York to see the extent of unsustainability-- globally. We live in an era of unprecedented health, prosperity, peace, and stability.

And we tend-- when we look at everyday problems, not to appreciate the extent to which the global environment today is much more wealthy, healthy, democratic, and prosperous than at-- at any time in human history. But Africa has, of course, struggled. This is a graph that shows-- Africa's growth rates-- G.D.P. per annual growth rate from about 1960 to 2010 on an average five-year-- av--average.

And we can see how Africa's growth plummeted until the end of the '80s. Then we see the start of what-- there's a lot of speculation in the media about at the moment the rise of Africa, the emergent Africa. That-- emergent rise-- or that rise, as-- we have written about three or four years ago in a publication called *African Futures 2050*, is driven by fundamental factors: L, Africa's population growth, urbanization, and associated factors-- some of which impact on what I am going to say.

We can see the impact of the global recession-- in-- at-- at-- when it hit-- and the impact that that has had on Africa. But generally, the continent is structurally-- on-- a global path-- on development that has wide-ranging impacts for almost every aspect of social well-being in the-- in-- in-- in Africa.

The paper itself deals with-- firstly, it looks at-- the current characteristics of conflict in Africa. And we say that there are largely five. We say firstly conflict is typically fought on the peripheries of states. Insurgents tend to be militarily weak and factionalized, thus increasingly fragmented.

And the number of actors, particularly non-state-- factions involved in conflicts, are rising. So it's difficult to make an argument this is state versus non-state-- actors. In actual fact-- it's quite a complicated picture. Secondly, many of the insurgent groups have strong transnational characteristics.

They move quite easily between and across states, across borders. And there's the issue of convergence and connection between networks of organized crime and their illicit-- activities, including money laundering and so on. Of course, there are many-- they try and make too much of this.

So you find what we (UNINTEL) convergence theory, where everything is terrorism-- and-- whole industry-- that-- tries to create linkages sometimes where they don't exist. To some extent-- the era of democracy and elections has seen a move of instability from-- on conflict f-- for control over certain parts of-- of state territory to contestation around elections.

This is a hugely positive trend. It means that democracy, as indeed it is, is taking root on the continent. Because the violence is around the electoral contestation. It's no longer violence where you challenge the legitimacy of the state itself. You buy into the political processes.

We see that-- localized violence over livelihood resources is increasing. And this is a trend that is-- it's-- it's a long-standing trend. It's nothing new. But we don't see this translating into intra-- interstate in the short to medium term. Now, just to show that we are not the only people saying these, I have got three graphs from-- Uppsala Group (PH), which sort of re-- reemphasize this.

Firstly, it's-- it says that-- it's-- it's a graph that looks at armed conflict by time. And it basically just makes-- the argument firstly that-- intrastate-- intrastate internal conflict is now the dominant-- type of-- of armed violence, as opposed to-- interstate violence or, as they refer to it, extra-state or-- former colonial-- wars of liberation.

So internal war's the major type of wars that we see on the continent. The next is if

we look-- at a similar graph going from 1946 to 2010, it shows you that-- minor wars are much, of course, more prevalent and are increasing in their relative number-- as opposed to major wars.

So the number of smaller conflicts are increasing. And the number of large, particularly interstate conflicts are-- are declining. And the third graph is simply to show that-- as we all know, that the majority of conflict is basically in Africa and-- in Southeast Asia.

In this case, the graph speaks of Asia as a group. Africa, in actual fact, is not historically the most conflict-prone-- prone region. But-- it is generally associated as sus-- but tho-- as such. Those two regions in actual fact also coincide with regions that are the most poverty stricken in the world, which is a major expla-- explanatory-- factor running through the paper.

The next section in the paper speaks about seven relationships that-- explain relatively high levels of-- of internal violence in Africa and indeed in other-- low-income regions in comparison with more prosperous regions. If you want to know where people are-- where there is violence, simply look where there is poverty.

The first is population structure and dynamics, the youth bulge exclusion. The second, transitions to democracy, which tends to be violent. Third is levels of inclusion, democratic deficit. The bad neighborhood-- behind effect. A history of previous intrastate-- violence. Governance issues. And then of course the big relationship, poverty, and violence, and instability.

And the relationships are spelled out in the little diagram. So a few remarks on each of these. First-- countries with a large-- youthful populations suffering from widespread exclusion, rapid r-- urban population growth, et cetera are simply more conflict prone. If every-- and it's got a number of statistics.

For every 1% increase in the youth bulge, youth bulge is people aged from 15 to 24-- years of age, the risk of conflict increases by more than 4%. If the-- if-- where youth make up more than 35% of the adult population, the risk of armed conflict is 150% higher than in countries with an age structure similar to most developed countries. Old folks don't make war.

The effect of the youth bulge is-- is greater in most autocratic regimes as in-- well, as in most democratic states. In other words, it's a U-shaped relationship; i.e. the youth bulge greater opportunities in autocracies and greater motives in democracies. To show what-- the relationship is-- in Africa, the median age is Sub-Saharan Africa is 19 years of age.

That means half the population is over than 19, and half the population is younger than 19 years of age. Average age-- in Europe is about 40, 41, 42, depending on which country you're in. There is the five regions that we use in the African Futures project. There's a little picture on the bottom right hand side that indicates how we define these regions.

I wanna make two points about that. Firstly, the D.R.C. is part of Central Africa, not

of Southern Africa and that the horn of Africa is part of Eastern Africa. So Eastern Africa. But if you then look at the youth bulge within those five regions that we use for the African Futures project, you will see firstly how-- small the relative youth bulge is in North Africa.

And many of you would have speculated on the-- on the role of the youth bulge in the North Africa Arab-- so-called Arab Spring. It played a role. But the youth bulge in the rest of Africa is much, much higher. That is 15 to 29 years of age. And it is-- on average, almost 50% of Africans lie within that age bracket.

Africa is also a very rapidly urbanizing continent. The most rural region in Africa is Eastern Africa. And the most urban area is North Africa. If we then look at-- how from 1960 to 2050 urbanization will proceed-- in-- Eastern Africa, and we see that Eastern Africa will only become largely-- urban-- by almost the turn of the ce-- the middle of the century while North Africa-- already became that in around 1995.

Dramatic changes in our composition. The second is transitions from autocracy to democracy are generally unstable. Large numbers of African countries appear to be trapped. They are neither fully democratic nor fully autocratic. A large number of African countries are-- so-called anocracies (PH).

They are trapped somewhere neither autocratic nor-- democratic. Anocracies are about six times more likely than democracies and-- two and a half times more likely than autocracies to experience new outbreaks of interstate war. Now, this analysis, I should add, is based on the work of the Polity IV Project, the Monty Marshall-- database.

So there is s-- some issues with the-- with the database itself. But that-- I think-- doesn't speak-- doesn't underm-- does not detract from the main trend that I am pushing out, that I am proposing. States that experienced a stall-- stalled transition from autocracy to democracy or adverse regime changes tend to be more prone to conflict and instability.

A time of change is unstable. Anocracies-- that means neither a f-- a full-- fully consolidated democracy or a fully-- full-- autocracy-- are generally unstable with over 50% experiencing a major regime change within five years and over 70% within ten years. And-- further analysis that they did show that partial democracies with factionalism, where a particular-- ethnic or other group is particularly advantaged is particularly unstable.

When we looked at this-- it led us to-- a next issue, which is really to look at: To what is the extent of democracy in an African country-- compared t-- the level of democracy compared to where you would expect its democracy be-- t-- to be given its level of education, it's G.D.P. per capita?

So the graph that I'm showing you now-- again, based on the Polity IV data-- and you can argue with and p-- take-- issue with many of the ways in which particular countries are ranked. But it firstly looks at-- those countries that clearly face a challenge that there is a democratic defi-- deficit.

They have much less democracy than would-- one would expect. And countries like Equatorial Guinea and Swaziland, obviously, we all know this-- are countries that face particular challenges. But then there are also a number of countries that in actual fact have more democracy than we would expect given their levels of G.D.P. and G.D.P. per capita.

This is not-- this is not a measurement of democracy. It's on-- only a measurement of where we would expect their democracy to be given their level of G.D.P. per capita and education level. Why else-- why do countries have more democracy than one would expect? There are a number of reasons.

Firstly, there has been a whole campaign by-- to-- to move-- of which the Open Society is a part, and a proud partner, and so is the I.S.S. and many other organizations, to push towards more open and transparent-- regimes. There has been the structural adjustment programs. There has been a whole donor engagement.

So-- external-- in-- external environment does certainly does have an impact. But increasingly today, democracy is driven by Africans themselves. It is increasingly a domestically issue. Democracy is no-- is no longer an imposed concept. But Africans believe and want democracy as an independent good.

But it is something to watch. Because if there are countries that have-- democracy levels that are higher than one would expect, it-- may also be that as we see the collapse of donor support, particularly to the-- to the N.G.O. sector in Africa at the moment as we have seen for some time, it could have an impact on stability going forth.

The next factor is really repeat-- previous or repeat violence. And-- and I will combine that with the bad neighborhood effect. What we see here is a co-called heat map-- also from-- Uppsala, which looks at where conflict occurred on the continent from 1989 to 2010. And we can clearly see the countries and the regions.

And-- the best predictor for future conflict is simply if you have had conflict in the past or if you live in a bad neighborhood. So v-- 90% of last decade's civil wars occurred in countries that experienced a civil war in the last 30 years. And-- and so we can carry on. This is a major driver of conflict.

To escape that conflict trap is one of the major-- the most important and difficult challenges that faces the international community. It is the reason for the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission, et cetera, et cetera. Governance consists of-- service maybe in-- in the traditional-- western concept-- s-- occurred c-- sequentially firstly to provide a domestic security to-- to build the capacity to administer the state and then-- to embark upon-- the transition towards greater inclusivity, the so-called democratic transition.

Those are the functions of governance. The quality of governance obviously matters. Because if we look at this graph, which is a comparison between North Kor-- between South Korea, not North Korea, and Nigeria from 19-- early-- from the n-- about 1960 to 2010 and look at their G.D.P. per capita, it tells a story.

There are many differences between those two countries. South Korea received major development assistance from the U.S., more on a G.D.P. per capita basis than any other African country, I should add for those that always like to-- argue against-- development assistance.

But it has-- it had a different social capital basis. No-- Nigeria received about-- I think it's \$300 billion in oil revenues. And the results-- are self-evident. So governance clearly is-- a huge issue. But does governance cause development? Or does development allow greater capacity for government to manage the affairs?

Most of the liter-- of the literature would argue the latter, that government-- the quality of governance improves over time as a result of capacity. Most of us would like to believe the-- the-- the ob-- the-- the reverse. Donors tell Africans, "If you tell good governance, democracy, and human rights, you will develop."

There is very little in history that tells you that that is true. Major developing countries at the moment that have r-- drawn hundreds of millions of people out of poverty are the Asian tigers: China, to a degree, India. They did that out-- under an authoritarian regime, trade protectionism, the way that the West developed.

So I think that relationship is something that we need to look at very carefully. The paper does not really speak about the-- resource curse. Sarah, you-- you made some remarks about it. But actually in fact, it is conspicuously absent in the discussions in the paper. But it is for us an aspect of governance.

The livelihood conflict, I have referred to, which is increasing-- particularly at local levels-- al-- as well as the issue of the relationship between gender and-- quality of governance, which is-- a very good-- a proxy for the extent of inclusion in any society. And the final relationship is that between poverty and violence.

Poverty does not cause violence. But violence is characteristic of countries with large, urbanizing, youthful populations, little work prospects, and high rates of urbanization. Poor countries cannot provide security or effective governance due to capacity constraints. And the results is a high rate of exclusion, alienation, and frustration.

So the relationship between poverty and violence is not a direct relationship. But it is a strong correlation. If we were to look at-- expected poverty levels going forward in the five regions of Africa that we use for the African Futures Project-- this is a base case forecast using the International Futures system.

The picture is a generally optimistic picture. This is not a high growth scenario. This is how things are probably going to develop over the next-- few decades until 2050. We see in the top graph the millions of people. And it remains relatively stable, the number of people that re-- that live in absolute poverty. \$1.25 a day, that's absolute poverty.

The bottom graph shows the-- the percentage of the population. Of course, because of Africa's dramatic population growth, one-- by 2050, one in every four people living in the world will be living in Africa. And one in every eight people will be in Nigeria.

It is important to understand the momentum of Africa's population growth.

Africa's population graph is not-- even a triangle. It looks like this. The momentum of Africa's population growth is-- such that even with the most-- intrusive of efforts-- the absolute levels of poverty will only come down at relatively low rates. Central Africa, as we can see from the graph, is the region with-- that-- refle-- that role going forward have the greatest challenges going forward.

Yet conflict on the continent is coming down. And it will continue to come down. All indications tell us that. And-- and if you ask yourself why, if you look at a graph of-- conflict on the continent, cont-- conflict in Africa generally increased until the end of the Cold War.

At that point, 1989-- 1990, the-- proxy wars that were being fought, particularly in Southwest Africa and in Northeast Africa-- ended. There was sort of an upsurge of-- pent-up-- pressure. And since then, instability in the continent has declined steadily. And we expect that to happen, partly because some of the root causes of instability are being addressed.

So end of proxy wars and normalization of African interstate and intrastate relationships is a major driver of-- future declines-- continued declines in-- in poverty-- sorry, in instability. Then there has been a massive investment in peacekeeping, the African Union, and its African peace and security architecture, and the extent to which Africans today are in leadership positions when it comes to interna-- to peace-- making peace and security in Africa.

It's a sea change from where it was 20, 30 years ago, completely different. Africans are on the lead in Somalia, on the D.R.C.-- well, nobody's in the lead in the D.R.C. On Sudan and Somalia to a degree. Then there is progress in international rule of law. As you know, the I.C.C., which you do a lot of work on, is hugely controversial in Africa.

This is a controversy that is really created by-- African leaders that are threatened by the I.C.C. Amongst ordinary Africans, it's hugely popular. And it does serve as a major conflict prevention tool. Investments in development assistance and aid have certainly had a major positive impact because it deals with the structural conditions that-- that give rise to instability.

And, of course, Africa's development trajectory and the rise of China. China is hugely important for Africa. If China coughs, Africa c-- catches pneumonia. Our development is increasingly tied to the rise of the South. And-- as North-South relations stagnate, South-South relations are carrying our trade and our development.

Now, there are many ways to look at Africa. I have looked at-- I have divided Africa in five regions. Not a very helpful analysis. Because, for example-- in the top left-hand picture, I have-- asked the International Futures system, "Which would be the fastest-growing countries looking forward in 2010?"

2010 is-- that's-- "What-- what-- who were the fastest economies? 2020, 2030, 2040?" Look at the number of African countries that inc-- that are increasing in the number

of fast-growing economies going forward. By 20 f-- 2040, African countries occupy nine out of ten of the expected highest growth rates in the world. Of course, this is all things being equal.

And it's purely an indication. And it's from a very low rate, from a very ro-- s-- f-- sorry, low basis. The other graph at the bottom is-- what our-- forecast is on-- the-- G.D.P. per capita for some of Africa's key regional economical communities going back to 1960 and looking out to 2050.

And you will see the extent to which the North African-- the Arab Maghreb Union, which doesn't really exist. It exists in namely only. Really, it's-- it is the r-- North Africa is by far the richest, most urbanized, most well-educated region on the continent. How-- that region continues to accelerate-- past-- the r-- the next base region, which is Southern Africa, (UNINTEL)-- which is-- m-- doing a little bit better than the rest.

But if you do g-- a forecast on human development indicators, the best countries in Africa-- the worst countries in Africa by 2030 would be Eritrea, Burundi, Somalia, Niger, Guinea-Bissau, and so on. Many ways of looking at the continent. Urban-- sorry-- landlocked versus-- coastal. Export-- countries with high commodity exports and others with not.

So let me conclude. I think the first thing is-- is obviously-- you know, the world is changing. We all know this. And this graph shows-- the-- G.D.P. at purchase and p-- parity of-- the-- B.R.I.C.S. countries-- versus that of the E.U.-27, versus the G7. And you can see the changes that we will see going forward.

Already in purchasing power parity-- the B.R.I.C.S. countries have-- are larger than that-- for example, the E.U.-27. So large uncertainties remain for Africa, no doubt. The world is going through a f-- fundamental transition. Will it become more fragile? And we ask here, "Will the emergence of multiple growth centers, multiple centers of power, multipolarity lead to greater resilience and stability or drive fragmentation?"

Objectively-- more multipolarity should lead to greater stability. But the transition from the one to the other is the concern. As the U.S.'s relative power and dominance declines, that of China and India rises. All kinds of-- challenges-- potentially emerge. The graph on the right-hand side is an indication of Africa's trade.

Intra-Africa trade is only about 9%, one of our major problems. We don't trade with one another. China is now our major trading partner. European Union, all its-- 27 countries remain hugely important. The United States roughly at 12%. So Europe remains important. United States remains important.

But it is China's growth that is driving that. I've already made the point about continued global growth. But particularly the future economic trajectory of China, very important for-- for Africa. A question is: What will happen with the-- w-- the war on terror?

Will we see-- as we are seeing today in Brazil, in Turkey, all over the world, young people but ordinary people taking to the streets and-- becoming violent because of

their sense of relative disenfranchisement not in the electoral sense of the word but simply their sense, when they look at the opulence to the west, come to New York, and come and stay here, and see the waste and excess.

Then you ask yourself, "How is it possible in today's world-- with the extent of fraud and misappropriation that we see in the banking sector that-- this can-- that-- how-- now that we are aware of this, what are the implications of this?" Will we see a global class competition, a sense of relative deprivation?

We argue that-- violent armed conflict will continue to occur mainly in poor countries with weak governance, previously experience of conflict, spillover from being located in a bad neighborhood, and/or widespread youth unemployment and exclusion coexisting with a median age of below 25 years.

As I said, Sub-Saharan Africa, 19 years of age. But intrastate violence will also continue to decline over time, with the nature of violence evolving and blurring the lines between war and crime. We see that change happening. Continued democratization is probably inevitable. It is driven by the desire of ordinary people-- to-- and-- and it has now become-- not an imposed value.

But certainly, it is what Africans-- believe is the best type of government, not because it delivers economic goods. Because the relationship, as you all know, between democracy and economic growth-- there is no relationship. But there will be considerable instability in this process of democratization.

This is a graph of-- that maps-- the-- index of intrastate conflict going back to the 1960's. It's historical until 2012. And then it is a forecast. We have seen in recent years, the last two, three years, an upsurge in violence. It's also evident in intrastate violence. It's also evident on the continent, indistinct of Central African Republic, Mali.

But we do expect that the fundamental drivers of conflict will continue-- to deteriorate over time. We have had a very sharp reduction in conflict after the Cold War-- after the end of the Cold War. What we have done in this forecast is we have reduced only one factor, which is the-- the propensity for future conflict based on past conflict.

If you re-- only remove that, you have-- which is your largest-- apparent driver of instability-- it has a very dramatic impact. And if you then-- do that for each of Africa's five regions that we used for the African Futures Project, that is the picture that you can get. The horn of Africa, Eastern Africa is the region that-- probably from very levels of instability will continue to decline.

But generally, it's a very positive picture of where we expect these f-- what the impact of these-- the-- of greater prosperity-- democratization, et cetera will have on the future of interstate violence-- intrastate violence. Africa will continue to require assistance in various areas, including conflict management, post-conflict reconstruction, U.N. peacekeeping, investment in African peace and security architecture, Peacebuilding Commission, et cetera.

While-- it is-- a sense that Africa, because of its rising, can look after itself, the reality is Africa cannot fund, for example, a kind-- a kind of a mission as in Manuk (PH), or in Sudan, and-- D.R.C., or in Sudan, whichever the case will be. And different to much of the developed world-- Africans require more government.

Here in the U.S.-- strange place, people arm themselves to defend themselves against the government. I mean, this is strange. (LAUGHTER) Africans really demand and require more government objectively not only because it is their only defense against globalization but because we are still busy with the consolidation of the security community, the building of an effective state even before we can come to the transition towards greater inclusion.

But we have to undertake these three transitions in parallel, (UNINTEL) globalization. Very difficult challenges that-- that-- that we face. And, of course, the major challenge going forward is to-- to transition towards a developmental model where we can provide jobs and opportunity. And that can only happen if the green revolution really comes to Africa.

We have done quite a bit of work on the green revolution. And-- if you can bring manufacturing to Africa-- which is starting to happen. Services-- increasingly, the world is a services-based the economy. And services provide-- much work. But Africa also needs to-- to find a way of employing its-- young-- population-- in-- in a manufacturing-- revolution.

Many of these challenges will come together in Urban Africa. We published-- previous-- some-- quite a bit of work on this previously where we made the argument that-- the pressures that are going to build up in-- Africa's-- hot, crowded, dusty urban settings are going to be massive. And managing them-- no matter how good-- a leader you are or how bad-- in actual fact, are going to be immense.

And-- the urban-- the challenges of the urban environment, particularly-- cities like Addis Ababa, which are basically exploding-- literally in terms of development. But the difference is Ethiopia has got a strong central government and can, to a degree, mediate-- the impact of globalization and manage-- the extent to which-- it-- it-- it's got a degree of agency.

Very different, for example, a country like-- Kenya. But those are-- that's-- sort of one summary of the-- of the paper. Those who have read the paper will be-- amazed by my interpretation of it. But-- thank you very much for the opportunity. And the full paper is available on our website. Thank you very much, Sarah.

SARAH PRAY:

Well, thank you. Thanks, Jakkie. I-- I'm sure lots of people have questions. Maybe I can just-- kick off with-- with one or two. You know, I think one of the things that jumped out-- to me-- from your paper is after-- you know, you talked about the correlations that you went through helpfully in your presentation. Y-- it then says, you know, "In general, the existence and direction of causality is difficult to identify.

And proof is elus-- elusive."

You know, the-- the associations outlined, all the things you went through about poverty and neighborhood, et cetera-- do some suggest causal relationships-- even though the relative contribution of specific factors may differ. Can you talk a little bit about that? 'Cause I think that, to me, was kinda, like, the key of the entire paper. "Here, I'll lay out these seven things." But ultimately, it's kind of hard to prove what really is at the heart of it.

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

I'll-- I'm just going back to the-- to-- in the presentation itself, there is-- kind of a diagram. You know, the-- the paper was originally intended to be a relatively short paper. But as-- as I wrote-- wrote it, it-- kept on-- lengthening and lengthening. But-- from a causal relationship, from a causal-- point of departure, that's more or less how we see the relationships-- in the diagram.

The seven relationships-- high levels of poverty and inclusion-- that-- that is sort of-- that and governance, which are sorta the two overarching relationships-- of course, history of conflict and bad neighborhood relate-- to-- to one another because the one relates to the other. But that's really how we see the interrelationship of the-- the seven causal factors that I-- that I spoke about.

This diagram is not in the-- in the paper itself. It's quite difficult, of course, in the social sciences, to-- create a clear causal relationship. And this is something that many of us grapple with. I think academically, I would not ha-- not have gotten away with cre-- trying to create a causal relationship. But I do that because in our world, in the policy world, we are trying to exactly define those-- those-- relationships.

For me, this was-- was hugely important partly because of the argument that-- that is often made that Africa is unstable because it's Africa. And I think that what the argument makes here-- and then, you know, ge-- generally that's-- all kinds of issues are thrown into there. But those causal relationships would hold as much for Africa as it does for Southeast Asia, for example.

And-- for me, that's where the emphasis needs to be placed. You can-- there-- the second and third variations of that-- causal diagram that have-- less-- th-- that have subsidiary causal relationships in them. And then I try to identify c-- c-- correla-- indicators that one can use to try and measure causality-- sorry, that one can try and measure a particular causal factor. But-- that's-- that actually lies at the heart of the-- of the paper.

SARAH PRAY:

Great. Thank you. Perhaps-- now, I'll open up for questions. We have maybe-- say, 15, 20 minutes or so.

GLADYS:

Yeah, thanks for your presentation. My name is Gladys (PH). I work with a youth initiative. I was curious that religion and ideology didn't really feature to the extent that-- they are increasingly-- prominent as explaining narratives for conflict-- and what that says if it's not then-- in your paper.

My other question had to with-- G.D.P. trade volumes. Given that there's a lot that's happening in the informal sector-- a lot of growth there that's not documented, if it was-- how different do you think the detail would look like?

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

Excellent question. Africa is the most religious continent in the world. Eight out of ten Africans believe that religion is either very important or important in their lives. Africa is as religious as a continent as Pakistan is as a single country. Very interesting. If you look at the Pew (PH) wor-- work that has been done on this-- religion is hugely important.

Africa is largely divided between a Muslim north and a Christian south. And-- the exte-- I think many of us are-- can see the extent to which religion is being instrumentalized as part of a new ideological struggle. That new ideological struggle partly is what I have been referring to. It is the struggle-- it-- it is a struggle for-- about relative deprivation.

It's a struggle about being aware of how poor you are and how rich and opulent many others are. And this is a message that is carried through globalization. I think that we need to be very concerned about the extent to which religion-- will in future be instrumentalized in Africa, both-- Islam and Christianity.

Because-- they-- given the depth and the strength of religious intensity that is held in the continent-- the ability to instrumentalize religion-- is always there. And many of your suicide bombers and these type of people or the people that execute the actual event are desperate and poor people who are prepared to do that so that somebody will pay-- a pension to his family for-- and looking after their survival because he cannot.

And-- and this is a trend that-- so I am making a case that I think that-- religion and ideology-- depending on how you define ideology, are-- are very important in the future of the continent-- of-- of violence and instability in the continent. It is not defined in the-- in the-- in the drivers because I have-- I have sort of tried to identify-- fundamental-- drivers of conflict and-- and instability there-- th-- that apply equally across Africa and-- and elsewhere.

But-- because the-- the challenge really is that it is not the religion that is the problem. It is how it is instrumentalized and-- and how the relative deprivation-- people experience that relative deprivation-- which is why it is not-- not in the-- in the-- in the diagram.

As you will see, that natural resource governance, the issue, Sarah, that you raised right at the beginning is not there. For me, natural resource governance and the issue of religion really falls within the area of governance generally. But it is a contested interpretation. But it certainly is-- is a huge issue.

The informal economy, you know, you-- in much of Africa, the formal economy is an adjunct to the informal economy and not the other way around. So the informal economy is what people survive in and what they live off. But if you want to create-- a functioning state where there is-- a relationship-- on tax and other issues in that country, they need s-- you-- you need to find a way of bringing that informal sector into the-- the domain of that that is regulated, not necessarily into the-- into the formal economy.

But that's one of the big challenges. A country like South Africa, the informal economy is about a third of the size of the formal economy. That's South Africa, which has by comparative African standards-- good tax systems-- regulations, and-- and so on. So-- it is-- it's quite the reverse in-- in much of the-- the rest of the co-- of the continent. But what we need to do is we need to look at-- at the impact of the informal sector-- in particular. Because that's what-- what-- what most Africans survive on.

GLADYS:

Thank you.

MALE VOICE:

I'm (UNINTEL) in Washington. There's-- seems to be a growing debate about the-- the food question, food security in Africa. And some people seem to put it as-- multinational corporations versus more just democratic development. And-- you know, if we argue that-- exclusion and-- and-- and inequality yield-- violence-- what does this debate have to do with-- with-- the-- the question of long-term security in Africa?

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

I think the Oakland Institute has, in particular, put out quite a bit of-- work on this. And in a cou-- and in a place like-- Madagascar-- the role of corporations have played quite a role-- in subsequent political developments. I-- I would recommend you to have a look at the-- at the paper that we did on forecasting the green revolution in Africa, which is on our-- we have a special website in African futures.

And-- just look at our website-- /Futures. There's a whole site-- that looks at-- at-- modeling the future of Africa. Basically, Africa has got-- you all know this-- spare land-- agricultural land the size of India. Africa can relatively easily feed itself. It's

got a water problem and an infrastructure problem.

And-- and our forecasts would in-- would indicate that Africa can do so relatively-- quickly. It has to-- there are certain things that it has to do. But-- the-- we then lay out two scenarios. The one is Africa that-- grows food to feed the world, which we can do. We can literally become the breadbasket of the world.

Or an Africa that grows food to feed its own people and invests small agricultural-- and-- and-- and farms in-- building its social capital. And the impact of those two scenarios have very different implications for Africa. I think that there is potential-- there-- there are certainly disruptive challenges on the-- that face-- that face the continent due to the potential so-called land grabbing, large commercial farming.

But I always in this kind of debate-- it-- it's a difficult debate. Because on-- on-- Africa is going through a very rapid development-- curve at the moment. And that development is inevitably-- violent, unstable. It means people lose their property rights. S-- same that happened in the U.S. and Europe. It happened in Asia.

And that's what-- what's happening in Asia. It-- it is happening in the full glare of an interconnected, globalized world. But-- development is inevitably an unfair and a very, very disruptive process for many, many people-- on the continent. But I think the-- the-- the tragedy-- the tra-- tragedy of Africa at the moment is the fact that it has this absolutely massive agricultural potential.

It can very easily feed itself. If we can find-- and that, of course, is what-- C.A.A.D.P., the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Plan of N.E.P.A.D. and the African Union is all about. That is to try and get African governments to invest. But the reasons why you have food insecurity-- and famine in Africa has got very little to do with our agricultural potential.

It has everything to do with governance-- accountable governance, not necessarily governance-- government. But government that really is interested in-- in trying to make sure that it has grain reserves and sells them not to-- to the market but in actual fact provides them-- to its people at time-- at a time of hunger and of-- destitution. So it is really-- when we s-- speak of food insecurity, it's really ultimately a governance issue. And that really is where many of these issues-- I think-- really where the rubber hits the road.

SARAH PRAY:

Thank you for that. And maybe just to-- to tease that out a little bit-- because I'm-- I'm tryin' to reconcile what you just said with what you said during your presentation that, in actual fact-- you have to develop first and-- and then think about democracy. I mean, I'm paraphrasing. But do you mean what I mean? That--

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

Yeah--

SARAH PRAY:

--we as advocates have always said, "You can't overemphasize development at the expense of democracy." I mean, look at Ethiopia and Rwanda, right? Those are the examples that we always give, that U.S. policy is so backward on them because it's just looking solely at-- at development and not at-- at democracy.

So if-- you know, if-- if-- if our goal is-- is to reduce conflict, which I think it is, right-- how do we then take that bit of information with what you just said, you know, that it-- it's actually perhaps not so much about democracy but it's about accountability of the-- of the government and whether it's autocratic or not? And, you know, do you have any advice for us as advocates of what we would say-- say to the U.S. government when tryin' to reconcile those two?

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

I-- I-- this is a very difficult issue because we all believe in-- in accountability, democracy, transparency, and openness. And-- I think the only argument that I am making is-- is-- perhaps twofold. The one is that it is not necessarily true that-- improvement in democracy will lead to improvements in the well-being of ordinary people.

But that-- democracy and development need, in a sense, to go hand in hand. In the sense that they need to progress-- in-- that-- if-- if you have a situation where the one is out of step with the other, like you had in North Africa where you had a very dramatic democratic deficit before the-- the Arab Spring, then you have the buildup of social pressure and eventually the-- release of that pressure in-- in a v-- very violent manner.

Whereas, on the other hand, if you have-- I don't want to use the term too much democracy because it-- it can be-- but let me give you the example of South Sudan and-- and Kenya, two countries where-- and probably Somalia going forward. Where-- the basic problem in South Sudan is that the policemen and women cannot read or write in terms of criminal justice.

It-- what we want them to do is we want them to-- look after children's rights, women's rights, refugee rights. They need to be gender sensitive and all kinds of stuff. But they have to focus very much on-- there are-- th-- there is in a sense-- a very difficult tradeoff that those governments with very limited resources have to make.

And all that I am saying is we need, in certain instances-- to be sensitive to that. Secondly, maybe to the fact that-- w-- what is most important is accountability and

transparency, something very close to the heart of the Open Society and, I think, many of us who work on the continent.

It's not always the same thing as democracy. And-- I think one-- it's-- it's the quality of the governance that is perhaps-- more important than trying to attach-- to-- to-- to attach-- a very simple and simplistic label to it. Africa does not have the option but to develop, democratize-- at the same time.

It-- it's-- it-- we don't have-- it's not-- it's not a choice that we have to-- to be. We are more open, and-- we are more impacted by the global environment, I think, than almost any other continent because the countries are so weak and so fragile. So-- it is a question simply what do we prioritize and what is really important in terms of looking at the ordinary-- African.

Ethiopia is an interesting case. Almost-- by any measure-- despite the lack of-- we have an office in Addis. So I-- I spend a lot of time in-- in Ethiopia. Despite the very obvious-- lack of democracy-- what Meles Zenawi-- did before he passed away is to make-- to-- convert a country that was-- in perpetual conflict into a country that probably has done better on the N.D.G.'s than almost any other African country.

And in one-- one-- there is-- there is a balance there that needs to be struck. And as advocates for-- democracy and for openness and transparency, we just need to be aware of where that balance should be. I don't know where it should be. It's-- it's-- it's-- an uncomfortable debate for all of us that sit in this room, myself included.

Because-- it's not what we want. But it is perhaps-- and so what is realistic. And I-- and I w-- maybe conclude with a point that the push for democracy, it will only increase. Because it is ordinary people that want that. It is not something that is being imposed by you, or by me, or by the World Bank anymore.

It is a push by ordinary-- ordinary Africans, that they want that system that provides them a greater say and-- and-- and accountability in their-- in their lives. Not because they think it's gonna deliver particularly well. Because-- the history is it doesn't. But because it provides them with-- that aspiration that-- that all of us in a sense-- in a sense want.

So I can't give you a better answer than that. I wish I-- I-- I would. But academically, there is no relationship. You know-- that's-- that's the problem that we-- that we have. But there are relationships that I think can be-- we can look at, relationships between transparency and growth, between corruption and growth. Those relationships exist. And they-- many of these correlate with democracy. But those relationships exist. And I think they can be measured. And they are important for your work and-- and for our work.

SARAH PRAY:

As always, it's complicated, right? (LAUGHTER)

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

That's the problem.

FEMALE VOICE:

I just had a question about the model. It's really interesting to me and the first time that I have seen it. And I was wondering do you publish the data-- and things like confidence levels on each of the variable that you have tested online?

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

The International Futures model, which was-- run by the-- Frederick S. Pardee Center for International Futures at-- Denver University is completely open source. And-- you can-- download it. It's-- a big download. But-- and-- it's-- we are going to have a f-- subsequent session where we are going to talk a little bit about-- about the-- the data and the use of the model-- in this.

But it is probably the largest integrated forecasting model that exists globally. And it is completely open source. You can even check the coding. And-- the issue here is not the m-- it-- the-- the-- the data that much of this is-- is based upon in this instance is the Polity IV data b-- data, which I think they (UNINTEL PHRASE).

But-- there is a new database, the-- Variables of Democracy-- database which is coming online by the end of this year, which has been a European project, which will for the first time provide, I think-- an update and a check on-- on Polity IV-- which I think will-- will help me-- much-- many of us-- in our work going forward. 'Cause it will be the only global set on the history of democracy-- and-- and-- the nature of democracy with all its-- complications and issues.

FEMALE VOICE:

That's very exciting. Thanks.

SARAH PRAY:

(UNINTEL PHRASE) from the university. Did you have a question?

MALE VOICE #2:

Hi, yes, I just wanted-- this is easy, too. I just wanted to get back-- a bit to the discussion we were having before on democracy. So one of the points you pointed out-- in your presentation was that-- the trend is that-- now that the violent is now

around elections themselves.

So when you have-- you know, for example, political parties based on-- certain cleavages, natural cleavages, and in many instances these cleavages tend to be ethnic, what role do you see this-- kinda playing out in-- in your-- in your predictions?

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

The-- actual fact-- there was a very interesting publication by Jack Goldstone-- recently that looked at this. And-- and they made the argument that the-- the-- the-- the kind of government that is the most unstable is-- a democratizing, ethnically-- factionalized-- regime. The best example of where-- ethnicity has been mobilized, of course, is Kenya-- where-- the issue of tribe as they use it in-- in-- in Kenya-- dominates everything else in political life.

So-- for me, the extent of ethnic mobilization, factionalization is, again, a governance issue. And it differs from country to country-- hugely. The fact that it is important-- or it is a huge a var-- it's-- it's a huge variable. But whether it is instrumentalized in political violence or not is largely a function of the leadership of a country. So-- but there is quite a bit of literature on this. And-- and-- and I would recommend that you have a look at the-- at this-- this-- at the-- at the-- at-- at the publications that-- Jack Goldstone has written quite recently on this.

SARAH PRAY:

Hearing that, boy, does it make me nervous about Nigeria. Because if you look at all of those seven-- factors and then obviously you're democratizing ethnically a factionalized country, I mean, this does not bode well. Do you ever get into sorta specific country projections? Or, you know, obviously, we would wanna look at it from the prevention side.

You know, what-- what-- what would be the most important factor that we should try to mitigate? I mean, I-- I-- I know from O.S.F.'s perspective, one of the things that we have always tried to emphasize is that despite the fact that people wanna make-- you know, violence in the north about Muslims versus Christians, that it's really about this sort of-- you know, economic and political marginalization and the fact that-- you know, that the-- that the-- the population feels that way. But, you know, any insight you have?

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

You know, we've been-- we've been-- we have an agreement with the pre-- with the Nigerian presidency to help them on their Nigeria 2020 project, which-- it is really looking at where Nigeria is going in the-- in the medium term. So this is something that-- that-- that we have a particular interest in.

Because a number of African countries and regional economic communities are interested in looking where-- where-- where things are going for them. You may have heard of the African Agenda 2063, S.A.D.C. 2050. South Africa's got a national development plan 2030. Kenya has got a 2030 plan and so on and so forth.

But Nigeria faces many, many challenges-- on every aspect. And it has a lot to do with something which is not there, which is the resource issues, which, of course-- relates to-- to-- again-- if you-- if I put on the-- the next level of this, which relates to the-- to the governance-- dimensions that are-- on that diagram.

I-- I wish I-- I wish I had an answer for you on-- on Nigeria because-- it's-- ni-- what happens in Nigeria is going to have an in-- will and has an impact in the wider region and faces and will face West Africa and Africa with all kinds of challenges going forward. And all of these issues come together in Nigeria.

Without appropriate leadership and-- and guidance from-- from-- from the top and-- a leader and a government that sets an appropriate example-- you know, culture-- culture is not set in stone. And I think we-- p-- part of the purpose of this paper is to try and dissuade the argument that-- as I have said earlier, that Africa is violent because it's full of Africans and it's got a particular violent or corrupt culture, which, of course, is absolute nonsense.

But leadership creates culture in the sa-- political culture. In the same way that Kenyan political leadership has mobilized ethnic fragmentation in Kenya, Nigerian leadership-- has-- created a country that is literally-- at war with itself and that is held together largely, as some have put it, by corruption-- and the-- the-- the-- battling for the spoils of-- from the state rather than by a common-- common sense of working together-- on Nigeria.

So-- a tremendous effort is going to be required in Nigeria. And if you look at the dynamics within-- within Nigeria-- I was-- most recently looking at-- a forecast that-- University of Texas have done on-- on sublevel-- on-- state fragility at the subnational level-- and-- and-- the impact on climate change on fragility.

Nigeria is going to present Africa and the world with-- with-- substantive challenges going forward unless there is-- a clear change in leadership and in leadership attitudes that can set-- a new political cultural direction on that content. But-- the situation at the moment is extremely worrying. I-- I-- you know, we can carry on talking for Nigeria for-- for days, I think. But there's no-- there's no magic-- there's no magic bullets in-- in Nigeria.

SARAH PRAY:

Any final questions for JAKKIE? Martin (PH)?

MARTIN:

Maybe just one because you still have-- five minutes. The-- the question of the youth bulge, of course, is a d-- a double-edged sword. On the one hand, having a lot of young people, especially young men, exacerbates the risk of violence. On the other-- other hand, if you have a young-- a lot of young people of working, productive age-- it can create, I think, what demographers call this democratic--

MALE VOICE #3:

Dividend--

MARTIN:

--dividend-- which-- Europe, and Asian, and North America have very much benefited from. So my question is more-- what-- what do the demographic trends s-- say? Or what do they indicate? I mean, for-- for how much longer will Africa likely have this kind of youth bulge? And is it different in different regions of-- subregions of-- of Africa?

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

The-- Africa's dem-- demographic-- momentum is such that it will-- Africa's population will continue to grow until the end of the century. And-- at the moment-- I have indicated-- if-- if you look at the continent as a whole, then West and East Africa are growing particularly-- rapidly.

And North Africa's population growth is-- will shortly stabilize. Southern Africa is the region that is-- growing after North Africa the slowest. But-- so the demographic weight in Africa is going to increasingly move to East and West. And I think by 2050, Eastern Africa will have about 750 million people.

West Africa will have ab-- abou-- have about the same, 750 million people. And if you look, Africa has got about a billion people at the moment. If you just listen to those figures and you just think of what the global impact is of having such a massive momentum of young people-- that will-- you know, we-- we-- our-- we-- we-- we are saying-- that if the median age is below 25, there is a particular propensity towards violence.

I think Africa reaches 25 by 195-- by 2052 or something like that. I mean, it is-- it is the-- the-- demographic momentum and the potential for change. Martin, you wrote about this in South Africa when you wrote about-- the relationship between youth, and violence, and crime. And that relationship holds also at this level in a sense.

The major source of instability-- are young men and particularly young men in urban

settings. And-- so the volatility that that is going to present in-- in the continent is-- is going to be-- is going to be huge. So one can look at this-- from very-- many perspectives. To translate the-- the youth bulge into a demographic dividend, we need jobs.

We need-- to get the green revolution happening. But some of that is happening. And it's important other under-- to understand that increasingly, Africa's growth is not only driven by-- it's increasingly driven by-- by consumer demand. And-- and that is-- a sea change. Only-- the figures differ.

You have got three figures that I know. If you ask what-- you know, generally, per-- the perception is growing because of natural resource endowment. But there are three figures. 16, 32, and 42%, I think, which is the contribution that-- natural resources make to Africa's growth. The other two thirds of our growth is because of population, consumption, and so on and so forth.

So-- it-- it's-- it's difficult. But one has to look at a way of balancing the extent to which urbanization and demogr-- and demographic g-- bulge are also the reasons for our growth. They are the engine of our future economic growth as much as they are a problem, which is why I make the point. And they-- and democratic-- sorry, urbanization in Africa is also driven, of course, by climate change and the impact on-- on rural-- in rural areas.

So this massive move to urban areas is not because urban areas provide greater opportunity. They are because rural areas no longer provide. So there is much more push than there is pull. And-- and-- and so the sort of summary of that was that a lot of this is going to come together in Africa's urban settings.

This is really where the rubber's gonna hit the road. It's gonna be very difficult to manage them irrespective of democracy or anything else. Just the infrastructure, and the security-- and the livelihood challenges in urban areas are-- are going to be-- to be really huge. But then when you point out those challenges, you must also say, "But that's where Africa's growth and development is happening."

And manufacturing and services are coming to the continent. I was listening this morning about the discussions of an open skies agreement in Africa-- which just unlocks-- transport-- air traffic-- connection. So there's a lot happening. And finding the balance between these negative things and all these bad things that drive instability and the positive, good news story about Africa rising-- these are two sides of the same coin in actual fact.

And-- and where will the balance tilt? When you speak about Nigeria, we are hugely concerned, all of us, and West Africa, and the Sahara. Because clearly, there are-- there's-- a particularly-- toxic-- mixture that-- that-- can-- that is igniting there, that is a cause of-- of huge concern. But-- elsewhere in the continent, it is-- it's a story of inequality, and struggle, and violence.

But is that because it's greater instability or because that's how countries develop? Difficult-- difficult issues. And I-- I am not giving any answers to this. I am just spelling out the challenges. One must be careful in looking at Africa's growth sh--

trajectory and Africa's potential for violence and isolation from one another. They are the same picture. But where that balance is-- I-- I-- I wish I knew.

SARAH PRAY:

Any other final words, Jakkie?

JAKKIE CILLIERS:

Thank you for the opportunity. I am on a sabbatical at the moment. I spent two months at the Korbel School in Denver-- learning to ski but also-- (LAUGHTER) (UNINTEL PHRASE). And-- I have, for many years, worked on peace and security issues in Africa. But you, at a point, come to-- increasingly, my interests are where developments are taking the continent and what are the future prospects.

And I think there is also opportunities for the Open Society to look at-- at some of these trends, to position yourself and to look at the contribution that-- openness, governance, reductions in corruptio-- corruption, democracy, et cetera make towards growth, towards-- alleviation of-- human development issues and indicators.

And I think-- that that's-- that's also important for-- for the Open Society. Because, increasingly, we all want to find a way of measuring the impact of the work that we do. And I think today it's-- that-- that is starting to become-- to become possible. But thank you for the opportunity, Martin.

MARTIN:

Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

SARAH PRAY:

Well, thank you. Thank you.

* * *END OF TRANSCRIPT* * *