

Democratic Consolidation in Africa And The Practice of Non-Indifference By Ecowas: Lessons From the Gambian Reversed Victory

Aja Akpuru-Aja*, Onyemaechi Augustine Eke**

Aja Akpuru-Aja is Professor of International Relations & Strategic Studies at the Abia State University Uturu, Nigeria.

***Dr. Onyemaechi Augustine Eke teaches in the Department of International Relations at the Gregory University, Uturu. Nigeria.*

Abstract: The paper argues that the outcome of The Gambian democratic election was determined more by the logic of international practice of the principles of non-indifference than the dictates of The Gambian society. Democratic patterns are gradually undergoing transformation in Africa, particularly with the growing concern of the international community. A case in point was the outcome of The Gambian democratic election on December 1, 2016 whose victory was credited to the President-elect Adama Barro. Even when the seating President Yahya Jammeh acknowledged the transparency of the election process by congratulating his victorious opponent Barro, a day after, he reversed the victory. Reversal of the electoral victory attracted international condemnation particularly from EOWAS member-states. Rather than deterred by the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of The Gambia, Nigeria-led ECOWAS was motivated more by concern for possible fear of humanitarian fallouts from Jammeh's act to adopt the principle of non-indifference to the reversed victory. The broad objective is to underscore the role of international community in democratic transformation in Africa. The specific objective is to demonstrate that The Gambian reverse victory was an abuse of settled principles, norms and values for democratic consolidation and that the principle of non-indifference by the ECOWAS was to save The Gambian society from humanitarian crisis that might have arisen in the post-reversed victory. This paper is anchored on global interconnectivity as a theoretical force.

Keywords: Gambia, democratic consolidation, non-interference, non-indifference, reversed victory

Date of Submission: 09-10-2017

Date of acceptance: 30-11-2017

I. INTRODUCTION

The Gambian presidential election was conducted on December 1, 2016 and was acknowledged by the seating President Yahya Jammeh as free, fair, transparent and credible in favour of Adama Barro. Surprisingly, a day later, Jammeh reversed the victory. The reversed victory was quickly condemned as pervasion of democratic precepts and values by the international community particularly the Nigeria-led ECOWAS who rather than got deterred by the principle of non-interference, was motivated more by the need to avoid humanitarian crisis which might arise as a result of Jammeh's action in The Gambia political system. The broad objective is to underscore the role of international community in democratic transformation in African countries. Democracy is no longer determined absolutely by the dictates of internal dynamics. The specific objective is to demonstrate that The Gambian reversed victory was an abuse of settled principles, norms and values for democratic consolidation and that the principle of non-indifference by the ECOWAS was pragmatically timely and welcomed even by The Gambian society.

To successfully navigate the analytical contours, this paper is planned into seven sections: section 1 deals with introduction; section 2; conceptual and theoretical explanation; section 3 reviews development of democracy in Africa; section 4: lays the background to The Gambian reverse victory; section 6: analysis of principle of non-indifference by ECOWAS in in The Gambian Crisis; and section 7: policy recommendations and conclusion.

II. CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL EXPLANATION

There is a bulk of academic literature on the meaning, development, principles and practice of democracy. From its Greek origin, democracy means "rule by the people", sometimes called "popular sovereignty," which approximates "direct, participatory, and representative forms of rule by the people." The

cardinal principles of modern democracy includes citizen involvement in decision making, a system of representation, the rule of law, an electoral system – majority rule, measurable degree of equality among citizens, some degree of liberty of freedom exercised by citizens, education, embodying civic or citizen type (Sargent, 2009: 62). Rustow (1970:337-338) writes that democratisation could be explained by three analytical approaches that:

- (i) “connects stable democracy with certain economic and social conditions, such as high capita income, widespread literacy, and prevalent urban residence;
- (ii) concentrates on “the need for certain beliefs or psychological attitudes among citizens such that civil culture and willingness to participate in public affairs pervade for establishing democracy; and
- (iii) looks into the characteristic features of social and political structure.

Howbeit, Huntington (1991) reinforces that obstacles and opportunities for further democratisation can be compartmentalised into three broad categories: political, cultural, and economic. He goes on to opine that within the three, the cultural aspect calls for two claims: 1) only western culture provides the appropriate base for the development of democratic institutions and, therefore, democracy is not suitable for non-Western societies; and 2) some cultures are intrinsically incompatible with democracy, e.g., those promoting Confucianism and other religions. Barro (1999) supports that increases in various measure of standard of living forecast a gradual rise in democracy and in contrast, “democracies that arise without prior economic development, sometimes because they are imposed by former colonial powers or international organisations tend not to last.

Despite the socio-psychological and economic precipitants in approaches to democracy, United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan, at the founding meeting of Community of Democracies (CD) in 2000, defended global spread of democracy as a universal phenomenon that is “... not peculiar to any culture” but offers double promise “as agent of peace and liberation.” Democracy became a key point of the nineteenth-century classical liberalism, which stressed the importance of the individual and democratic systems.

The United States President Woodrow Wilson argued that America’s participation in World War I was about “making the world safe for democracy” by destroying authoritarian governments and empires in Europe (Kaarbo and Ray, 2011:12). Long after Wilson, President George Bush, in his Second Inaugural Address on January 20, 2005, ‘solemnly’ declared: “the policy of the United States [is] to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world” (Axelrod, 2005). Enforcement of democracy as a global culture became tied to America’s perception of ‘global’ challenges of the 21st century such as securing human rights, preventing international and civil wars, and fighting terrorism in parts of the world by stealth on humanitarian intervention as the Iraqi case demonstrates.

To pursue America’s sworn foreign policy goal of supporting the growth of democratic movements and institutions globally, the U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Poland’s Foreign Minister Bronislaw Geremek founded Community of Democracies (CD) as the first intergovernmental organisation of established democracies and democratising countries to work together in promoting, deepening and defending democracy across countries of the world (Boucher, 2000). The U.S. and Poland co-opted eight other countries that make up ten-member Convening Group (CG) which drafted a statement of Democratic Principles and Practices that became the “Warsaw Declaration” on open elections to multiple parties; independent judiciary; freedom of speech; freedom of assembly; freedom of the press; and equal protection of the law as irreducible conditions. Global spread of democracy is anchored on the perception that democratic system of governance is less likely to go to war and is likely to be economically better off and socially more harmonious (Burnell, 2008) in a cooperative and interdependence world.

The link between democracy and humanitarian concerns is very strong. Thus it has become incontrovertible that the international community draws support from America’s hegemonic power to promote democracy as a global norm and a crucial test of the legitimacy of political engagements in the contemporary world with missionary zeal. This has become evident in securing human rights, fighting dictatorship and terrorism by the application of the principle of non-indifference as the ECOWAS example in The Gambian reversed victory demonstrated.

III. DEMOCRATIC TRANSFORMATION IN AFRICA

Africa’s democratic transformation is linked to Southern Europe in the 1970s. Africa and parts of Asia, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, began to imbibe democratic culture only as alternative to replace authoritarian regimes which had become political aberration. Democratisation in Africa was perceived as third wave of liberation: first from European colonisers; second from post-independence leaders; and third, from African despots. The democratic wave was never recorded in history when state leaders, however anecdotally, appealed so widely to democratic ideals to legitimate their rule (Dahl, 1989:313; Ezeani, 2010:57).

However, transformation of African countries into democracy became mostly aid-driven by Western economies. In the 1980s, the international financial institutions used liberal economic programmes as condition for aid-giving to influence policies in African countries; and in the 1990s, with the third wave of democracy, Western economies emphasised promotion of political reforms in addition to economic reforms in such a way that actual donor practices vary: France proposed greater liberty and democracy, Great Britain recommended good government, the United States focused on good governance, Japan talked about linking aid to reduction in military expenditures (www.nap.edu/read/204/chapter/5). Aid became the carrot and selling-point for democracy, especially in developing countries when the option of external military intervention was not likely to yield desired results. Aid strategies for democratic transformation in African countries portrayed democracy as a 'con game' invented by Western developed societies to outplay their developing counterparts.

Although, African states remain "frail and shallow, thin veil over political and social structures and institutions which have changed little since the days of authoritarianism" (Sørensen, 1998), there is no doubt that since 2000, coups and counter-coups that marked forceful and illegitimate transfer of political power have reduced. In 1990, African historian and social theorist, Achille Mbembe warned:

We are stymied in evaluating the prospects for African capitalism and democracy that are not simply acquisitions, or impositions, of elements drawn from western societies. In brief, Africa's failures reflect also failures of our theories and prescriptions... we risk reducing democracy to mimicry, or worse, to a convenient way of becoming more "presentable" in the world... Regimes which long relied on modes of authoritarian governance are making an about-turn and verbally espousing democratic ideals... there is a danger that multipartyism will reflect, in the end, merely a new consensus among the elites on the reallocation of prebends (African Governance Programme of the Carter Centre, 1990: 4).

As logic would expect, Mbembe's political apostles in Africa put democracy in retreat. The precipitants for the growth-lessening of democracy in Africa include: (a) nature of post-colonial states, (b) fear that democracy could undermine leadership legitimacy, (c) domination and attempt to prolong leadership, (d) making elections the sole indicator of democracy, (e) manipulation of election voter-turnout, (f) resource curse and resistance to transfer political power, (g) the entrenchment of illiberal systems, (h) conflicts in the Middle East and North Africa countries and elsewhere, (i) jihadist and other intractable wars, and (j) backlash of globalisation, etc.

The afore-stated precipitants for democracy growth-lessening provide normative justification for frequent Western intervention in African countries sometimes to the extent of ridiculous regime change under the guise of promoting democracy, keeping peace and/or restoring peace (Gleditsche, 2005:1). However, previous military interventions in Iraq and Mali, for example, show that short-term military success creates an open door for more interventions with potential negative consequences in the long-run.

The danger of using Western lens to judge the pace of Africa's transformation to democracy portrays African continent as averse to democracy. Every country, however authoritarian, exhibits some elements of political liberalisation, for instance, through the presence of opposition parties, civil society, and/or an independent press. Similarly, there is not one democratic country that would be considered fully consolidated (McMahon, 2000:3). The 2016 America's electoral process which recorded protests by mass of the Hillary Clinton's supporters from over half the number of American states against the declaration of Donald Trump's victory is quite an instructive point in case.

IV. BACKGROUND TO THE GAMBIAN REVERSED VICTORY

The spectacle of The Gambian reversed victory followed spiral of events which attracted national and international interests. Since The Gambia got independence from Britain in 1965, Yahya Jammeh became its second President after unseating Dawda Jawara in 1994. Jammeh legitimatised his presidency through spurious elections in 1996, 2001, 2006 and 2011 by intimidation, suppression of dissent, restrictions of press freedom and other human rights violation. In 2015, President Jammeh declared that The Gambia was an Islamic Republic (*Reuters*, 17 January 2017:1). Though, having ruled for 22 years as one of the longest serving African Presidents, Jammeh claimed that he could "rule for a billion years" (Courey-Boulet and Abdoulie, 3 December 2016).

Jammeh's political malfeasance was hinged primarily on long records of poor human rights and electoral misbehaviours. Illustratively, he jailed 30 opposition political parties' supporters including Ousainou Darboe, leader of The Gambia's largest opposition United Democratic Party. But he was clueless that a 'political novice' – 51-year Adama Barrow - could garner endorsement of unified opposition and support of seven political parties to become his main challenger in the presidential election. With the ticket of the coalition of opposition, Barrow quit the United Democratic Party so as not to be viewed as a leader of one party within the grouping. His exit from the party left the opening for his successor Mama Kandeh to contest on the platform of UDP.

Confused by the scenario, Jammeh's old habit of intimidation and threats of the voters by his thugs and ban of European Union monitors from monitoring the presidential ballot to gain easy and cheap victory in the

presidential poll and the April 2017 53-member, five-term, one-chamber parliament. With all these plans and tactics, Jammeh lost to Barrow as the third President of The Gambia in the one-round plurality-vote election of 1 December 2016 for a five-year term in the first instance.

In what was a rare public display of sportsmanship, Jammeh on 2 December 2016, before the official declaration of the election result, called and conceded defeat to Barrow’s electoral ‘shock victory’ saying: “you are elected president of The Gambia, and I wish you all the best...I have no ill will” (Corey-Boulet and Abdoulie, 3 December 2016). He promised to take a backseat and help Barrow work towards the transition.

The Chairman of Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) of The Gambia, Alieu Momar Njie announced the result, stating that Jammeh received 36.7 per cent of the votes compared Adama Barrow’s 45.5 percent, and Mama Kandeh’s 17.1 per cent. Detail of the The Gambia’s presidential election is represented in the tables as follow:

Table 1: The Gambia Presidential Election Results by Constituency

Constituency	Adama Barrow Coalition 2016		Yahya Jammeh APRC		Mama Kandeh GDC	
	Votes	%	Votes	%	Votes	%
Banjul	6,639	50	5,704	42	1,028	8
Kanifing	56,107	50	44,873	40	11,127	10
West Coast	74,823	43	76,880	44	21,656	13
North Bank	23,346	37	18,316	29	22,039	34
Lower River	16,476	56	7,996	27	5,048	17
Central River	22,215	32	30,228	43	17,581	25
Upper River	28,102	44	24,490	38	11,289	18

Source: Independent Electoral Commission of The Gambia, 2016.

Table 2: Summary of Election Results by Candidate

Candidate	Party	Votes	%
Adama Barrow	Coalition 2016	227,708	43.3
Yahya Jammeh	Alliance for Patriotic Reorientation and Construction	208,487	39.6
Mama Kandeh	Gambian Democratic Congress	89,768	17.1
Total		525,963	100
Registered voters/turnout		886,578	59.3

Source: IEC (Votes), IEC (Registered voters), 2016.

Out of The Gambia population of 2009,648 as of 1 July 2016, registered voters as of 11 April 2016 were 886,578, with an average turnout of 59.3 percent. The Gambian election was characterised by voter apathy, low turnout, and resistance for fear that votes would not count after all. However, while Jammeh and his political associates nursed their electoral wound, Barrow’s group reported that Jammeh would be prosecuted for his alleged abuses soon Barrow took office. Following the election, 19 opposition prisoners were released, including Ousainou Darboe. Notwithstanding the political climate, the electoral commission reported modified results on 5 December, saying there had been error in the counting. The modified result showed a smaller lead for Barrow (reducing the margin from 8.8% to 3.7% and 9.1% lower number of total votes cast) (IEC, 5 December 2016). The combination of report from Barrow’s group and the modified election results turned things awry.

Jammeh, on 9 December 2016, made about-turn, reneged on his concession of defeat, announced that he was rejecting the results, called for a new election, reversed the victory, and petitioned The Gambia’s Supreme Court to uphold the cancellation of the presidential election result. His action sparked a political and constitutional crisis that moved events very fast. His action was condemned and rejected by internal and external bodies including The Gambia Bar association, press union, university, medical association, the ECOWAS, the AU, and the UNSC. Open and secret flurry of diplomatic efforts began from States to Banjul, capital of The Gambia, to pressure Jammeh to abide by the global principles of democracy, the will of The Gambians and the world. On January 11, a high-level delegation of leaders of ECOWAS made up of Liberian President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, Nigerian President Muhammadu Buhari, Sierra Leon’s leader Ernest Bai Koroma and then outgoing President of Ghana John Dramani Mahama visited President Jammeh to explore diplomatic solution to the constitutional impasse. The diplomatic effort failed to make Jammeh back down and cede power to Barrow.

Events deteriorated and culminated into meeting of Defence Chiefs of Staff of ECOWAS who met on January 15 to fine-tune strategies to remove Jammeh from office if by 18 January, he failed to accede to the will of The Gambian electorate and the world to cede power to Adama Barrow. With The Gambia under tenterhooks as ECOWAS troops prepared for war against Jammeh, President-elect Adama Barrow, on 15 January, fled to Senegal for security reasons, after his son reportedly died of dog-bite.

On 17 January, President Jammeh declared a state of emergency. Speaking through The Gambia's national television, he lashed out at international pressure on him to cede power as "an unprecedented level of foreign interference in our election and internal affairs and also a sustained smear campaign, propaganda and misinformation" (*Aljazeera*, 11 January 2017) and warned against "any act of disobedience to the laws of The Gambia, incitement of violence and acts intended to disturb public order and peace" (*BBC* 18 January 2017). He also announced the nomination of his Chief Justice in what he called all-stakeholders mediation in the constitutional logjam. President Jammeh maintained that his grouse to reject the election results include:

- marked irregularities in the election process;
- turning away his supporters from polling stations;
- errors made by the electoral commission, etc.

Although the electoral commission admitted committing some errors, it insisted that Barrow still won because the errors were marginal and not sufficient to cancel the result. Technically, Jammeh's declaration of state of emergency was a curious dyadic strategy to prevent power vacuum; and buy more time in office to superintend the Supreme Court rule on his petition challenging the election results. On 18 January, The Gambia's Parliament voted in favour of Jammeh's state of emergency and consequently, extended his term in office for 90 days (i.e., 3 months).

The development heightened insecurity and prompted the evacuation of tourists by British and Dutch travel operators from the country's Seaside resort, which is a major source of income for The Gambia. United States' State Department Spokesman urged President Jammeh to cede power peacefully to Barrow because "Doing so would allow him leave office with his head held high and to protect The Gambian people from potential chaos...Failure to do so will put his legacy, and more importantly, The Gambia, in peril" (*BBC*, 18 January 2017). On January 19, Jammeh was outmanoeuvred when Barrow was technically sworn in as President at The Gambian embassy in Dakar, capital of Senegal. In a post-inauguration statement on his *Facebook* page, reported in *The Guardian* (21 January 2017:2), President Adama Barrow announced that Jammeh agreed to cede power and leave the country. He used the page and thanked all those who supported the struggle including President Macky Sall for hosting him and his family; ECOWAS, AU, UNSC, all nations that stood by The Gambians, and The Gambian electorate at home and Diaspora. He also urged The Gambian army to remain in their barracks. Thus, President Jammeh's malfeasance and obduracy, after conceding election defeat and placing the "smiling coast of West Africa" on the global map of sparkling example of democracy, erased his grand moment of history to become respected chief driver of The Gambian first democratic transition of power. As The Gambian leader, he created ethnic schism, enthroned economic hardship, and technically denied himself global respect.

Factors that Forced Jammeh to Cede Power

Many factors were responsible for Jammeh's ceding of power despite his obduracy. These factors include international (global and regional) and national factors.

International Factor:

(a) Global Factor

The global factor revolved around all steps and actions taken under the United Nations fulcrum in respect to the crises in The Gambia. They include condemnation by the Security Council of United Nations - the global supranational body supported by European Union (EU), African Union (AU) and United States against Jammeh's action and the spectacular response by United Nations Security Council (UNSC) through votes of unanimity approving Economic Community of West African (ECOWAS) regional military intervention in The Gambia.

(b) Regional Factor

At the regional level, it was perceived that if ethnic conflict breaks out in The Gambia following President Jammeh's malfeasance, it would have reverberating effects of insecurity for democracy and peoples in most African states. The regional effort spearheaded by Senegal, Ghana, Nigeria, Togo, and Mali to foreclose a dark phase in African political culture was also congenial for re-colonisation of the continent. ECOWAS role in The Gambia was very significant following its:

- pressure mounted on The Gambian people and its president;

- swearing-in of Adama Barrow as President of The Gambia;
- overweight against The Gambian forces with little combat experience and low morale to “put their life on line for Jammeh” (*The Guardian* Saturday 21 January 2017: 2).

National Factor

Jammeh’s malfeasance was greeted by resignations of the Mayor of Banjul, Vice President, 9 cabinet members of his administration. More so, transfer of allegiance by some of The Gambia’s diplomatic missions, pressure from its military command under Chief of Defence Ousman Badjie and defection of The Gambia’s forces to ECOWAS military forces twisted Jammeh’s fate and placed him in harm’s way. At the last count, Edward Gomez, lawyer for Jammeh’s Alliance for Patriotic Reorientation and Construction (APRC) party, abandoned Jammeh’s petition in the Supreme Court and urged him to step down and “avoid violent and gruesome end.” Despite these morale-dampening events, President Jammeh declared state of emergency, abused his office, twisted the arm of the country’s Parliament, and used it to ratify his state of emergency and extension of tenure in a bid to shifting the goalpost in the middle of the game.

Part of the anxiety was that The Gambia is an ethnic-based country with its dose of vulnerabilities. In the event of a political vacuum during inter-ethnic crisis, the country would find it a surprise to survive, especially where the ethnic Jola-born President Jammeh had declared the State, Islamic Republic, fanned the embers of religious war and threatened to wipe out people of Madinka ethnic group (*Quartz Africa*, 18 January 2017:1). Beyond the political risk of ethnic crisis, there was also negative economic implication to the crisis. The Gambia, placed 40 and 175 on Human Development Index (HDI) in Africa and the world, respectively is a very poor country. It comes after Ethiopia and before Democratic Republic of Congo and Liberia - Africa’s war-torn economies (UNDP Report, 2014). The Gambia has double-digit unemployment rate at 29 per cent of average total labour force between 2006 and 2016 (www.tradingeconomics.com) and lacked the economic vitality to sustain any military conflict generated by political crisis. More so, there was immediate disruption in tourism sector which is the mainstay of The Gambian economy. About 45,000 and 800, for example, fled The Gambia to Senegal and Guinea-Bissau, respectively. The deep sense of insecurity which the crisis created on tourists will linger and harm the economy of West Africa’s once “smiling coast” for many years to come. It was under this scenario that finally, on 21 January, Jammeh left The Gambia for an ECOWAS-arranged exile, allowing the transition to take place (*BBC News*, 21 January 2017).

The Gambian Reversed Victory and Non-Indifference Principle

The political crisis generated by President Jammeh not only cast serious spell on the future of democratic institutions and principles in The Gambia, Africa and the world at large but on humanitarian concerns. The Gambian reversed victory was an internal threat capable of creating humanitarian challenges of transnational and trans-sovereignty dimension. Logically, the “trigger clause” in international relations practice that an attack on a member-state of a military alliance is an attack on all the members is not limited to external threat, since uncontrolled internal threat in a member State has the potency of creating humanitarian challenges of transnational proportion. For ECOWAS, rather than deterred by the UN/AU Charter provisions on non-intervention in the internal affairs of a state, it was motivated more by a contending principle of non-indifference to head off anxiety of humanitarian crisis. In the end, The Gambian political order was restored without either revolt by The Gambian society or international condemnation.

Jammeh’s intransigency caused grave national, regional and global security concerns. As noted earlier, beyond the cumulative cost of logistics plan on ECOWAS, AU and UN, his political atrocities - nauseating electoral abuse, threats to immerse The Gambia and its people into regional conflict and intransigence - were perceived as grave sources of insecurity and abuse of international law, its principles and institutions. These acts, though domestic in character, did not gel with global liberal internationalism amply characterised by international law and institutions. Logically too, the acts constituted civil threats not only of national character but regional and global. These challenges dictated the UNSC-approved ECOWAS internal morality and preference for the principle of non-indifference over the non-intervention jibe against a cerebral dictator whose people disowned based on serial human rights violations, political misbehaviour and intransigence for almost three decades.

At the global level of analysis, The Gambia is inexorably tied to the global order; it is a member-state of the international system governed by law, ethics and norms. Under the structural power arrangements, President Jammeh failed to interpret correctly, courses of action that awaited him if he failed to comply with the settled norms and rules by all states to preserve the international system (Brown and Ainley, 2005: 89-90; Frost, 1996). As a member of sub-regional, regional and global organisations, e.g., ECOWAS, AU, UN, etc., The Gambia and its presidents, are subject to international law and norms. The international community with the lens of guiding principles of democratic process found Jammeh in breach of electoral system as the “most essential part of the workings a political system” (Satori, 1994).

Jammeh's actions to immerse The Gambian people into a pathological civil war relieved the socio-biological assumption that man is possessed by *thanatos*, a death-wish, that preternaturally predisposes him to violence (Brown and Ainley, 2005:104). Jammeh's actions were inimical to peace and security. Jammeh's failure to learn from two earlier lessons of Laurent Gbabo of Cote d'Ivoire and Captain Amadou Hayer Sanogo of Mali over abuse of democratic institution and practice caused him historical political catastrophe. The Nigerian-ECOWAS non-indifference intervention symbolises a positive transformation of democratic process in Africa and an unwelcome dispensation for sit-tight syndrome of leadership in Africa.

Summary and Conclusion

The Gambian reversed victory demonstrates that democracy is in retreat in many African countries. The inexorable nexus between democracy and human rights is to foster wellbeing, peace and security through inclusive participation in governance. It is noteworthy that Jammeh, in his strategic political error, backed down because he lost the triad of war factors: people's animosity against ECOWAS forces; military command to manage the contingency; and political leadership to legitimise the aims of his intended war. His recapitulation was neither because of the will of The Gambian electorate, democracy nor the will of the world.

The lessons from The Gambian reversed victory expect would-be Africa dictators to appreciate that in the new world of interconnectivity, states are not at liberty to do what they please under the subterfuge of territorial integrity and principle of non-intervention, without reprisal effects. Human security has become a more pronounced universal value in the post-Cold War international system. African leaders should imbibe good governance which establishes great linkages between people, security, and human rights. More so, in the new international system, it behoves these leaders to develop strong and effective security and defence policy within the rubrics of international law to be better able to solve African security problems the Africa's own ways in order to stave off global insecurity capable of exposing African countries to Great Powers' complex politics of peace support operations (PSOs).

It has to be taken home that beyond international law or morality, Jammeh's offence contradicted the doctrine of *pacta sunt servanda* because The Gambia is *ipso facto* party to the United Nations Charters and system of accepted norms and principles of law, especially concerning democracy (Akpuru-Aja, 2009). ECOWAS non-indifference became an imperative option in The Gambian reversed victory. It was justifiably just as it was justiciable.

Bibliography

- [1]. African Governance Programme of the Carter Centre (1990). "Democratisation and Social Movements in Africa", Africa Demos, vol. 1, no. 1. November.
- [2]. Aljazeera 11 January 2017, "Yahya Jammeh Slams Foreign Pressure, Appoints Mediator", www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/01/yahya-jammeh-slams-foreign-pressure-appoints-mediator-170111131
- [3]. Annan, Kofi (1998). "Annual Report of the Secretary General on the Work of the Organisation", United Nations. August 27.
- [4]. Axelrod, Robert (2005). "Promoting Democracy through International Organisations". Revised Paper from Ernesto Zedillo (ed.) Reforming the United Nations for Peace and Security. New Haven: Yale Centre for the Study of Globalisation, March: 19-38.
- [5]. Balaam, David N. and Michael Viseth 2008, Introduction to International Political Economy, 4th Edition. New York: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [6]. Barro, Robert A. (1999). "The Determinants of Democracy". Journal of Political Economy, 107:158-183.
- [7]. BBC News (18 January 2017), "The Gambia's Yahya Jammeh's Term Extended by Parliament", www.bbc.com/news/world.africa-38662000
- [8]. BBC News (21 January 2017), Ex-President Yahya Jammeh leaves The Gambia after losing election." BBC News. Retrieved 22 January 2017.
- [9]. Boucher, R. (2000). "Towards a Community of Democracies," Press Statement. Washington, D.C.: U.S. State Department, Office of the Spokesperson.
- [10]. Brown, Chris and Kirsten Ainley (2005). Understanding International Relations, 3rd Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [11]. Burnell, Peter (2008). "From Evaluating Democracy Assistance to Appraising Democracy Promotion", Political Studies Association, Political Studies, vol. 56.
- [12]. Clausewitz von, K. (1976). On War (trans and ed. by Michael Howard and Peter Paret). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [13]. Corey-Boutlet, Robbie and John Abdoulie (3 December 2016), "Gambia Leader's Hold on Power Ends with Surprising Speed," Associated Press: Retrieved 24 January 2017.
- [14]. Dahl, Robert A. (1989). Democracy and Its Critics. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- [15]. Ezeani, Emmanuel O. (2010). *Political Science: An Introduction*. Abakaliki: WillyRose & Appleseed Publishing Coy.
- [16]. Frost, M. (1996). *Ethics in International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Gleditch, Nils P.; Lene Siljeholm C., and Havard Hegre (2005). "Democratic Jihad Military Intervention and Democracy", www.prio.no/cscw/datasets
- [17]. Huntington, Samuel P. (1991). *The Third Wave: Democratisation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Oklahoma: Oklahoma University Press.
- [18]. IEC (5 December 2016). "Total Final Election Results", Independent Electoral Commission of The Gambia. Retrieved 7 December 2016.
- [19]. Kaarbo, Juliet and James Lee Ray (2011). *Global Politics, 10th International Edition*. Austria: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- [20]. Kissinger, Henry (2014). *World Order*. New York: Penguin Group (USA) LLC.
- [21]. Lichback, Mark I. and Helen G. E. de Vries, 2007, "Mechanisms of Globalised Protest Movements" in Boix, Carles and Susan C. Stokes eds, *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [22]. McMahon, Edward R. (2000). "Assessing Democratic Development in Africa". A Discussion Paper for the Department of State/NIC Conference, "Africa: What is to be Done", on December 11, 2000. Washington, D.C.
- [23]. O'Brien, Robert and Marc Williams 2007, *Global Political Economy: Evolution and Dynamics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [24]. Oddih, Michael (2009), "Globalisation and Socio-Economic Conflicts in Nigeria", in Ikejiani-Clarke, Miriam ed., *Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution in Nigeria: A Reader*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd: 188-210.
- [25]. Quartz Africa January 18 2017, "Gambia's President Has Declared a State of Emergency so He Doesn't Have to Hand Over Power", qz.com/888014/gambias-jammeh-has-declared-a-state-of-emergency-the-day-before-he-is-supposed-to-step-down
- [26]. Reuters 17 January 2017, "Gambian President Jammeh Declares State of Emergency", www.reuters.com/article/us-gambia-politics-idUSKBN15119P
- [27]. Rustow, Dankwart A. (1970). *Transitions to Democracy: A Comparative Study of 119 States, 1850-1979*. Helsinki.
- [28]. Satori, G. 1994, *Comparative Constitutional Engineering*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- [29]. Sergeant, Lyman T. (2009). *Contemporary Political Ideologies: A Comparative Analysis*. Belmont, USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- [30]. Sørensen, Georg (1998). "Democratisation in the Third World: The Role of Western Politics and Research." A Paper contributed to Transitology Research Theme "Failed States and
- [31]. *International Security: Causes, Prospects, and Consequences*, Held at Purdue University, West Lafayette, February 25-27, 1998.
- [32]. The Guardian 2017, "Jammeh Agrees to Step Down, to Leave Gambia", The Guardian (Lagos), Saturday January 21.
- [33]. The Nation 2017, "U.S. Elite Forces in Deadly Raid on Qaeda in Yemen", The Nation (Lagos), Monday January 30.

Aja Akpuru-Aja Democratic Consolidation in Africa And The Practice of Non-Indifference By Ecowas: Lessons From the Gambian Reversed Victory." *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, vol. 22, no. 11, 2017, pp. 55-62.