

This is an indispensable book, thoroughly researched, boldly argued, and written with the clarity, sobriety, and refinement of an aesthete. Daniel Bach is equally adept as storyteller and political investigator or strategy analyst. He charts decades of regionalism in Africa while keeping a perceptive eye on all sorts of foreign influences, and weaves with ease throughout several overlapping and conflicting narratives. Whether he recounts the intersecting histories of colonial politics and postcolonial policies or whether he uncovers the hidden rationales of the various stakeholders, Bach chronicles the hijacking and failure of Africa's most daring slogan, shedding unpleasant lights on the genesis and the perversion of ideals.

*Célestin Monga, Managing Director,  
United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO)*

Daniel Bach has long been one of the most original thinkers on Africa's international relations. This book is particularly timely in exploring sympathetically, yet with a keen analytical perspective, the various strands of African regionalism and how governments are using them to transform their integration in the global economy.

*John Ravenhill, Director, Balsillie School of International Affairs,  
Waterloo, Canada*

This study combines analytical sophistication with superb empirical knowledge of both the history and contemporary practices of regionalism in Africa. It draws together the many different dimensions of regionalism, from the power of colonial legacies and the ambiguous implications of dense cross-border transactions to the importance of club diplomacy and regime survival. It is the most important study of regionalism in Africa to have appeared in past decade.

*Andrew Hurrell, Montague Burton Professor of International Relations,  
Oxford University*

Regionalism remains a dominant trend in African international relations even though regional institutions are plagued by severe political and institutional strains. Yet beyond the quest for functional organizations which furnish order, security, and prosperity, there are many other forms of interactions across Africa that analysts and policymakers seldom give serious attention. Daniel Bach's *Regionalism in Africa* succinctly captures these two competing dimensions in Africa's search for cooperative arrangements. The book provides a magisterial account of the travails and triumphs of integration from the colonial period to the present. It is a critical addition to studies of regional integration in Africa and informs comparative analysis of regionalism elsewhere.

*Gilbert M. Khadiagala, Jan Smuts Professor of International Relations,  
The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa*



# Regionalism in Africa

Africa, which was not long ago discarded as a hopeless and irrelevant region, has become a new 'frontier' for global trade, investment and the conduct of international relations.

This book surveys the socio-economic, intellectual and security-related dimensions of African regionalisms since the turn of the twentieth century. It argues that the continent deserves to be considered as a crucible for conceptualising and contextualising the ongoing influence of colonial policies, the emergence of specific integration and security cultures, the spread of cross-border regionalisation processes at the expense of region building, the interplay between territory, space and trans-state networks, and the intrinsic ambivalence of global frontier narratives. This is emphasised through the identification of distinctive 'threads' of regionalism that, by focusing on genealogies, trajectories and ideals, transcend the binary divide between old and new regionalisms. In doing so, the book opens new perspectives not only on Africa in international relations, but also Africa's own international relations.

This text will be of key interest to students and scholars of African politics, African history, regionalism, comparative regionalism, and more broadly to international political economy, international relations and global and regional governance.

**Daniel C. Bach** is CNRS Director of Research at the Emile Durkheim Centre for Comparative Policy and Sociology, Sciences Po Bordeaux.

## **Routledge Studies in African Politics and International Relations**

Edited by Daniel C. Bach, Emile Durkheim Centre for  
Comparative Politics and Sociology, Sciences Po Bordeaux

**1. Neopatrimonialism in Africa  
and Beyond**

*Edited by Daniel Bach and  
Mamoudou Gazibo*

**2. African Agency in  
International Politics**

*Edited by William Brown and  
Sophie Harman*

**3. The Politics of Elite Corruption  
in Africa**

*Roger Tangri and  
Andrew M. Mwenda*

**4. Reconstructing the Authoritarian  
State in Africa**

*George Klay Kieh, Jr. and  
Pita Ogaba Agbese*

**5. Critical Perspectives on  
African Politics**

Liberal interventions, state-building  
and civil society  
*Edited by Clive Gabay and  
Carl Death*

**6. Homegrown Development  
in Africa**

Reality or illusion?  
*Chukwumerije Okereke and  
Patricia Agupusi*

**7. Real Governance and Practical  
Norms in Sub-Saharan Africa**

The game of the rules  
*Edited by Tom de Herdt and  
Jean-Pierre Olivier de Sardan*

**8. African Migrants and Europe**

Managing the ultimate frontier  
*Lorenzo Rinelli*

**9. Africa in Global  
International Relations**

Emerging approaches to theory  
and practice  
*Edited by Paul-Henri Bischoff,  
Kwesi Aning and Amitav Acharya*

**10. Regionalism in Africa**

Genealogies, institutions and  
trans-state networks  
*Daniel C. Bach*

# **Regionalism in Africa**

Genealogies, institutions and  
trans-state networks

**Daniel C. Bach**

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2016  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2016 Daniel C. Bach

The right of Daniel C. Bach to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*

Bach, Daniel, author.

Regionalism in Africa : genealogies, institutions and trans-state networks / Daniel C. Bach.

pages cm. -- (Routledge studies in African politics and international relations)

1. Regionalism--Africa. 2. Africa--Politics and government. I. Title.

JQ1873.5.R43B33 2016

327.6--dc23

2015026428

ISBN: 978-1-138-83988-5 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-73318-0 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman  
by Taylor & Francis Books

**To Catherine, Emilie and Jérôme**





# Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Abbreviations</i>	x
1 Introduction: a world of regionalisms	1
2 Amalgamation and hysteresis	10
3 The politics of economic cooperation: regime consolidation, club diplomacy and patronage	32
4 The magnetic pull of frontiers	52
5 Mental maps and holistic agendas	77
6 Defragmentation and connectivity	115
7 The frontier as concept and metaphor: Africa in international relations	130
<i>Bibliography</i>	145
<i>Index</i>	191

## List of illustrations

### Figures

5.1	Regional integration in Europe	81
5.2	The eight RECs: composition and overlapping memberships	86
5.3	Africa's three regional EPAs	103

### Maps

2.1	Africa's colonial federations in 1953	12
-----	---------------------------------------	----

### Table

5.1	The RECs GDP, number of members and intraregional trade	96
-----	---	----

## Acknowledgements

This book is the outcome of a life-long interest for the study of regionalism in Africa. It is therefore impossible to fully acknowledge the moral and intellectual debt that I owe to the mentors, colleagues and friends who have contributed to stimulate my interest and intellectual curiosity on a broadening range of issues. I also wish to express my gratitude to the friends whose have contributed to shape, sharpen and clarify my understanding of the African ‘maze’. They include Isabelle Ramdoo and San Bilal, Olivier Walther, Alice Sindzingre, Walter Kennes, Joana Leite Pereira and Luis Mah, René Lemarchand, Jayati Srivastava and Amit Prakash, Jabin Jacob, Helge Hveem, Trudi Hartzenberg, Colin McCarthy. I also owe special thanks to Wanyama Masinde for giving me a crash course in East African integration during my visits to Kenya.

Of invaluable help has also been the institutional support received over the years from the *Institut Français de Recherche en Afrique* (IFRA-Nairobi and Ibadan). I also owe special thanks to Sciences Po Bordeaux, the Emile Durkheim Centre for Comparative Policy and Sociology and the French *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique* (CNRS), my employer. Without them this volume would have been unquestionably much more difficult if not impossible to envisage. It is also my pleasure to thank the Africa Capacity Building Foundation for granting permission to reproduce Table 5.1 from UNCTAD (2013: 17) and ACBF (2014). The South African Institute of International Affairs has also kindly authorized the reproduction in Chapter 7 of extensive sections from an article that was published under the same title in the *South African Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 20, 1 (2013).

Not surprisingly, it is to my wife Catherine that this book owes most, not least due to her patient support as a frontline observer and participant in the process that led to this volume. There is little need to say that none of the institutions and people mentioned should be held responsible for its limitations.

## Abbreviations

ACBF	Africa Capacity Building Foundation
ACHPR	African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights
ACP	African Caribbean and Pacific
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AEC	African Economic Community
AfDB	African Development Bank
AFTA	Asian Free Trade Agreement (ASEAN)
AGOA	African Growth and Opportunity Act
ALBA	Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas
AMIB	African Union Mission in Burundi
AMIS	African Mission in Sudan
AMISEC	African Union Mission for Support to the Elections in the Comoros
AMISOM	African Union Mission to Somalia
AMU	Arab Maghreb Union
ANC	African National Congress
AOF	<i>Afrique occidentale française</i> (FWA)
APEI	Accelerated Economic Integration Program
APRM	African Peer Review Mechanism
APSA	African Peace and Security Architecture
ARF	Asian Regional Forum
ARIA	Assessing Regional Integration in Africa
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AIDB	Asia Infrastructure Development Bank
AU	African Union
AU-PSC	AU Peace and Security Council
BCEAO	<i>Banque centrale des États de l'Afrique de l'Ouest</i>
BDEAC	<i>Banque de Développement des États de l'Afrique centrale</i>
BEAC	<i>Banque centrale des États d'Afrique Centrale</i>
BIT	Bilateral Investment Treaties
BLS	Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland
BLSN	Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Namibia
BOT	Build-Operate-Transfer

BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa
CA	Constitutive Act (of the AU)
CAF	Central Africa Federation
CAFTA-DR	Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement
CAPC	Central African Power Corporation
CAR	Central African Republic
CARIFORUM	Forum of the Caribbean Group of African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States
CCJ	(ECOWAS) Community Court of Justice
CEAO	<i>Communauté Economique de l'Afrique de l'Ouest</i>
CEDEAO	<i>Communauté Economique des Etats de l'Afrique de l'Ouest</i> (ECOWAS)
CEMAC	Central African Economic and Monetary Community
CEN-SAD	Community of Sahara-Sahel States
CEPAL	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
CEPGL	<i>Communauté Economique des Pays des Grands Lacs</i>
CET	Common External Tariff
CEWS	Continental Early Warning System
CFA	<i>Colonies françaises d'Afrique</i> , then <i>Communauté Financière Africaine</i>
CILSS	<i>Comité permanent inter-Etats de lutte contre la sécheresse dans le Sahel</i>
CMEA	Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon)
CMA	Common Monetary Area
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CONSAS	Constellation of Southern African States
COPAX	Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa
CM	Common Market
CPA	Cotonou Partnership Agreement
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
CSTO	Collective Security Treaty Organisation
CU	Customs Union
DFQF	Duty Free and Quota Free
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EAAC	East African Airways Corporation
EAC	East African Community
EACoJ	East African Court of Justice
EACSO	East African Common Services Organisation
EACU	East African Customs Union
EAHC	East Africa High Commission
EALA	East African Legislative Assembly
EAP	East African Posts
EAEC	Eurasian Economic Community

xiv *Abbreviations*

EARC	East African Railways Corporation
EBA	Everything But Arms
EC	European Commission
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECB	European Central Bank
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central African States
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
ECLA	Economic Commission for Latin America
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
ECOMOG	ECOWAS Monitoring Group
ECOSCC	Economic, Social and Cultural Council
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Committee
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ECTS	Electronic Cargo Tracking System
EEC	European Economic Community
EMU	European Economic and Monetary Union
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
EPZs	Export Processing Zones
ESA	East and Southern Africa group (EPA negotiations)
ESC	Economic and Social Committee
EU	European Union
EUISS	European Institute of Strategic Studies
FCCD	Fund for Co-operation, Compensation and Development
FCD	Community and Development Fund
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FEA	French Equatorial Africa (or AEF)
FLS	Front Line States
FOB	Free on Board
FOCAC	Forum on China-Africa Cooperation
FOSIDEC	Fund for Intervention and Development of the Community
FTA	Free Trade Area
FTAA	Free Trade Area of the Americas
FTAAP	Free Trade Area of Asia-Pacific
FWA	French West Africa (AOF)
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GSP	Generalized System of Preference
GVC	Global Value Chain
HCTs	High Commission Territories
ICA	Infrastructure Consortium for Africa
ICD	Infrastructure Country Diagnostic
ICGLR	International Conference on the Great Lakes Region
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IEPA	Interim Economic Partnership Agreement
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development

IGADD	Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development
IGO	Inter-Governmental Organisation
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IOC	Indian Ocean Commission
IRTGI	Improved Road Transport Governance Initiative
ISDSC	Inter-State Defence and Security Committee
IUCEA	Inter-University Council of East Africa
KOAFEC	Korea-Africa Forum for Economic Cooperation
LDC	Least Developed Country
LLA	Lesotho Liberation Army
LPA	Lagos Plan of Action
MAR	Market Access Regulation
MCPMR	Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution
MDC	Maputo Development Corridor
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MERCOSUR	Southern Common Market (Mercado Común del Sur)
MFN	Most-Favoured Nation
MIP	Minimum Integration Programme
MLC	<i>Mouvement de libération du Congo</i>
MMA	Multilateral Monetary Agreement
MNCs	Multinational Corporations
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NC	Northern Corridor
NCTTCA	Northern Corridor Transit and Transport Co-ordination Authority
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NITRA	Niger Transit
NNPC	Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation
NRA	New Regionalism Approach
NSW	National Single Window,
NTB	Non-Tariff Barrier
OAU	Organization of African Unity
OCAM	<i>Organisation Commune Africaine, Malgache et Mauricienne</i>
OCDN	<i>Organisation commune Dahomey-Niger</i>
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
ODPSC	(SADC) Organ for Defence, Politics and Security Co-operation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OSBP	One-Stop Border Post
OSIS	One Stop Inspection Station

xvi *Abbreviations*

PAC	Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania
PAP	Pan-African Parliament
PIDA	Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa,
PSC	Peace and Security Council
PTA	Preferential Trade Area
RCD	<i>Rassemblement Congolais pour la Démocratie</i>
RDV	Rendez-vous clause (EPA agreements)
REC	Regional Economic Community
RENAMO	<i>Resistência Nacional Moçambicana</i>
RMA	Rand Monetary Area
RoO	Rule of Origin
RSA	Republic of South Africa
RTA	Regional Trade Agreement
SACCAR	Southern African Centre for Cooperation in Agricultural Research
SACU	Southern African Customs Union
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SADCC	Southern African Development Coordination Conference
SADF	South African Defence Force
SA	South Africa
SAP	Structural Adjustment Policies
SAPP	Southern African Power Pool
SATCC	Southern African Transport and Communications Commission
SCO	Shanghai Cooperation Organisation
SDI	Spatial Development Initiative
SEA	(EU) Single European Act
SEM	(EU) Single European Market
SINELAC	<i>Société internationale pour l'électricité des Grands lacs</i>
SOCAD	<i>Société de commercialisation agricole du Dahomey</i>
SONARA	<i>Société nigérienne de commercialisation de l'arachide</i>
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
SWS	Single Window System
TC	Telecommunications Corporation
TCC	Trans-Caprivi Corridor
TCR	Regional Cooperation Tax
TDCA	(EU-SA) Trade and Development Cooperation Agreement
TICAD	Tokyo International Conferences on African Development
TLS	Trade Liberalization Scheme
TRALAC	Trade Law Centre
TVBC	Transkei, Venda, Bophutatswana, Ciskei
TPP	Trans-Pacific Partnership
UAM	<i>Union africaine et malgache</i>
UAMCE	<i>Union Africaine et Malgache de Coopération Economique</i>
UAMD	<i>Union Africaine et Malgache de Défense</i>



UDAO	<i>Union Douanière de l'Afrique Occidentale</i>
UDEAC	<i>Union Douanière et Economique de l'Afrique Centrale</i>
UDEAO	<i>Union Douanière et Economique des États de l'Afrique Occidentale</i>
UEMOA	<i>Union économique et monétaire ouest-Africaine (WAEMU)</i>
UN	United Nations
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
USD	US Dollar
VAT	Value Added Tax
WAEMU	West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA)
WAGP	West African Gas Project
WAMZ	West African Monetary Zone
WBCG	Walvis Bay Corridor Group
WEF	World Economic Forum
WTO	World Trade Organisation
ZANU-PF	Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front



# 1 Introduction

## A world of regionalisms

The revival of regionalism in the late 1980s was a global and largely unanticipated phenomenon. The *de facto* crystallisation of trade and investment flows around the three core regions of the ‘triad’ owed much to the dynamism of non-state players. And when states were a driving force, this went along with significant policy-shifts in the mandates and agendas of established regional inter-governmental organisations (Bach, 1999a; Fawcett, 1995).

### Waves of regionalism: moment and momentum

The movement known as the first wave of regionalism had surged in the aftermath of the Second World War, shaped by the Cold War and the quest for developmental policy templates in the developing world. The process of European (re)construction, in conjunction with the US Marshall Plan and the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) had reached a decisive step with the adoption of the three Rome Treaties in 1958. The European Economic Community (EEC) and the stated ambition of the ‘fathers’ of Europe to evolve towards a federal state set the tenets for what was presented by the neo-functionalists as a universal and teleological template (Haas, 1961).

In Latin America, the EEC was a particular source of inspiration at a time when US policy remained firmly committed to free trade and multilateralism (Dabène, 2009: 18). The newly appointed Director of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC or CEPAL in Spanish), Raúl Prebisch, had published in 1949 an advocacy of the unification of markets and the planned increase of industrial productivity behind tariff walls (Dabène, 2009: 16–17). The deterioration of commodity prices in the second half of the 1950s had then given a decisive impulse to the elaboration and dissemination of the CEPAL doctrine (*Cepalismo*). *Cepalismo*’s aspiration to combine regional integration with Import-Substitution Industrialisation (ISI) was, by then adopted by a whole generation of new Latin American leaders and bureaucrats. The structuralist approach that was being advocated carried a strong social component, but dissociated itself from the delinking strategies prescribed by the dependency school and experimented,

## 2 *A world of regionalisms*

between 1949 and 1991, by the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA or Comecon).

The resurgence of regionalism (Fawcett and Hurrell, 1995; Gamble and Payne, 1996) in the late 1980s followed nearly two decades of growing disillusion towards European construction and integration theory as a whole (Duffy and Feld, 1980; Haas, 1975). The most tangible sign of this revival was the sudden proliferation of Regional Trade Agreements (World Bank, 2005: 28–9) underpinned by trade liberalisation policies (Mansfield and Milner, 1999: 589–627). In Latin America, the days of *Celpalismo*'s emphasis on ISI behind tariff walls were over. The revitalisation of regionalisation was part of an overall shift towards market-oriented programmes and neo-liberal reforms (Phillips and Prieto, 2010: 116; Malamud and Gardini, 2012: 118). ECLAC was also committed to the idea that integration agreements should not operate 'as alternatives to a more dynamic role in the international economy, [but] ... as processes that complement the effort towards that goal.' (ECLAC, 1994: 11). Regional integration was expected to promote the emergence of building-blocks for an international economy that would be 'free of protectionism and barriers to the exchange of goods and services'.

ECLAC explicitly drew its inspiration from the achievements of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum that, since its establishment in 1989, had developed its brand of trade liberalisation. Known as 'open regionalism', it involved the extension of Most Favoured Nation (MFN) treatment to both members and non-members of APEC (Ravenhill, 2001: 2). By the early 1990s, APEC included key world economies and was celebrated as one of the world's most successful regional economic grouping. Its intra-regional trade represented over a third of the global trade of its member-states who also accounted for over 45 per cent of global trade (ibid.).

In contrast with this converging endorsement of neo-liberal and multi-lateral principles, the goals and visions of the regional institutions involved in the second wave of regionalism were highly diversified. They were also closely articulated with intimations that a 'world of regions' (Katzenstein, 2005) or a 'global world order of strong regions' (Buzan and Waever, 2003: 20) were emerging within world politics (Acharya, 2007: 629–52).

In North America, it was the lack of progress in multilateral trade negotiations under the Uruguay round that initially prompted, in 1985, the conversion of US trade policy to regionalism. The first RTA, a bilateral agreement signed with Israel in 1985, was followed by negotiations towards the Canada–United States Agreement (CUSA) and, following its enlargement to Mexico, the conclusion of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1992 (Payne, 1996: 104–7). The agreement was institutionally modest (it merely established a free trade area) but ambitious – it straddled across the north-south divide and went along with the Enterprise for the America Initiative towards a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA).

In Europe, it was the Single European Act, initiated in 1986, that resulted in a highly successful (but largely unanticipated) revival of European

construction. Initially triggered by European concern at the rise of Japan, the completion of the Single European Market (SEM) programme was achieved by 1992. By then, the dissolution of the communist bloc in East and Central Europe was conferring a new geopolitical dimension to the project of European construction. In the process, debates on federalism and the constitutionalisation of integration were revived (Weiler, 1998).

Within ASEAN, doubts about the progress of multilateral negotiations within the Uruguay round had triggered fears that the completion of the Single European Market (SEM) might transform the EU, already a powerful trade bloc, into a 'fortress'. One of the outcomes was the adoption, in 1992, of the Asian Free Trade Agreement (AFTA) towards the establishment of an ASEAN Free Trade Area. This reorientation, however, did not signal any endorsement of the European Union as a model. ASEAN cooperation kept being associated with a unique set of norms and practices (the 'ASEAN-Way') that emphasised informality and non-intervention in the internal affairs of member-states (Acharya, 2001: 27–8).

The European model of integration through transfers of sovereignty and ASEAN's emphasis on non-interference were the expression of two broad prototypes of regionalism: sovereignty pooling and sovereignty enhancement:

APEC and other regional interstate co-operation bodies such as ASEAN, and its ancillaries such as AFTA and the ARF [Asian Regional Forum] in the security domain, are statist and are used to enhance legitimacy. In contrast to the EU, Asian regional organisations are geared to sovereignty enhancement not sovereignty pooling ... . Consequently, regionalism becomes a tool for the consolidation of state power.'

(Higgot, 1998: 52–3)

The ASEAN-Way model also challenged the widespread assumption that regional groupings could only prosper in 'a quintessential liberal-democratic milieu featuring significant economic interdependence and political pluralism' (Acharya, 2001: 31; Aris, 2009: 452–3).

The second wave of regionalisms was stimulated by the globalisation of the world economy and widely assimilated to the triumph of neo-liberalism and its values. Two decades later, regionalism is associated with new agendas and debates. In Latin America, the lack of clarity of the goals and purposes of 'new regionalism' is contrasted with the dynamism of regionalisation as a structural force (Phillips and Prieto, 2010: 118–19). Theories of (new) regionalism, the same authors argue, are less attuned to what regionalisation '*does* look like', than to 'what it *should* look like' (ibid.: 117). Should one therefore consider that regionalism has already peaked? This is the general question asked by Andrés Malamud and Gian Luca Gardini since the association of comprehensive economic integration with macro-regions has been losing ground to regionalism understood as 'a set of diverse cooperation projects' disseminated in several sub-regions (Malamud and Gardini, 2012: 11). The

#### 4 *A world of regionalisms*

notion of post-hegemonic regionalism(s) also stresses the loss of centrality of ‘open regionalism’ and ‘US-led neo-liberal governance’ since the 1990s (Riggirozzi and Tussie, 2012a: 12). Post-hegemonic regionalism also brings attention back to the plurality of models and patterns of cooperation or integration that ‘coexist and overlap’ (Briceño-Ruiz and Ribeiro Hoffmann, 2015: 48). Regionalism has become associated with ambitious transformative regionalist agendas, especially in the case of the Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas (ALBA). Created by Hugo Chavez in 2001, ALBA seeks to promote alternatives to existing orders and institutions through non-capitalist practices, alternative development principles based on welfare cooperation and solidarity, civil society participation and direct opposition to neo-liberalism (Riggirozzi, 2012a: 26–9).

From a global perspective, current evolutions point to an interplay between regionalism and the concept of ‘region’ that has become increasingly diffuse and unmanageable, an issue already foreseen by Andrew Hurrell (1995b: 38) in the hey days of the ‘new’ wave. The regional label, as applied to Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs), conventionally refers to arrangements that are apposite to a multilateral agreement. Accordingly, a RTA encompasses free trade or customs arrangements that may be bilateral or quasi multilateral – that is ‘multicounty’ or ‘plurilateral in WTO parlance (Sindzingre, 2014b: 4; World Bank, 2005: 28).

The regional component of the ‘plurilateral’ arrangements is particularly elusive as their span is less than multilateral but more than bilateral or regional (Schwab and Bhatia, 2014: 18). The issue has also gained renewed acuity with current plans towards the formation of ‘mega-regional’ RTAs tying together individual countries situated in different parts of the world. The mega-agreements share little more in common than the inclusion of countries or regions that account for a major share of world trade and Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). These RTAs have earned their mega-regional status because two or more of the parties are in a ‘paramount driver position, or serve as hubs in global value chains’ (GVC), as in the case of the USA, the EU Japan or China (Meléndez-Ortiz, 2014: 13). The RTA’s extensive packages are meant to go well beyond World Trade Organisation (WTO) obligations and cover services, competition policy, investment, technical barriers and regulatory compatibility, intellectual property protection. It is expected that the combination of production-sharing RTAs with regulatory convergence provisions will iron out differences in investment and business climates (Meléndez-Ortiz, 2014: 13).

Another issue, the loss of congruence between regionalism and multilateralism, is at the centre of what Richard Baldwin (2011) describes as twenty-first century regionalism. While the meso-regional organisations of the late 1980s and 1990s were conceived as ‘stepping stones’ towards better integration within the multilateral system, the mega-agreements aspire to become norm-makers against the backstage of a stalled multilateral system. The quasi-multilateral or mega-RTAs are instruments to pursue bloc building

strategies in areas such as intellectual property and investment that were not covered by the Doha round of negotiations.

Unlike 'new' regionalism, which was WTO compatible, twenty-first century regionalism is stimulated by the disillusionments generated by multilateral trade negotiations. The negotiations have become entangled with geopolitical considerations due to the nature of the players involved, and their ambition to become global norms makers (Draper and Ismail, 2014; Baldwin, 2014; Capling and Ravenhill, 2013: 553–75). Such a dimension was exacerbated when, in November 2014, APEC countries – all of them party to the US-led Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations – cautiously agreed to endorse China's proposal to undertake a feasibility study towards the establishment of another mega-regional agreement, the Free Trade Area of Asia Pacific (FTAAP). The move, described as reluctant, was immediately interpreted in Washington as a US diplomatic success (Mitchell, 2014). Such success was not replicated when, a few months later, another regional project with a global reach, the Asia Infrastructure Development Bank (AIDB) was launched. Like the FTAAP project, it had been initially conceived as a default option, an expression of the impossibility of achieving global multilateralism (Wildau, 2015; Camroux, 2012: 109).

### **The regionalism–regionalisation nexus**

Andrew Axline observed in the late 1970s that even though regionalism kept expanding in the Third World, research in the field was dominated by theoretical language drawn from the European experience (Axline, 1977: 83). Along with the second wave of regionalism, the rise of the new regionalism studies has contributed to give a decisive impulse to the comparative study of regionalisms. The shift away from the more restrictive notion of comparative regional integration has challenged the projection of particular readings of European integration on regionalism (and what it should stand for) in the rest of the world (Söderbaum, 2005: 231; Acharya, 2012: 12).

The substitution of the regionalism/regionalisation dyad to the previous focus on integration/cooperation has been path-breaking in several respects. It is today generally established that regionalism refers to cognitive and/or state-centric projects, while regionalisation points to processes and/or *de facto* outcomes. The gist of this analytical distinction was already present in Bjørn Hettne's liminary introduction to the UNU/WIDER 'new regionalism' project that subsequently led to the publication of five volumes (Hettne, 1994: 1–11, also 1999: xv–xxix).

We define regionalism as the ideas or ideologies, programmes, policies and goals that seek to transform an identified social space into a regional project (Bach, 2013, 2008c, 1999b). Since regionalism postulates the implementation of a program and the definition of a strategy, it is often associated with institution-building and the conclusion of formal agreements. Regionalism also refers, under the influence of the constructivist literature, to cognitive and

ideational projects associated with the 'invention' of regions and construction of identities (Adler, 1997) and delineation of mental maps.

The definition of regionalism as a social phenomenon challenges essentialist conceptions of the region as 'a limited number of states linked together by a geographic relationship and by a degree of mutual interdependence' (Nye, 1968: vii). Regions, in addition to geography and the flow of goods and people, refer to 'social and cognitive constructs that are rooted in political practice' (Katzenstein, 2002: 105). How political actors, state as well as non-state, 'perceive and interpret the idea of a region' has become an integral component in the definition and study of (new) regionalisms (Söderbaum, 2011: 54).

Regionalism can account for processes of regional integration through sovereignty pooling, but also for groupings that, as the track-record of ASEAN illustrates, conceive region-building as sovereignty enhancement. For the purpose of drawing cross-regional comparisons, the term is analytically more useful than the more restrictive notion of regional integration:

Integration by definition implies loss of sovereignty, voluntary or through pressure. Regionalism does not. This does not make regionalism less important, as some suggest, but it does call for different concepts and approaches to the study of the phenomena.

(Acharya, 2012: 12)

Unlike the notion of integration, regionalism, can be used to discuss policy-orientations, claims and identities within states. This was precisely the case when, in the 1970s and 1980s, the expression of new regionalism became associated with the idea of an emerging 'Europe of regions' (Le Galès, 1998: 265; Keating, 1998).

Regionalisation relates to the build up of interactions that are not necessarily associated with an explicitly asserted or acknowledged regionalist project. Regionalisation is a more encompassing notion than regionalism since it takes into account processes and configurations within which states are frequently not the key players. In addition to the role of diasporas and cross-border trade networks, regionalisation can be associated with the activity of large multinationals, seeking to enhance their competitive edge. More generally, definitions of the dynamics of regionalisation converge towards what was from the onset the rallying ground for all students of the second wave: the study of 'undirected economic and social interactions between non-state actors, whether individuals, companies or non-governmental organisations ...' (Fawcett and Gandois, 2010: 619; Bøås, Marchand and Shaw, 1999). These representations of regionalisation processes were, at least initially, shaped by the experience, turned into a model, of Asia's network-led integration and open-ended micro-regional processes. In the first case, what was earmarked was the remarkable ability of diasporas to side-step weak regional institutions and strong politico-bureaucratic constraints; while in the second case, it was



the perceptions of what integration entailed that were radically challenged by the conversion of growth triangles, infrastructure corridors and other spatial development initiatives into global gateways (Mittelman, 1999; Breslin and Hook, 2002).

### **The African maze**

A few years ago, two EU scholars, while discussing how to bridge the gap between EU studies and the 'new regionalist literatures', quizzically noted that 'Africa poses challenges' to the political study of regionalisation (Rosamond and Warleigh-Lack, 2009: 20). This acknowledgement was a significant departure from the days when the study of regionalism and regionalisation in Africa would be squarely ignored or declared irrelevant.

Africa may still be considered as a puzzle, but it is no longer a dead angle in the study of regionalisms and regional integration. The continent is becoming the crucible for conceptualising and contextualising cross-border regionalisation processes, the interplay between territory, space and networks, or global frontier narratives. The new relevance gained by these issues is also a symbol of the analytical limitations of the theories of regional 'integration'.

The end of the systematic assimilation of regionalism to regional integration, the focus on non-state actors, the ideational dimension of regionalisms and the multiscalar and diverse nature of regionalisation processes cast into the limelight issues and areas that never caught the eye of regional integration studies. This is a boost and a bonus for the comparative study of African regionalisms, a major beneficiary of the combined effects of the dissemination of the conceptual tools used by constructivism (Adler, 1997; Sidaway, 2002; Flynn, 1997), border studies (Baud and van Schendel, 1997; Martínez, 1994; Igué and Soulé, 1992; Foucher, 1991) and, of course, the new regionalism intellectual movement (Söderbaum, 2004a; Grant and Söderbaum, 2003; Breslin *et al.*, 2002; Breslin and Higgot, 2000; Hettne, 1999).

The study of African regionalisms represents a challenge and an incentive to revisit a number of common assumptions. The notion of 'waves' of regionalism and the narratives associated with these is a first issue that calls for reassessment. The identification of two waves overlooks the deep and global imprint left by imperial and quasi-imperial policies associated with colonial federations in Africa and Latin America, but also the legacies of China's tributary system, of Japan's zone of co-prosperity during the inter-war period and, in Latin America, of the US Monroe Doctrine.

In Africa, the legacy of colonial amalgamation policies is part of the DNA of a number of regional groupings and powerfully affects ideational representations of federalism and regionalism in general. Conversely, the regionalist ideologies that challenged colour discrimination and colonialism (Pan Africanism, Bolivarism, Pan-Arabism, Pan-Asianism) contribute to identities, but also – as in the case of Pan-Africanism – shape the goals and design of regional organisations.

## 8 *A world of regionalisms*

The analytical implications of such legacies have been frequently overlooked and misunderstood. In Africa, during the 1960s, much of what was interpreted by students of integration as a wave of region-building was actually tied to debates on the deconstruction of policies that had been decided by colonial rulers without consultation of the people of the territories concerned. Regional integration in East Africa was thus celebrated by Joseph Nye in the wake of the accession to independence of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, as unique and unparalleled in Europe (Nye, 1966: 131). In doing so he ignored the gist of the definition of regional integration as a process:

Whereby political actors in several distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations and political activities towards a new centre, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states.

(Haas, 1968: 16)

Today, regional 'integration' still relates in Africa, to the continuation (and re-legitimisation) of colonial arrangements (the CFA monetary zone and the Southern African Customs Unions) that have been pursued beyond independence, hence our conceptualisation of these in Chapter 2 as cases of integration through 'hysteresis'.

The discrepancy between the second wave of regionalism and how it actually translated in Africa has been another source of confusion. As demonstrated in this volume, the revival of regionalism in Africa went along with a transformative agenda that was strongly inspired by the EU. The European experience was neither perceived as 'old' nor marginalised. As neo-liberal integration gained traction in the Americas, the EU featured instead as an attractive substitute to the then discredited cepalist model in Latin America.

This was somewhat paradoxical at a time when the new regionalism literature, despite its strong Africanist anchor, kept emphasising the need to go beyond the analysis of institutions and claimed to build its legitimacy through disregard for 'old' regionalism, associated with outdated integration studies and dysfunctional institutional structures (Shaw, Grant, and Cornelissen, 2011: 5; also their criticism by Acharya and Johnston, 2007a: 10). The EU, in the process, was often cast into the mould of a quintessential expression of 'old' regionalism and, as Alex Warleigh neatly put it, 'the most suitable "other" against which the new regional approach should seek to define itself' (Warleigh, 2004: 307). The EU and EU studies in general were losing their centrality as a model for other regions, but they remained an integral and active participant in the second wave of regionalism. As noted by Philippe De Lombaerde:

The fact that new regionalism has given us a better and broader understanding of regionalism (i.e. multi-actor, multi-dimensional) does not

necessarily imply that more conventional approaches, based on narrow definitions have lost their relevance.

(De Lombaerde, 2011: 46)

More generally, the discourse of the New Regionalism Approach (NRA) on 'newness' has led to an impasse, due to its deficit on historical contextualisation (Lorenz-Carl and Remp, 2013: 5) and overemphasis on the binary opposition between the 'new' and the 'old'. What was once termed by Kate Meagher an 'ideology of "newness"' (Meagher, 2001: 40) has been prone to consider uncritically the latest wave of regionalism, as if it had 'overcome, by definition, the failings of the old' models (ibid.).

This study of African regionalisms proceeds through the identification of distinctive threads so as to overcome the analytical trap created by references to 'waves' or to the binary implications of the distinction between 'old' and 'new'. The notion of distinctive threads of regionalism also helps to preserve the centrality of African agency by focussing on genealogies, institutions and trans-border networks and spaces.

Five main threads have been identified in relation to what we consider to be prototypes (or quasi ideal-types) of cross-border interactions: integration through hysteresis; regionalism as an arena for the conduct of club diplomacy; the emergence of regional spaces in conjunction with the instrumentalisation of cross-border disparities underpinned by trans-state networks; region- and institution-building as expressions of shared pan-African aspirations and cognitive maps; lastly, the dilution of the divide between local, regional and global integration through defragmentation and innovation.

The conceptual tools used to discuss these categorisations are informed by the 'new' regionalism literature and the revitalisation of African borderland studies under the impulse of geographers, economists, historians and anthropologists (Zeller, 2013; Walther, 2014c; Dobler, 2008, 2009). Africa is unquestionably the continent where the broadening of the goal posts and horizons associated with the study of regionalisms has been most notable over the past two decades. The focus on the regionalism-regionalisation nexus, is also durably contributing to call attention to issues that 'put...mainstream approaches to a serious test' while highlighting that 'there are many roads to regionalism and not all of them lead to new forms of regionalism' (Börzel, 2012: 263). The world of regions is also a world of regionalisms.

## 2 Amalgamation and hysteresis

On 26 February 2014, the President of Nigeria, Goodluck Jonathan, hosted the centennial anniversary of the Amalgamation of Nigeria in the national stadium of Abuja, an event celebrated as a ‘significant milestone in our journey to nationhood’ (Jonathan, 2014; Maduabuchi, 2014; Ikechukwu, 2014).

Nigeria’s amalgamation, decided in 1914 through administrative fiat, was a casual expression of the obsession of colonial powers with cutting down the cost of managing their respective empires. Federal or quasi-federal entities were established in West Africa (Nigeria, French West Africa federation), Central Africa (French Equatorial Africa federation, Central African Federation) and East Africa (East Africa High Commission). The logics of integration did not necessarily require territorial contiguity, as in the case of inter-territorial cooperation among the four British colonies in West Africa. These politico-administrative arrangements combined elements of centralisation and decentralisation, classically associated with the definition of federal governments (Wheare, 1956: 35), but two key ingredients were missing: federalism was established without any consultation of the communities concerned; the Federations also operated under the authority of metropolitan powers.

The term amalgamation was used by the British to characterise their administrative and financial decision to regroup distinct territories into a single entity. On 1 January 1914, the merger of the Northern and Southern provinces into the Colony and Protectorate of Nigeria established a system that was already ‘federal in character’ since it recognised the existence of two autonomous entities, the Northern and Southern Provinces (Ezera, 1964: 20). The birth of Nigeria was at the same time a ‘pure expression of imperialist political will’ (Peel, 1983: 15 and 146), the outcome of a merger that did not endorse any process of convergence rooted in pre-colonial history (Adebanwi and Obadare, 2010). The amalgamation of the two Nigerias, as they were called, followed protracted negotiations between the northern and southern colonial administrations, and a final approval by the House of Commons in London. The name ‘Nigeria’ was then adopted, following a suggestion by Flora Shaw – who later married Nigeria’s first governor, Frederick Lugard.

The people who were being ‘amalgamated’ had never been consulted. As a result, the Premier of the Western region, Obafemi Awolowo, kept declaring