

WEST AFRICA: CIVIL SOCIETY STRENGTHENING FOR CONFLICT PREVENTION STUDY

Conflict Prevention and Peace Building Case Study: The Casamance Conflict and Peace Process (1982-2001)

Prepared for

United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
West Africa Regional Program (WARP)

Prepared by

Linda Beck, Team Leader
Senegal Team: Linda Beck, Robert Charlick, Dominique Gomis, Geneviève Manga
Gambia Team: Nana Grey Johnson
Guinea Bissau Team: Cheibane Coulibaly
Robert Charlick, Overall Project Leader

ARD, Inc.

159 Bank Street, Suite 300
Burlington, VT 05401 USA
Telephone: (802) 658-3890
FAX: (802) 658-4247

under the
USAID Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems (BASIS)
Indefinite Quantity Contract

December 2001



This report is intended only for the use of the Government and may contain information that is legally privileged, proprietary and/or confidential. Any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this report is prohibited except by permission. This restriction does not limit the Government's right to use information contained in this data if it is obtained from another source without restriction. The data subject to this restriction are contained in all sheets and all annexes.

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	ii
CONFLICT IN WEST AFRICA: <i>INTRODUCTION: THE LARGER CONTEXT</i>	iv
I. ORIGINS AND HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT	1
II. THE REGIONAL CONTEXT AND CURRENT PEACE PROCESS.....	5
III. ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS AND OTHER NON-STATE ACTORS	8
IV. CASE STUDIES: CSOs IN THE CASAMANCE CONFLICT MITIGATION PROCESS.....	12
A. <i>Association pour la promotion rurale de l'arrondissement de Nyassia (APRAN)</i> [Case S1]	12
B. Women and Traditional Religio-Cultural Practices [Case S2]	14
V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY	19
ANNEXES	
ANNEX 1 CONFLICT STUDY METHODOLOGY	
ANNEX 2 LIST OF INTERVIEWED PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS	



Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACAD	<i>Association Culturelle Aguene et Diambogne</i>
ACAPES	<i>Association Culturelle d'Aid à la Promotion Educative et Sociale</i>
ADAN	<i>Association pour le Développement de Nyassia</i>
ADF	Allied Democratic Forces
ADWAC	Agency for the Development of Women and Children
AJAC	<i>Association des jeunes agriculteurs casamançais</i>
AMDM	Anglican Mission Development Ministries
ANAFSA	<i>Association Nationale pour l'Alphabetisation et la Formation des Adultes</i>
AOF	French West Africa
APRAN	<i>Association pour la promotion de l'arrondissement de Nyassia</i>
CILSS	<i>Comité Inter Etats de Lutte Contre la Sécheresse au Sahel</i>
CNCR	<i>Conseil National de la Concertation de Cooperatives Rurales</i>
CONGAD	<i>Conseil des ONG d'Appui au Développement</i>
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
CRSFPC	<i>Comité Régional de Solidarité des Femmes pour la Paix en Casamance</i>
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EU	European Union
GAFNA	Gambian Food and Nutrition Association
GIA	<i>Groupes Islamiques Armés</i>
GIE	Economic Interest Group
GOS	Government of Senegal
GRAPAC	<i>Groupe de Réflexion et d'Action pour la Paix en Casamance</i>
GRDR	<i>Group pour la recherche et développement rural</i>
LRA	Lord's Resistance Army
MFDC	<i>Mouvement des Forces Démocratique de la Casamance</i>
MOFEPAC	<i>Mouvement des Femmes pour la Paix en Casamance</i>
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NPFL	National Patriotic Front of Liberia
OAU	Organization of African Unity
ONDH	<i>Organisation nationale de droits des hommes</i>
ONEL	Electoral Observer Commission
PDS	<i>Parti Démocratique Sénégalais</i>
PS	<i>Parti Socialiste</i>
PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
RADDHO	<i>Rencontre Africaine pour la Défense des Droits de l'Homme</i>
RCD	<i>Rassemblement Congolais pour la Démocratie</i>
RENAMO	<i>Resistência Nacional Moçambicana</i>
RUF	Revolutionary United Front
SONACOS	Senegalese peanut parastatal
SUD	<i>Solidarité-Urgence-Développement</i>
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNITA	<i>União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola</i>

UNSANA A federation of initiated women and their *prêtesses*
USAID United States Agency for International Development
WAJA West African Journalists Association



Conflict in West Africa

Introduction: The Larger Context¹

Crisis and conflict are not new to post-colonial Africa. Until the 1990s, the most important conflict sites were located on the ever-shrinking domains of colonial or white minority rule. The armed liberation struggles, which emerged when peaceful achievement of independence was impossible, were frequently overlain with cold war-driven external involvement. The final demise of colonial occupation and the end of apartheid coincided a decade ago with a sweep of democratization across the continent, creating high hopes for an African rebirth. Though liberalization and liberation have brought important benefits in many parts of the continent, two large zones of complex, interpenetrated, and deadly civil strife have taken form. The largest stretches in a vast arc from the Horn of Africa to Angola and the two Congos, directly involving ten countries. The other, West African, conflict zone extends from Senegal to Liberia, and threatens to engulf Côte d'Ivoire, including a half-dozen states.

Some of the conflicts extend back further than 1990 (Sudan, Casamance in Senegal), but over the last decade the level of violence has intensified, and the warfare has flowed over state boundaries to create a maze of interwoven armed struggle. As well, calamitous outcomes previously beyond imagination became realities: the complete collapse of state institutions (Somalia from 1991, Liberia, 1990 to 1997, Sierra Leone at times in the 1990s). Gradually it became apparent that the web of conflict in these two large zones of civil strife reflected new parameters to African politics. The spread of rebel militias in part reflected a significant weakening of the institutional fabric of a number of African states. Close scrutiny of the insurgent groups populating the conflict zones reveals a number of crucial novel features in the nature of rebel militias. Both these factors merit attention.

The weakened fabric of states, unevenly experienced across the continent, originates in the protracted political and economic crisis of the 1970s and especially 1980s. Politically, the steady erosion of the legitimacy of single party or military dictatorships had produced by 1990 a widespread public cynicism and disgust: the state as merely a predator. Economically, the development ideologies of the 1960s produced a vast expansion in the scope of state action, which far exceeded its performance capacity or resource base. The economic austerity programs promoted by the international financial institutions and Western donor community by the 1980s had uneven results at best, and frequently shrank the institutional capacity for governance and service provision. Thus in many countries, insurgent groups faced a government far less able to exercise effective control over its territorial domain than had been the case in the 1960s.

Even more important were a series of developments in the nature of and resources for insurgent warfare that cumulatively transformed the landscape. In contrast to the earlier wars of national liberation, many of the 1990s rebels had little political purpose beyond a lunge for power and control of resources. Even more significant, they demonstrated the capacity to survive over extended periods of time with negligible popular support, or even in the face of strong public

¹ This section of the report was written especially for this study by Dr. Crawford Young of the University of Wisconsin.

antagonism (Revolutionary United Front [RUF] in Sierra Leone, Lord's Resistance Army [LRA] and Allied Democratic Forces [ADF] in Uganda).

The origins of rebel movements were also different. Beginning with the Tanzanian overthrow of Idi Amin in Uganda in 1979, in a growing number of instances displacement of existing regimes was accompanied by dissolution of extant armed forces (Chad in 1982, Uganda in 1986, Ethiopia in 1991, Somalia in 1991, both Congos in 1997, Liberia in 1990). Former soldiers fled into the countryside, or into neighboring countries, often with their weapons. The arms stock could be secreted in the countryside, or sold in a swelling black market. When one recollects the sheer size and armament level of some dissolved armies (Ethiopia and Somalia, for example), the proliferation of weaponry was on a very large scale; one may usefully contrast the new context of readily available automatic weapons with the disarmed populace which was a legacy of the colonial state.

To this new source of weaponry was added another: the collapse of the Soviet bloc left in its wake a number of bankrupt states with overflowing armories (Bulgaria, Ukraine, and Russia). This supply stream added to the armament resources accessible to potential insurgents, augmenting an already established international black market in arms. Although the end of the cold war mostly shut off official arms supply from the major powers, the new patterns of interpenetrated conflicts increased the willingness of neighboring states to become suppliers.

Less frequently noticed but also important was a diffusion of sophisticated military skills into insurgent ranks. Former officers with advanced training abroad from dissolved armies frequently turned up in rebel militia (Somalia, Uganda, Rwanda, and Congo-Kinshasa). Other insurgent leaders had acquired critical guerrilla warfare experience in Afghanistan (various *Groupes Islamiques Armés* [GIA] fragments in Algeria, Touareg rebels in Mali). The initial leaders of the National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) of Charles Taylor and the Sierra Leone RUF were trained in Libya. Although national liberation movement leaders also had acquired military skill through foreign training and experience, other insurgent movements of an earlier period, such as the 1964 Congo rebels, had only rudimentary abilities and were easily defeated by small mercenary groups reinforcing the national army.

Another novel development was the deliberate and systematic use of child soldiers, particularly notable in Sierra Leone, Liberia, Uganda and both Congos. This tactic was first employed systematically in Mozambique in the mid-1980s by *Resistência Nacional Moçambicana* (RENAMO), which had difficulty recruiting adult fighters. The agendaless insurgents of the 1990s were frequently driven to this expedient; in some cases, adolescent males in marginal circumstances willingly joined rebel militia, but in other instances they were forcibly abducted from rural communities, particularly in Sierra Leone and Liberia. Brutalized, terrorized, often drugged, the child soldier could prove a ruthless killer.

Also developing in the 1990s was the large-scale use of high value resources to finance insurgent combat. The end of the cold war shut off financial and supply channels motivated by global calculus, both to insurgents and to governments. Mobutu Sese Seko in Congo-Kinshasa and Samuel Doe in Liberia ceased to have any use value to the United States. In Angola, the *União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola* (UNITA), which had previously survived

largely on South African and American support, now had to seize and hold diamond fields to finance its warfare. Thus in the 1990s civil strife in Africa became intimately bound up with resource wars: timber and diamonds for Taylor; diamonds for the RUF and UNITA; gold, diamonds and coltan for the two Congo *Rassemblement Congolais pour la Démocratie* (RCD) factions. States torn by civil strife as well desperately struggled to retain control of some marketable resources. Governments choosing to intervene in neighboring states likewise sought to finance their action through seizure of high-value resources (Taylor and Sierra Leone seized diamonds; the six armies in Congo-Kinshasa seized gold, diamonds, oil, timber, coffee and coltan).

Finally, the high respect accorded in the African international system and its dominant norms to inviolability of frontiers and nonintervention substantially weakened. Occasional episodes of intervention occurred prior to 1990 (Ethiopia-Somalia, Tanzania's overthrow of Amin), but they were exceptional and widely criticized. But in the two zones of conflict, the degree of cross-border involvement has escalated dramatically. The existence of serious insurgent warfare in a neighboring state necessarily poses security dilemmas across the border. These become acute if a strife-torn state provides or permits sanctuary to rebels from a neighboring state. Conflict resolution then requires not only resolving the internal sources of strife, but satisfying the competing security logics of neighboring states. The current Sierra Leone conflict, for example, directly involves Liberia, Guinea and Burkina Faso. In Congo-Kinshasa, partners to the strife include Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, Zimbabwe, Angola, and until recently Namibia, in addition to four armed Congolese-named factions and at least a dozen local militia known as "Mai-Mai".

When we sum these elements, we can readily understand why these conflict patterns have been so resistant to internal resolution and external mediation. The sheer complexity of the conflicts makes major outside players reluctant to deeply engage, though the British have made an important commitment in Sierra Leone. Engagement necessarily must pass through existing regimes, frequently either weak, corrupt, internally contested, uncooperative, or otherwise uncomfortable partners. The international community, beginning with the United States, is reluctant to engage major resources in what appear to be open-ended struggles; one may compare the 20,000 United Nations peacekeepers and multibillion dollar operation in Congo-Kinshasa mounted almost overnight in 1960, with the mere 3,500 UN soldiers assembled with great difficulty currently present in that vast country. Africa commands much less priority in world affairs than in earlier decades, a trend which will certainly be reinforced by the global struggle against terrorism now unfolding.

All of the factors identified above are present to one degree or another in the West African conflict zone. The rebel movements are not identical in nature; the Sierra Leone RUF, the NFPL and new rebels in Liberia are best characterized as warlord formations, while the *Mouvement des Forces Démocratiques de la Casamance* (MFDC) in Senegal includes secessionists in some of its factions. Multiple factors are at play; the mosaic of conflict cannot be reduced to a single element, or a *passé-partout* explanation to simplify the search for understanding.

In a multiethnic and multireligious environment, communal identities play a part in defining social choice and political affiliation. The swelling antagonism to Doe partly derived from his use of an ethnic security map for his army, which became heavily drawn from his Krahn group.



This ensured its loyalty, but ruined its capacity to respond to the initially small challenge of the Taylor NPFL incursion in December 1989. The Kamajors in Sierra Leone, a Mende militia, have been an important resisting force against the RUF, but the latter includes a number of Mende in its ranks. The MFDC in Senegal is mostly composed of Jola, who are also numerous in the Senegal army and the Dakar population. Their armed fragments have enjoyed at times support from Gambia President Yahya Jammeh, also a Jola, and late Guinea-Bissau senior officer and serial coup-plotter Ansoumane Mane, likewise a Jola. The assassination of Mane in November 2000 and the election of Balante Kumba Yala as Guinea-Bissau President have cost the MFDC its open sanctuary across the border. General Robert Guei, briefly President of Côte d'Ivoire in 1999-2000, is guarded in his redoubt near the Liberian frontier by a private Yacouba militia, many of who are from Liberia where the ethnonym for the same group is Gio. Gio had provided the bulk of the initial fighting force of the Taylor NFDL. Ethnicity is thus woven into the fabric of conflict, but not in any clear-cut pattern. None of the major militia (except the Kamajors) has an ethnic designation. Although the MFDC might appear to reflect Jola aspirations, all of its fragments deny an ethnic objective, arguing instead that Casamance is a distinctive region containing multiple ethnic groups. Indeed, the first demands for Casamance autonomy were advanced by French settlers in the 1920s. The Jola do not speak with a single voice, reflected not only in the marked fractionalization of the movement, but by the numerous Jola, especially in Dakar, that do not support it. Ethnicity thus needs acknowledgment as one element, but not a prime determinant. Much less can one speak of "ancient tribal hatreds"; none of the rivalries observable have any deep history, and the identity units themselves are a product of ongoing social construction.

Warlordism is clearly central to Liberia and Sierra Leone, but less useful as a notion in the other countries. The degree of legitimacy of rulers in the subregion varies widely. Senegal, despite its inability to resolve the Casamance issue, has a relatively effective state, and a legitimacy greatly enhanced by the peaceful electoral succession in 2000 of Abdoulaye Wade. Jammeh seized power by military coup in Gambia in 1994, and was confirmed by very dubious elections in 1996. Ahmad Kabbah in Sierra Leone and Taylor were ostensibly elected in balloting more or less accepted by the international community, but have very limited legitimacy; both rule over states which had reasonable legitimacy and performance until the 1970s, then went into accelerating decline. State institutions are mere shadows of what they had been two decades ago. Guinea-Bissau had an exceptionally weak colonial infrastructure but a strong liberation movement; however, the latter never succeeded in consolidating an effective state, and by the 1980s faced seriously contested legitimacy. Guinea initially had a strongly supported radical populist regime under Sekou Touré; however, his rule veered into tyranny and institutional ruin by the time of his death in 1984. His military successor, Lansana Conté, had some initial external and internal support, but beneath the shallow pretense of a liberalized regime the ongoing reality is autocratic rule. However, the Guinean state remains much stronger than its southeastern neighbors, as demonstrated by the punishment inflicted on RUF insurgents who crossed the border in 2000 to spark an uprising by disaffected populations in the Guinea forest zone.

The cause of conflict resolution, in spite of the many complexities, does enjoy one major trump card: the surprising attachment of nearly all players to the existing state framework. Only in Casamance is there a call for dismemberment of an existing state and this comes only from the extreme factions of the MFDC. The formal institutional vessel for a reconstructed political order

thus exists. Given the deep delegitimation and institutional dereliction of several of the “really existing” states, persistent attachment in the popular imagination to a “Sierra Leone” or a “Liberia” is a crucial trump card. However artificial the origins of the African state system, remarkably a “nation” of sorts survives even without an operative state.



I. Origins and History of the Conflict

Although the Casamance secessionist movement led by the *Mouvement des Forces Démocratique de la Casamance* (MFDC) began in 1982, grievances by the local population against the central government date to the French colonial state. While most of Senegal was brought under colonial administration by the turn of the twentieth century, continued resistance in Casamance, aided by the geographical separation of the region from northern Senegal by the British colony of the Gambia, forced the French to create a special administrative relationship with the region that placed it under the direct authority of the governor of French West Africa (AOF) in Saint-Louis. Later, the region was incorporated into the Senegalese colony as a “circle” with administrative structures parallel to Senegal’s other regions.² As a result of its distinct colonial experience, Casamance separatists assert that the region has a legitimate claim to independence under the accepted Organization of African Unity (OAU) norms of sovereignty and self-determination based on colonial boundaries.³

The colonial state’s use of northern Senegalese to administer the region only served to further alienate the Casamançais population. After independence, this practice was continued by President Leopold Senghor, although he included representatives of the region in his government, as he did with each ethno-regional and religious group in Senegal. Indeed, the initial MFDC, from which the separatist movement derives its name, was a political party founded in 1947 by Emile Badiane and Victor Diatta (Jolas from Lower Casamance/Ziguinchor), and Ibou Diallo and Edouard Diallo (Peuls from Upper Casamance/Kolda), who joined forces with Senghor a year later.

Opposition to Senghor’s socialist party, however, remained stronger in Casamance than in any other region of independent Senegal. This may be explained in large part by the nature of Senegal’s patrimonial politics and the distinctive social structures of the Casamance region. Throughout Senegal, the reciprocal relationship between politicians and the *Grands Electeurs* (e.g., Sufi marabouts) is based on the latter’s capacity to mobilize large voting blocs. The Casamance, particularly the Lower Casamance (Ziguinchor region) in which the Jola are the ethnic majority, is characterized by a highly decentralized pre-colonial political system without the social hierarchies based on caste and/or religion that are pervasive elsewhere in Senegal. Consequently, the political base of politicians from Casamance has been more limited and thus so was their influence in the ruling Socialist Party. For example, while Emile Badiane served as a minister in Senghor’s government until his death in 1972, he never held a particularly powerful post, which limited the resources he could distribute to his constituency, thus perpetuating a vicious circle of limited political support in the region.

For the first two decades of independent rule, the Casamançais, who characteristically pride themselves on their autonomy, contented themselves with this arrangement. Two key factors transformed political opposition to the regime into a secessionist movement: the implementation of the 1972 land reform, and the economic and demographic consequences of desertification.

² Roche, 1976.

³ Naldi, 1989; Young, 1991.

Between 1972 and 1984, the *domain national* land tenure system was gradually instituted region by region, arriving in the Casamance only in 1979. In anticipation of the creation of new rural and municipal councils that would enjoy authority over land distribution, leaders of the ruling party, local administrators and merchants — all of northern origin — engaged in land speculation that was clearly illegal under the principle of national domain, in which occupied land could not be expropriated. More importantly, this was done at the expense of the indigenous (primarily Jola) population.

Desertification reinforced these tensions in several ways. First, northern Senegalese began to move into the region to exploit both the land (rice and peanut cultivation) and other natural resources (forest products). Second, economic pressure on Casamançais led them to reevaluate their relationship with the centralized state and to resent the perceived lack of state assistance to the region relative to other areas of the country. Finally, there were growing tensions between indigenous Casamançais and fishermen from northern Senegal over fishing rights along the Casamance River and the Atlantic coast.

These factors contributed to historical tensions between the region and the remainder of Senegal, manifesting itself prominently at sporting events and ultimately setting off the prolonged armed conflict in the wake of a student demonstration at the local high school in Ziguinchor. In 1980, students throughout Senegal demonstrated against the new mandates of the new structural adjustment program, which included a reduction in their stipends and the closing of dormitories for students attending high school outside of their home region. These cutbacks particularly affected students in Casamance who were often forced to go to high school in Dakar and Saint-Louis (northern Senegal) because the Ziguinchor high school could not accommodate the high rate of schooling in the region. During the demonstrations in Ziguinchor, there was a conflict between the students and the high school principal who was not from Casamance. This conflict led to the death of a Jola youth and angered the local population, not only over the youth's death but also over the refusal of the government to take action against the unpopular principal who was perceived as a "foreigner" to the region. Out of their frustration, women in Ziguinchor led the first of many demonstrations which resulted in the Government of Senegal (GOS) addressing the students' grievances (see the mini-case study in Section IV).

The arrival of President Abdou Diouf in 1981 did little to reassure the Casamançais. Neither a member of an ethnic nor religious minority as was Senghor, the Casamançais had little faith that they would fair better with Diouf. Furthermore, it was commonly believed among the would-be leaders of the MFDC and their supporters that a secret pact had been struck between President Senghor and Emile Badiane prior to independence. Under this agreement Casamance would receive independence 20 years after Senegalese independence. Some supporters of Casamance independence go so far as to claim that Badiane, who died in 1972, was assassinated by agents of the Senegalese government who then destroyed the signed accord.⁴ Now, with the departure of Senghor, it was believed that there was no more hope that Senghor would keep his word to the alleged promise of independence.

Consequently, in November 1981, a group of Jola led by Augustin Diamacoune Senghor, a Catholic priest from Casamance, held a secret meeting in the sacred forest near the Ziguinchor

⁴ Lambert, 1998.

airport where the participants decided to “revive” MFDC. The following year, shortly before Christmas, there was a demonstration of approximately 1,000 people who marched from the sacred forest to several government buildings where they replaced the Senegalese flag with a white flag as a symbol of their demand for independence.⁵ To this day, MFDC leaders contend that the participants in the demonstration had not intended to start a civil war, but were pushed in that direction by the violent response of the state on that day, the mass (often arbitrary) arrests and the extensive use of torture during the months and years that followed.

Initially, MFDC relied on ordinary tools (axes and hatchets) and old muskets that were more “memorabilia” from the colonial period than effective weapons. Periodic skirmishes between MFDC and the Senegalese security forces that were brought into the region continued throughout the 1980s, leading to hundreds of casualties, particularly in December on the anniversary of the first demonstration. But the conflict remained an essentially sporadic dispute, limited by MFDC’s rudimentary firepower.

By the early 1990s, however, two factors changed the nature of the secessionist movement: tensions with neighboring countries (Gambia, Mauritania, and Bissau), and instability in the West African subregion, particularly in Liberia and Guinea-Bissau. It is widely believed that both of these factors contributed to the influx of arms into the region, complicating the resolution of the conflict by mixing the political goal of independence with economic issues of weapon- and drug trafficking as well as banditry.

During the 1990s, there were several attempts at peace negotiations — accords were signed in 1991 and again in 1993. These were quickly broken with each side blaming the other. Although President Diouf formed a quasi-independent peace commission that included members of civil society in the mid-1990s, the role of nongovernmental and civil society organizations (NGOs and CSOs) in these early peace processes was minimal. There were some failed efforts by religious leaders and educated Casamançais to encourage both dialogue between the government and MFDC and a greater understanding of the grievances of the Casamançais; however, most Casamançais, whether living in or outside the region, refrained from publicly speaking out on this issue for fear of being labeled either a traitor or rebel, or both.

Part of the problem of forging a resolution to this conflict has to do with the internal characteristics of MFDC itself. MFDC is composed of a civil or political wing that is now officially led by members of the external wing (expatriates residing primarily in Europe), and a military wing (“Atika”), that is composed of a northern and a southern front. Within the political wing, there are currently three prominent leaders. *Abbé* Diamacoune has been MFDC’s spiritual leader since its inception and its secretary-general until August 2001, when he was demoted to president. Within MFDC, it is still hotly debated whether or not this is an honorary post. The other two leading figures are Jean-Marie Biagui and Alexandre Djiba, who were designated respectively as MFDC’s secretary-general and official spokesman in August 2001.

There is some reason for skepticism of the influence that either Biagui or Djiba enjoy over MFDC combatants. Biagui, who resides in Europe, does not appear to have any direct contact with the rebel forces (*maquis*). He seems to have been brought on board initially by Sidy Badji

⁵ Marut, 1994 and 1995.

both as an intellectual (*cadre*) who can negotiate with the GOS, and as a means to sideline Diamacoune. On the other hand, Alexandre Djiba, who has resided in a hotel in Banjul since 1999 (free of charge), seems to be more the point man for the Gambian government than for MFDC. Indeed, many Casamance refugees in the Gambia have accused him of skimming off money collected in Europe on their behalf, according to officials working in the camps.

Diamacoune, on the other hand, clearly is widely respected both within MFDC and among Casamançais in general. He is an important symbol for MFDC, respected and feared by many for his alleged mystical power. Because of his popularity, as well his frequent calls for an end to the conflict since 1993, the Diouf administration attempted to unite the MFDC behind him at the 1999 MFDC meeting in Banjul. The newly elected Wade administration in Senegal also seems to have pinned its hopes on Diamacoune, at the expense of and to the chagrin of other MFDC leaders. At the same time, it is clear that Diamacoune has been unable to exert the influence needed on the various MFDC fighters to persuade them to lay down their arms in response to his repeated calls. Those that oppose negotiations claim that since he has been effectively under house arrest since 1993, he is not free to speak his mind.

The political wing, therefore, can hardly be said to speak for or control the military wing, which is composed of the northern front led by the octogenarian Sidy Badji, and the southern front which is splintered between forces loyal to Leopold Sagna and Salif Sadio. Having first laid down his arms in the early 1990s, Sidy Badji has been the most willing leader of Atika to negotiate a peace agreement — that is until Diamacoune began negotiating with President Wade unilaterally. Sadio, on the other hand, has been the hard-liner who continues to demand independence and refuses to negotiate a peace settlement. With Sagna presumably killed or taken hostage by Sadio earlier in 2001, the GOS placed a price on his head with the blessing of Diamacoune who openly condemned Sadio as a renegade. Nevertheless, a recent letter from Sadio to Diamacoune published in *Sud Quotidien* suggests that there may be a rapprochement even between these two. In the letter, Sadio sided with Diamacoune in condemning the creation of a new MFDC cabinet (*bureau*) in Banjul and the eviction of Diamacoune from his post as secretary-general.

Following the resignation of Biagui as secretary-general in early November, a new rift and thus new alliances have appeared within MFDC. Sidy Badji declared himself to be the interim secretary-general with the support of Alexandre Djiba. Upon Diamacoune's request, however, Biagui resumed the post of secretary-general a few days later with a new cabinet composed of several key Diamacoune allies, including his younger brother, Bertrand Diamacoune. Sud-Communications journalist, Demba Ndiaye, has also reported that Salif Sadio supports efforts to reunite MFDC under Diamacoune's leadership, having provided military protection during a recent meeting of the MFDC called by Diamacoune.

II. The Regional Context and Current Peace Process

The Gambia and Guinea-Bissau have been heavily implicated in the Casamance conflict and peace process. The Gambia and Guinea-Bissau are believed to have been primary sources for weapons smuggling as well as sites for rebel bases, although both have been more explicit in Guinea-Bissau. Tensions have existed between Bissau and Dakar as a result of a dispute over offshore petroleum rights, which were resolved in the early 1990s, and repeated violations of Bissau territorial and airspace by the GOS in its pursuit of MFDC rebels. Furthermore, Bissauan politicians and military leaders of all stripes have allegedly been involved in the arms trafficking of former Soviet stockpiled weapons left over from Bissau's prolonged struggle for independence from Portugal. Both President Joao Bernardo Vieira (1980-1999) and his nemesis, General Ansoumane Mane, were allegedly involved in this lucrative business. Mane's involvement with MFDC, however, was believed to be not only economic but also political, as he was seen as closely allied with and a protector of MFDC.

Mane's political fortunes were, therefore, closely tied to those of MFDC, or at least elements within it (i.e., Salif Sadio of the southern front). The 1998 military rebellion and the ultimate overthrow of President Vieira in 1999 gave MFDC greater freedom of movement in Guinea-Bissau, while Mane's assassination in November 2000 was immediately followed by the forced expulsion of MFDC through the bombardment of their camps along the Bissau-Senegal border. Any political incentives on the part of President Kumba Yala, elected in November 1999, to strengthen ties with Senegal were undoubtedly reinforced by the high economic cost of his country's involvement in the Casamance conflict.

In terms of Bissau's current potential as a political ally that the GOS can count on, President Yala's regime is highly unstable. There also continues to be tensions between the two countries over cross-border cattle rustling and over the economic consequences to Bissau of its labor being drawn into more lucrative work in cashew production in Senegal. It is also suspected that this labor flow is a primary method for the MFDC combatants to re-enter Senegal.

The Gambia has also been accused of arms trafficking and harboring of MFDC combatants. The GOS has complained for years that among the large number of Casamance refugees — estimated at 6,000 to 8,000 — who reside in official camps along the Gambia-Casamance border, are MFDC members and their supporters. The camps are thus seen as staging areas while providing crucial supplies to the separatists. At the urging of the United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees (UNHCR), the Government of the Gambia decided to close the refugee camps along the border and move the refugees to Bambali, a village north of the Gambian river in central Gambia.

The decision to transfer the refugees became controversial when over three-quarters of the refugees refused to move and thus were deported in late spring of this year. The deportation was portrayed by the Gambian government and by some Gambian NGOs as voluntary (see mini-case study on the Gambian Red Cross and the Gambian Food and Nutrition Association [GAFNA] in Section IV). The refugees who chose not to go to Bambali, however, complained that the land there was not conducive to the sort of rice farming methods used by the Casamançais, and far from their home villages where they regularly went to provide for the elderly and animals they

had left behind. Nevertheless, some individuals interviewed, including camp representatives of GAFNA believe that the refusal by the majority of refugees to move to Bambali was an indication that the GOS was correct in its assertion that at least some of the refugees were MFDC sympathizers who could not help in the rebellion if they were moved far from the conflict.

While both Guinea-Bissau and the Gambia have played important roles in the peace process, serving as guarantors of previous accords and providing sites of negotiation between the GOS and MFDC, President Yahya Jammeh of the Gambia, an ethnic Jola allegedly born in the Casamance, has undertaken the unusual role of attempting to “harmonize” the different elements of MFDC. His critics claim that this is because of his close association with MFDC, while a more generous reading is that Jammeh would like to assume a regional role in conflict resolution. What is clear is that since the mid-1990s, the Senegalese government has emphasized unification of MFDC behind a single leader as a necessary first step to negotiate peace, since the GOS believes that the repeated collapse of negotiated peace accords is due to rogue elements of the separatist movement. Consequently, in June through July 1999, the Gambia, with GOS support, hosted the first in a series of meetings among MFDC leaders, following the historical meeting and symbolic handshake between President Diouf and Diamacoune in January 1999.

By the end of 1999, there was some evidence of progress at a Banjul meeting between MFDC and GOS in the presence, for the first time, of external observers including representatives of various Senegalese NGOs. The negotiated cease-fire, however, did not even last through the presidential elections in February and March 2000, during which the *Parti Démocratique Sénégalais* (PDS) candidate, Abdoulaye Wade, declared that if elected he would end the conflict within a month.

Wade and various other PDS leaders had been heavily involved in earlier negotiations after opposition parties joined a Senegalese Socialist Party (PS)-led coalition government in 1991. Indeed, there was some speculation that President Abdou Diouf intentionally thwarted the peace process in the early 1990s to prevent Wade from receiving credit for ending the conflict. In an interview with Diamacoune, however, Wade was blamed for not “forcing” the GOS to abide by the accords, or at the very least, leaving the government in protest after what was perceived by MFDC as violations of the accords on the part of the Senegalese government.

Immediately following his election, Wade announced that his approach to the conflict would differ from that of his predecessor in two ways. First, the military would “pacify” its stance. There were to be no more arbitrary arrests or use of torture, with the intention of convincing MFDC that the GOS was negotiating in good faith. This also would have the welcomed effect of ending the highly public criticism by international human rights organizations as well as the more private urgings of bilateral and multilateral donors to address these issues. Second, Wade announced that he would engage in direct dialogue with the MFDC leadership rather than relying on the various civil society mediators used by the Diouf administration who were criticized for having profited from their role without producing results.

Little progress was made on the peace talks until December 2000, after which a series of accords were signed in March and April 2001. The subsequent waves of returning refugees from Guinea-Bissau as well as the Gambia, however, may be more of a reflection of changing politics in the

refugees' host country than changing circumstances in Casamance. Furthermore, fighting in the region has continued intermittently. This is attributed in large part to the continuing rifts within MFDC over whether or not to negotiate a settlement short of independence.

Although numerous informants claimed that what has fundamentally changed in the peace process is that civil society has become weary and is mobilized to end the conflict, the rocky road of the Casamance peace process suggests that the progress made in 2001, while not insignificant, is also not irreversible. Furthermore, the GOS approach of "harmonizing" MFDC may be sociologically unrealistic given the decentralized and heterogeneous nature of Casamance society. The conflict between Leopold Sagna, the leader of the southern front designated by *Abbé* Diamacoune, and Salif Sadio may be creating (or reinforcing) a rift between the predominantly Christian Casa Jola in southwestern Casamance and the predominantly Muslim Bolouf and Fogny Jola of northwestern Casamance. In promoting the role of civil society in the peace process, one must be aware that this sociological fault line may also pose a problem to their offering a valuable contribution to the peace process.

III. Role of Civil Society Organizations and Other Non-State Actors

Although for the first decade and a half of the conflict, the role of civil society and other non-state actors was minimal, sporadic and highly personalized, there were efforts by religious leaders and educated Casamançais to encourage both dialogue between the government and MFDC and a greater understanding of the grievances of the Casamançais. Notable among them were the efforts of such religious organizations as the *Association Nationale des Imams* and the *Coalition des Eglises*, as well as various ad hoc (and typically short-lived) groups, such as the *Délégation des Cadres Casamançais Elargie*. The capacity of these organizations to promote peace, however, proved to be quite limited, either because they did not have the confidence and trust of the actors involved or because they were demonized as traitors, rebels or both.

Indeed, fear of being branded as such led to a “complicitous silence” by the majority of Casamançais.⁶ Meanwhile, organizations such as the *Conseil National de la Concertation de Cooperatives Rurales* (CNCR) that may have had the social capital to influence the peace process, chose not to get involved in a conflict, minimizing its importance to what one CNCR official described as an “*affaire de ghetto*.”

One notable exception was the role of *Rencontre Africaine pour la Défense des Droits de l’Homme* (RADDHO). Affiliated with various international human rights organizations, RADDHO first became involved in Casamance in 1992, following massacres in the town of Kaguite. Since then they have written numerous reports on human rights violations by both the GOS and MFDC, including arbitrary arrests, torture, summary executions and the disappearance of individuals. As a human rights organization, RADDHO is nonpartisan, however, according to Mbala Mbow, the assistant secretary-general of RADDHO, the GOS initially tried to prevent the organization from playing a role in Senegal as the PS administration considered it to be part of the political opposition. Relations with the GOS improved after RADDHO played an intermediary role between the Minister of the Interior and the newly created electoral observer commission (ONEL) during the 1998 legislative elections. In 2000, RADDHO was able to augment its role in promoting transparent elections through funding from USAID and France. Currently, RADDHO is also receiving funding from the Ford Foundation (\$250 million) to coordinate donors working with refugees (West African Refugee Program Network), and the European Union (EU) is funding local observatories, each equipped with computers, Internet access and two salaried personnel. These individuals record the accounts of victims and witnesses of human rights abuses, and if necessary, conduct complementary research to support their charges in legal hearings. The information collected is then published on the Internet.

Recently, RADDHO extended its mission to include the reconstruction of homes that have been destroyed in the conflict, with funding from Catholic Relief Services (CRS) through a subgrant from USAID. While activities such as this are an important part of the peace process, the expansion of RADDHO’s role in the region is also indicative of a potential problem that local NGOs and CSOs face with the influx of donor funding to these organizations (specifically from USAID, the EU, and in the future the World Bank). While taking on new activities to fulfill the needs of the community is to be applauded, there is growing competition between local NGOs

⁶ Faye, 1994.

and CSOs for donor money that has led to a high level of overlap, according to Samba Barry, the Ziguinchor representative of Program *Solidarité-Urgence-Développement* (SUD), an initiative by the *Conseil des ONG d'Appui au Développement* (CONGAD), which serves as an umbrella organization for Senegalese NGOs.

Following a GOS request in the late 1990s to increase donor aid to the region as part of the larger peace process, a Dakar-based donor coordination committee was formed under the leadership of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the EU. Since the creation of the coordination committee, the number of donor-funded private voluntary organization (PVO) and international NGO projects in the region has increased dramatically, although this is probably not attributable directly to the committee's coordination in Casamance itself. Those who have returned or started to work in Ziguinchor include several American organizations — Africare, CRS, Handicap International, Oxfam-America, and World Education, most of which receive funding from a USAID special objective. In addition to their own activities, these organizations have distributed funding to local NGOs and CSOs — which have also benefited from direct USAID funding — in areas such as conflict resolution, reconstruction of infrastructure, and humanitarian assistance to returning refugees and displaced persons.

The increased participation of local organizations is tied not exclusively (or even primarily) to donor funding, but rather is in large part a reflection of a crucial forum organized by CONGAD in March 1998. The conference entitled “*Paix et Développement en Casamance: C'est Possible!*” was attended by more than a hundred people, including politicians, religious and customary leaders, NGOs, women's and youth associations, and administrative and municipal officials. This forum led not only to a call for peace that was translated into the local languages of the Casamance region, but also the participation of local NGOs and CSOs as observers at the December 1999 negotiations between the GOS and MFDC in Banjul. While they did not contribute substantively to the negotiations, they were able to convey the widespread desire of the Casamançais population for an end to this conflict that has ruined so many lives as well as the economy of the region.

Since this high point in the activism of CONGAD in the peace process, several informants observed that CONGAD has not been as dynamic, at least at the national level. This was attributed to the departure of Malamine Savane, the former secretary-general who left to join the staff of the USAID-funded Decentralization and Local Governance Project. The challenge CONGAD faces with the change in leadership was evident in the difficulties that our team had in meeting with the current leaders. Like CONGAD, many African NGOs suffer from an overdependence on a single leader or small group of leaders. This overdependence could well jeopardize its capacity to contribute to a peace process. The same problem may well confront the two Ziguinchor-based groups that have been most implicated in the peace process, *Groupe de Réflexion et d'Action pour la Paix en Casamance* (GRAPAC) and *Association des jeunes agriculteurs casamançais/Association pour la promotion de l'arrondissement de Nyassia* (AJAC/APRAN), although this has not manifested to date.

GRAPAC is a CSO that seeks to unite local politicians, religious and traditional leaders, women and other local peace activists in the pursuit of peace for the region. GRAPAC is currently involved in a CRS-funded project with the women's organization *Kabonketoor* (“to forgive

oneself” in Jola) to promote peace through traditional Jola religious beliefs (see mini case study of women’s organizations in Section IV).

AJAC/APRAN, on the other hand, was not created to promote conflict resolution, but was initially an agricultural NGO that decided to become involved in conflict resolution given the impossibility of development in the region without peace (see mini case of AJAC/APRAN in Section IV).

In addition to concerns over the institutional capacity of organizations such as GRAPAC and APRAN, several informants, including Samba Barry of CONGAD, voiced their concern that competition between these and other local organizations is now verging on a zero-sum game with the consequent tensions between organizations and their leaders. While Barry hopes to head this off by enhancing CONGAD’s role as coordinator of NGO activities, there is already a perceived disparity in the external funding of local NGOs that has generated some resentment.

The USAID funding decisions may have contributed to this perception despite the fact that they appear to have been based on the desire to fund a variety of approaches to peace building as well as on well-founded concerns that the NGOs they fund are partisan in the conflict they hope to resolve. In the Casamance case, the issue has been whether particular NGO leaders are providing resources to MFDC, specifically the northern front.

Several informants also expressed their concern over tensions that are developing between local groups similar to the alleged tensions between the split within the MFDC between the Christian Casa and Muslim Bolouf/Fogny. These tensions may also become tied in with the land tenure issue in Nyassia given that APRAN is lead by “foreigners”, Fogny Jola, while GRAPAC and *Kabonketoor* are working primarily with *prêtesses* who are women belonging to the “indigenous” Bayut ethnic group. Although these tensions do not yet appear to have become serious conflicts, future funding of NGOs in Casamance should bear the potential for such conflicts on these grounds in mind.

Research in Gambia and Guinea-Bissau revealed that there was little evidence of the involvement of regional or subregional non-state actors. Local organizations such as the Gambian Red Cross and GAFNA are addressing refugee issues within their borders, but contacts between national and/or local groups such as human rights organizations and NGO consortiums have been minimal and sporadic at best.

There are two notable exceptions. The first was the international festival organized in Kolda (Upper Casamance) to address problems associated with cross-border cattle rustling and general banditry. The “*Festival pour la Paix*” held in October 2000 at Salif Kéney (Kolda) was attended by an estimated 1,000 people, primarily from Senegal and Guinea-Bissau. Some representatives from Mauritania and the Gambia also attended. The need for the festival arose after the border between Senegal and Guinea-Bissau was closed due to tensions between the populations related to cross-border theft of animals. Reportedly this festival was made possible through funding from Oxfam-America and CRS through CONGAD/Program SUD. After the festival, there were a number of “*ceremonies of restitution*,” and with the help of citizens, arrests of thieves rose and banditry in general decreased. Bissau villagers also returned horses and carts that they had stolen

in retribution for not being paid by the Senegalese peanut parastatal, SONACOS. In return, Senegalese villagers successfully lobbied SONACOS to pay the Bissauan farmers. In addition, according to one source, Senegalese and Bissauan villagers then cooperated to rebuild eight kilometers of road in the area.

The second exception was the creation of an embryonic network linking journalists from Senegal and Bissau. This activity was also funded by CRS and was intended to further journalists' understanding of how their reporting could affect a conflict, both positively and negatively. The initial meeting in the spring of 2000 was deemed a success by all participants. Unfortunately, tensions may already be developing in this network over allegations that some Senegalese journalists were paid by the GOS to project pro-government stances on the conflict. While these charges remain unsubstantiated, several sources interviewed for study contended that the Senegalese authorities had put pressure on them and had censored their articles on the Casamance.

IV. Case Studies: CSOs in the Casamance Conflict Mitigation Process

A. *Association pour la promotion rurale de l'arrondissement de Nyassia* (APRAN) [Case S1]

APRAN is a member of, and in some sense an offshoot of AJAC, which was created in 1974. According to Demba Keita, the secretary-general of APRAN, AJAC progressively evolved into an umbrella organization of local agricultural associations as a result of (1) the division of Casamance into two regions (Ziguinchor and Kolda) in 1984, and (2) the reinforcement of local representative structures through decentralization throughout the 1980s. Created in 1987, APRAN operates in one of the two counties (*arrondissements*) of the department of Ziguinchor in the region of Ziguinchor.

Like its parent organization, AJAC, the primary purpose of APRAN is to promote agriculture in the area. Although youths were their initial target population, they also work extensively with women. APRAN has, for example, supported women's organizations working on horticultural and gardening projects, such as the extraction of palm oil and the sale and dehydration of fruits and vegetables. Their most recent project is a mango-drying project financed by Europe Tiers Monde (Belgium). APRAN's plan is to export dried mangos as a source of funding for its other activities. APRAN also received funding from *Foundation de France, Le Monde* (German), CRS, and *Action de Carême* (Switzerland).

According to its internal documents, APRAN has 1,100 members, 850 of which are women, from 50 villages in the *arrondissement*. The association has an executive committee composed of five individuals, an administrative council composed of 65 members and a general assembly composed of 115 members representing each of the 50 village groups. The activities of AJAC and APRAN are well known in their localities and villagers have a generally favorable impression of the association.

In 1999, APRAN decided that to achieve its agro-economic goals, it needed to become involved in resolving the conflict in the Casamance. Without peace, it reasoned, economic development and specifically agricultural activities would be hampered. Nyassia, where APRAN is centered, had indeed been among the hardest hit areas of the region, with the largest number of villages abandoned due to a combination of fighting and landmines. They began their involvement in conflict resolution by funding a study conducted by three men in the area who are not directly affiliated with APRAN — Martin Mane, the regional president of CONGAD; Mamadou Moussa Ba, a journalist with Sud-FM; and Noah Cisse, the principal of the local high school and leader of the leftist party, And-Jëff. Unlike previous reports, this study was supposed to focus not just on the causes and implications of the conflict but also on what could be done to resolve the conflict.

Based on this report, APRAN decided to organize a series of cultural weekends, in September through October 2000, in the seats of five rural communities: Baghagha, Boutoupa-Kamaracound, Enempore, Niaguis and Nyassia. The explicit purpose of these weekends was to provide not only a social outlet for a war-weary population but also a forum to discuss the

conflict and the possibilities for peace. To prevent any occurrence of violence during these events, the leaders of APRAN approached both military officials at the local army camp in Ziguinchor and MFDC combatants, requesting that a cease-fire be in place during the cultural weekends. Both parties agreed and the events took place without incidence.

As a result of these contacts with both military and MFDC officials, APRAN became a de facto mediator. Demba Keita claims that between July 2000 and January 2001, APRAN conducted 13 missions into the *maquis*. A high official in the Ministry of Armed Forces confirmed APRAN's role. Impressed with their work and neutrality, this official stated that of the various organizations investigated, he determined that APRAN was best suited to work on peace issues because it was motivated by economic development rather than partisan objectives. Accordingly, he decided to incorporate APRAN into a special Senegalese government project to end the Casamance conflict.

APRAN's relationship with MFDC (the rebel movement), however, remains unclear and may well be exaggerated. It seems doubtful that as an association based in a single county, that APRAN can have effective connections with the leaders of such a highly divided secessionist movement spread throughout the region. It is reported, for example, that APRAN has little if any direct contact with the leader of the northern front, Sidy Badji. Its contacts even with some southern front leaders, such as Salif Sadio, appear to be very limited. Nonetheless, it is widely acknowledged that APRAN contributed to the signing of a series of peace accords in early 2001.

APRAN's involvement in conflict resolution, however, has not been limited to its role as mediator. For example, it has been involved in several activities including the return of refugees primarily from Guinea-Bissau. APRAN's current focus is on the reestablishment of villages (houses, wells, and in the future health centers, schools and fishing projects). It is not, however, involved in de-mining activities that will be essential if people are to return to their homes and till their land.

Clearly, APRAN has been able to build upon its intimate knowledge of the area and the trust it has developed through its various agricultural activities and through the fact that it is still regarded primarily as a development organization to effectively participate in conflict resolution. The APRAN leadership sees its involvement in conflict resolution as a temporary though necessary tangent from its purpose of promoting agriculture in the region. The mango project, for example, is evidence that it is not becoming financially or otherwise dependent upon its role in the peace process.

As a CSO, APRAN also confronts a number of problems and limitations with regard to its role in conflict resolution. The first, and perhaps most obvious, is that its leaders are not experienced or trained in conflict negotiation. This lack of training undoubtedly makes APRAN's activity in this area more risky and may well limit its effectiveness. The leaders of this CSO, for example, may not be able to successfully navigate the treacherous factionalism of MFDC, in which alliances and positions seem to be in constant flux.

On a related issue, the role of a local NGO in conflict resolution may be problematic in a context where not only is the independence movement fractured but so is the society. APRAN explicitly

states its neutrality, as well as discretion, yet it is difficult for individuals from a region to develop and maintain ties to all actors. Nor is it easy to maintain the even more difficult *appearance* of neutrality. Of course there are always the problems of competition between NGO/CSOs for donor assistance, reinforced perhaps by personality differences among the leaders. In the case of APRAN and its role in conflict resolution work, however, there is the real possibility that competition may erupt along the lines of MFDC factions and/or ethno-regional and religious identity, making its role as a valued neutral actor more problematic.

As for the role of donors, there are concerns that the agenda of funding agencies may adversely affect the promotion of conflict resolution by CSOs. There is, of course, concern about dependence on foreign aid, although this appears to be less of an issue for APRAN than for most CSOs. There is also concern that particular donor objectives may displace other concerns that the local population and/or NGOs consider to be more pressing. For example, some donors, including USAID, may focus on such activities as the rebuilding of villages, and given funding opportunities, this may come to dominate NGO programs. This might be the case despite the fact that such activities may be premature given the fact that the peace process has not yet even resulted in a cease-fire, let alone in disarmament of the combatants. On the other hand, other issues that local NGOs may consider more pressing, such as the return of refugees and the settling of land disputes exacerbated by the proposed administrative reforms, may not get sufficient attention since they may not figure prominently in the donors' agenda. This could ultimately undermine the NGOs' local bases of support.

Finally, there may be some concern about the degree to which the effectiveness of APRAN is dependent on the leadership of particular leaders like Keita and Diedhou. The capacity of APRAN could be severely hampered were these leaders to leave the organization for any reason.

B. Women and Traditional Religio-Cultural Practices [Case S2]

In the relatively egalitarian societies of the Casamance — particularly the Jola of the Lower Casamance (Ziguinchor) — women have played significant social and economic roles, including serving as keepers of sacred objects (fetishes) that are believed to have various powers. The most historically renowned of these *prêtesses* (fetishers) was Aline Siteo Diatta who led a resistance movement against the colonial state from 1941 to 1943. Indeed, Aline Siteo is a cultural icon in the region, where the local high school in Ziguinchor is named for her. She is also an important MFDC symbol, who included among its demands that an inquiry into her fate and remains be held.

Women in the Casamance have also been highly visible in the conflict with the Senegalese government. In 1980, a student strike resulted in the death of a student and women organized a massive protest march. This march followed a meeting of UNSANA, a federation of initiated women and their *prêtesses* in a sacred forest on the outskirts of the regional capital of Ziguinchor. Dressed in the traditional garb of calabash hats adorned with beads and “armed” with reed brooms, they marched to the governor's office, the police station and then to the principal's home. Their support of the students led the GOS to address their grievances.

Throughout the early 1980s, women continued to be particularly active in the demonstrations against the GOS, including a march in 1983 at which the women marched naked, a traditional sign of protest, through the streets of Ziguinchor from the sacred forest to the governor's office. After MFDC was formed, women continued to play a key role within the separatist movement by providing information, food, and the transport of weapons and land mines. Until recently, however, they have had little or no influence on the peace process, confining themselves to peace marches that have been little more than media affairs.

In 1993, for example, the feminist association based in Dakar, *Yewwu Yewwi*, organized a peace march of women to initiate *Mouvement des Femmes pour la Paix en Casamance* (MOFEPAC). Composed primarily of Casamançais women in Dakar, MOFEPAC lacked effective leadership and a clear purpose. When the GOS prohibited the march, the organization quickly fizzled. Nevertheless, throughout the 1990s, peace marches increased in frequency as the conflict regained its intensity. Women attended these marches en masse not only because of their historical role in society, but also because women were being profoundly affected by this prolonged and increasingly violent conflict. Not only were they displaced from their homes and at times even killed, although usually not as intentional targets of either side but they were also affected as the mothers, wives and sisters of *both* MFDC and GOS military soldiers.

Despite their highly visible role in the growing movement for peace, women remained marginalized from the peace process and entirely excluded from the negotiation of peace accords until the 1999 Banjul meeting at which various organizations and members of civil society were invited to attend the negotiations as observers. One women's organization that attended the meetings was *Comité Régional de Solidarité des Femmes pour la Paix en Casamance* (CRSFPC), created after the 1998 CONGAD forum "*Paix et Développement en Casamance: C'est Possible!*" Held in March 1998, the conference was attended by over 150 participants, including local NGOs, private entrepreneurs, union leaders, elected officials, representatives of youth, and of course, women's organizations. The object of the forum was to examine the possible.

According to its documents, CRSFPC was not an entirely new entity but rather an outgrowth of another NGO, *Association Culturelle d'Aid à la Promotion Educative et Sociale* (ACAPES), which began working in the region in 1977. ACAPES had been involved in numerous development projects such as the construction of a health center in Toubacouta. Given the activism of women and girls in ACAPES activities, the group decided to form a women's commission that became an interest group in 1985. This group brought together 20-odd women's groups in the area and was led by Fatou Gueye Diallo, an economics teacher at the local high school who later became the secretary-general of CRSFPC.

In 1997, problems related to land mines led a group of intellectual women associated with ACAPES, including Seynabou Male Cisse, who is currently serving as president of CRSFPC, to undertake a study of the situation. These women wrote a report in which they emphasized that in the Casamance, they (as well as men) play an important cultural role as the *prêtesses*, keepers/guards of the fetishes. Throughout history, when a crisis arrived, women would resolve it not only through mass demonstrations but also through ceremonies in the sacred forests.

A key event that also contributed to the formation of CRSFPC was a conference on regional cooperation and conflict resolution held in Zambia, and sponsored by the Banjul-based NGO, African Centre for Democracy and Human Rights Studies. Cisse had attended and had brought back several important lessons, among them the idea that anyone who is affected by a conflict can contribute “a stone to its resolution.” As a result she and other women were inspired to create an organization with the explicit purpose of offering a contribution to the peace process. To this end, women leaders from Casamance organized a meeting in November 1999, with assistance from the Fredrick Ebert Foundation (Germany). Some men were also in attendance, including Bertrand Diamacoune as the emissary of his brother, *Abbé* Diamacoune of MFDC. Bertrand recounted how several *prêtesses* had played a crucial role in the origins of MFDC in 1982. In addition to accepting the pledges of would-be MFDC combatants to the pursuit of Casamance independence, a group of *prêtesses* each took a fistful of soil from the sacred forest and used this to create fetishes elsewhere in the region where they would pray for the safety and success of MFDC. Bertrand then announced that for the violence to end, the *prêtesses* must “unbind those who were bound in the sacred forest.”

The men at the meeting were then asked to leave and the women discussed the proposal among themselves and decided to create CRSFPC. They then sought an invitation to the Banjul negotiations, and five women were permitted to attend. In Banjul, the women were initially quite frustrated. As observers, they were not permitted to speak and after the opening ceremony, they were asked to leave and not to return until the negotiations between the GOS and MFDC were completed. In the interim, the women lobbied several different participants in the negotiations, including Alexandre Djiba (MFDC spokesman), Pierre Goudiaby Atepec (leader of a politically influential group of Casamançais intellectuals), and Gambian President Yahya Jammeh. In the end, the women were permitted to speak, offering such a powerful plea for peace that many present were moved to tears.

Following the Banjul meeting, CRSFPC continued to pursue its mission of promoting the role of women in the peace process. By December 2000, however, problems began to emerge between Cisse and a group of women led by Marguerite Coly Kény that ultimately resulted in the creation of a new association, *Kabonketoor*, in June 2001.⁷ Ironically, this split appears to have at its core the very root cause of the Casamance conflict — disenfranchisement of individuals based on their ethnic or regional origin.

According to Kény, *Kabonketoor*'s president, this association was created because women who have not been initiated, such as Seynabou Male Cisse (a non-Jola), could not enter the sacred forest where the crucial role of women in the peace process now lay. In addition, she added that the presence of non-Jola women required the cumbersome process of translation when speaking with the *prêtesses*. Kény also complained that Cisse was too prone to speak to the media about the rituals they are engaging in, which requires complete confidentiality.

Cisse, on the other hand, attributed the split to an offer by a German NGO (WFD) to pay her as the full-time coordinator of the activities of CRSFPC, much to the chagrin of Kény. Cisse also claimed that when she attempted to have a meeting at the *Alliance Française* last March, Kény

⁷ *Kabonketoor* in Jola means “to forgive or pardon oneself.” Legally this group is not an NGO as is CRSFP, but is an economic interest group (GIE) permitted under law to engage in income-generating activities.

told the *prêtesses* that Cisse had intentionally organized the meeting across from the Ziguinchor military camp because she planned to kill them. Furthermore, Cisse claimed she was wrongfully accused of attempting to bring in foreigners to film their ceremonies and steal their secrets. Meanwhile, she answered their concern about her being non-Jola by pointing out the CRSFPC woman in charge of this project, Marie Claire Diatta, was an initiated Jola.

Cisse also pointed out that the first group to incorporate the cultural role of women in the peace process was an inter-ethnic association. In 1994, one of the most creative efforts to implicate women in the peace process had been undertaken by Saliou Sambou, a Jola governor serving in the Serère region of Fatick. The governor organized a “Festival of Origins” attended by Jola women from Lower Casamance (Ziguinchor region) and Serère women from the Sine (Fatick region). From this encounter, an association was formed, *Association Culturelle Aguene et Diambogne* (ACAD), in 1995. The name is based on the mythical twin Jola and Serère sisters who migrated from Egypt but, as legend would have it, were separated upon settling in Senegal. ACAD was not particularly active after the initial festival. In 1997, however, a Senegalese spiritual leader from Fatick, *Sheikh* Pape Samba Ndiaye, began to have a series of visions. These visions eventually led him to work with ACAD leader Saliou Sambou to identify and deactivate the “fetishes” that had been placed in 1982 following the MFDC induction ceremony. After the first one was located in July 2001, seven Jola men and women, including a *prêtesses* and the leaders of *Kabonketoor* and GRAPAC, went to Fatick in August of this year to give thanks and pray so that the other sacred sites may be found.

What is truly remarkable in this story is that despite the fact that non-Jolas and particularly Western-educated development officials do not necessarily share Jola beliefs about the mystical powers associated with the fetishes, they were able to recognize the important socio-religious role such beliefs have played in the conflict, and their potentially crucial role in either subverting or promoting peace in the region. Both USAID and CRS decided to provide funding for these individuals to pursue this avenue in the peace process. The turning of the tide that this may represent is evident in the most recent peace march by these women in which they not only called for peace but asked MFDC to lay down their arms and for all of the combatants to come to the negotiating table.

V. Conclusion and Recommendations

A few lessons emerge from this case study. Care must be taken if CSOs are to play a constructive role in a dispute like the Casamance.

Clearly external funding alone will not assure the desired strengthening of the role of CSOs. Their staff must be provided appropriate training to complete their role in the peace process. Before CSOs are funded in this area, both donors and the CSOs themselves must have a sufficient understanding of the socio-cultural dimensions of the conflict and the role the organizations must play within the particular context. Since the context shifts rapidly these factors must be reviewed and reevaluated frequently. Furthermore, donors should not put all of their eggs in a single basket. In order to incorporate as many socio-cultural groups as possible, donors should fund a diversity of organizations. Although organizations may present themselves as not falling along a social cleavage, de facto they may do so or at least be perceived as such. At the same time, funding should be reserved for organizations with a strong institutional capacity, whose functioning does not depend on a single individual or a tiny leadership group.

Donors must allow recipient organizations a good deal of leeway in setting their own agendas to contribute to the peace process. At the same time, care must be exercised to assure that numerous CSOs are not funded in the same or in overlapping areas of conflict resolution while other crucial areas remain unsupported. This is often occurring because the conception that donors have may be too limited. The support for the women fetishers represents a success which might not even have been considered if viewed only from the perspective of more typical or “stovepiped” programming.

Finally, the study of more successful CSOs in this case reveals once again that CSOs in West Africa work best when they have not only a civic agenda but also a role to play in economic development and income generation of members, and eventually for a broader community. Not only does this root them more firmly in the survival needs of the community, it enables them to sustain their efforts in the peace process. It also provides them with an alternative set of motivations and sources of revenue so that they do not become overly dependent on the peace process and its prolongation as a means of their organizational survival.

Bibliography

- Economist Intelligence Unit, *Quarterly Report* (July 13, 2001).
- Beck, Linda J. *Patrimonial Democrats in a Culturally Plural Society: Democratization and Political Accommodation in the Patronage Politics of Senegal* (Madison: Ph.D. dissertation in political science, 1996).
- “Senegalese Patronage Politics and Decentralization: The Origins of the Casamance Secessionist Movement,” MacArthur Working Paper Series (Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison).
- Cisse, Seynabou Male. “Femmes et Guerre en Casamance,” *Bulletin of the Association of Concerned Africa Scholars* (Spring/Summer 1999) no. 55/56.
- Diamacoune Senghor, Augustin. *Casamance-Pays du Refus: Réponse à Monsieur Jacques Charpy* (Ziguinchor, 1995).
- Faye, Ousseynou. “La crise casamançaise et les relations du Sénégal avec la Gambie et la Guinée-Bissau,” in *Le Sénégal et ses voisins* edited by Momar Coumba Diop (Dakar: Société-Espaces-Temps). 1994.
- Hesseling, Gerti. “La terre, à qui est-elle? Les pratiques foncières en Basse-Casamance,” in F.G. Barbier-,” in F.G. Barbier-Wiesser (ed.) *Comprendre la Casamance*. (Paris: Karthala, 1994).
- Lambert, Michael C. “Violence and the War of Words: Ethnicity v. Nationalism in the Casamance,” *Africa*, 68, 4 (1998).
- Marut, Jean-Claude. “Sénégal: Les évolutions politiques en Casamance,” *Afrique Politique* (1994), “Solution militaire en Casamance,” *Politique Africaine* 58 (1995).
- Naldi, Gino. *The Organization of African Unity* (London: Mansell Publishing Ltd, 1989).
- Roche, Christian. *Histoire de la Casamance* (Dakar: Karthala, 1976).
- Young, Crawford. “Self-Determination and the African State System,” in Francis M. Deng and I. William Zartman, eds., *Conflict Resolution in Africa* (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1991).

ANNEXES

Annex 1 Conflict Study Methodology

West Africa Regional Conflict Prevention and Peace Building Case Study Methodology

Guide to Conducting the Studies

August 21, 2001

ARD, Inc.

Under the

BASIS-West Africa Conflict Task Order

USAID/Africa Bureau

Introduction and Overview

Conflict Prevention and Peace Building Case Studies in this Task Order are designed to further a number of different goals. First, they provide examples of how civil society associations (broadly defined) have attempted to become involved in a variety of conflict amelioration processes in specific settings. Second, they are focused on a particular subregional conflict and in so doing they provide additional perspective and analysis on that particular conflict, principally as a way of understanding the context in which CSOs have attempted to function as peacemakers. Third, they extend our work of assessing the capacities of CSOs to undertake this work in the West Africa region, and help us understand both their strengths and limitations to do so. Finally, in the process of conducting these case studies, we hope to learn more about the relationships of CSOs to subregional and regional institutions that are involved in trying to resolve conflicts and maintain order, such as the CILSS and ECOWAS.

The underlying assumption of this study is that a number of factors matter in how effective civil society actors are likely to be in playing a role in conflict mitigation. We hypothesize that these factors are:

- The overall political environment for civil society actor, and especially the relationship between national governments, regional institutions and civil society;
- The capacity of civil society associations in terms of their own organization, training and skills;
- The phase of the conflict in which they are trying to have an impact (see presentation by Terrance Lyons).

Data for these studies will come from a number of sources. Of course we will synthesize what material is already available on the board outline of the conflict and on the role of civil society organizations in it. For the most part, however, our data will come from interviews conducted in the countries involved in the conflict. For our two case studies these countries are:

- Casamance dispute — Senegal, Gambia and Guinea Bissau
- Mano River rebellion — Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea (Conakry)

Many of our interviews will be conducted with actors in civil society themselves. Others will complement these and will involve members of the national media, members of national governments, political party leaders, and other informed persons.

The product of these interviews and other data sources will be a unified report that will combine our analysis of the several countries. The report will consist of the following elements:

- An analysis of the key political stability issues in the subregion;
- An understanding of the principle actors involved in tensions, disputes and conflicts, including those working to prevent or reduce these conflicts. These will include local governments, national governments, international and regional organizations, and civil society actors including as relevant civil associations, farmer associations, professional associations, media associations, human rights associations, women's associations, and business networks;
- An understanding of the relationship between and among these actors with regard to efforts to deal with the conflict; and
- The identification of particular issues involving the capacity and limitations of actors, and particularly civil society actors to communicate and form networks to strengthen their joint abilities to play constructive roles in dealing with the conflict lessons learned in this case.

In addition to the overall synthesis report, research in the individual countries should enable us to produce a number of mini-cases of particular efforts on the part of CSOs to become involved in conflict prevention and peace-building activities. These cases will illustrate the issues of capacity, policy environment, and phase of conflict in the likelihood of success or failure, and will permit a more focused and concrete discussion of the improvement that may be made to strengthen the process.

- I. Below is a set of questions to guide team leaders and members in conducting the various kinds of interviews. They are not intended to be definitive, but they should help in structuring the kind of information that we hope to receive.
- A. Policy Environmental Issues for CSOs [to be ascertained through key interviewed and in interviews with a limited number of CSO leaders]

The overall issue we are examining here is the degree to which a CSO can be a participant in the formation and implementation of policies within a given society.

1. Does the constitution or fundamental law authorize or guarantee freedom of association, assembly and expression? How has this been treated in operational law and in the practice of the governmental authorities?
2. How easy is it for CSOs to be legally registered, or to operate in a legal condition? What problems do they usually encounter?
3. Is there a multiplicity of laws governing the operation of different kinds of associations? Are there a number of different government ministries involved?
4. How easy is it in law and in reality to suppress a legally registered or recognized association?
5. Is it possible for CSOs to generate revenues from their own activities?

6. What is the image of CSOs that is portrayed in the national media (print and electronic)?
7. What is the perspective of CSOs on the willingness of government to include them in its functions in general (for example to include them on commissions or in legislative hearings)?

B. Organizational Characteristics

1. Autonomy

- a. How was the association formed (voluntary or government induced)
 - b. In the past or at present does the government name officials of the CSO?
 - c. In the past or at present does the government provide financial support or other forms of logistical support to the CSO?

2. Legal Status

- a. Is the CSO currently legally recognized?

3. Internal Governance Issues

- a. Does the CSO have a Board of Directors
- b. Regular meetings of its Board?
- c. Does it have members?
- d. Do its members paid dues or an inscription fee?
- e. Are there annual meetings of the membership?
- f. Are the CSOs officers elected by its members or its Board?
- g. Have they ever changed?
- h. Are women included in the Board?

4. Capacity Issues

- a. Does this CSO have a separate bank account?
- b. Is this account audited by some independent source?
- c. Does the CSO have a staff (paid or voluntary)?
- d. Does it have an office

- e. A telephone/ fax
- f. Internet connectivity?
- g. Has the CSO received financial support from public institutions
- h. From its own government
- i. From international donors such as the UNDP, World Bank, European Community
- j. From bilateral donors, such as USAID, CIDA, the NORDICS
- k. From private donors, such as foundations and institutes, and church groups

C. Conflict Prevention and Peace building Activities

1. Actions

- a. Has the CSO undertaken any mobilization campaigns or lobbying efforts in general?
 - i. which?
 - ii. how often?
 - iii. with what results?

2. Has the CSO undertaken any actions specifically to try to deal with a conflict or with its consequences?

- a. Which?
- b. At what level — local, national, beyond the separate nation — subregional?
- c. How often?
- d. What results?

3. What training have leaders or members of this CSO had in terms of

- a. Analysis of conflict?
- b. Negotiation?
- c. Mediation?

4. Do the leaders of this CSO want to become more heavily involved in working on issues of conflict?

- a. What kinds of conflict?
- b. At what level?

II. Additional Questions to Pose of CSO Leaders on the Particular Subregional Conflict

1. What is the perspective of your association on the problem of insecurity in the sub-region? For example on the issues of insecurity of frontier areas, of refugee issues, or of civil war?
2. What is (are) the principal cause(s) of these problems in the view of the leaders of this group?
3. What solutions do the leaders of this group think are possible to improve the situation?
4. Is this group interested in being involved in these possible solutions?
5. Has this group already tried to become involved in these solutions?
6. With what results?
7. What are the successes that the CSO has had in trying to reduce conflict?
8. What are the capacities of this CSO in the view of its leaders that have contributed to its having these successes?
9. What are the limitations or weaknesses of this group in the view of its leaders to work in this area?
10. What kinds of support does this CSO want in order to be more effective in this area?
11. Are there any specific needs in the area of
 - a. relations with the media?
 - b. communications with other associations at the national level?
 - c. communication with other associations in the subregion or region?

III. Interviews with Other Actors –A Few Suggestions

A. Donors

1. What programs do they have in conflict prevention and peace building?
2. Who are their partners?
3. What is their perspective on the specific conflict?
4. What role do they see for civil society in the improvement of this conflict situation?

5. What relationships do they have with regional and sub-regional actors working on these conflict issues?

B. Media, Parties, Unions

1. What is their perspective on the evolution of this conflict?

2. What role do they think civil society actors have played in this conflict?

3. What role do they think civil society actors could play?

4. What do they think are the limitations of civil society actors playing a larger role?

5. What role has the media (parties, unions) played in this conflict?

6. Can it play a larger role?

7. What does the media (parties, unions) need to do so?

8. Do media outlets (parties, unions) have relationships with others in the subregion and region that could be helpful in their playing a larger role in conflict issues?

Annex 2 List of Interviewed Persons and Organizations

ORGANIZATION	CONTACT
The Gambia	
Action Aid	Omar Badji 392 244, 004 392 425 (fax)
Agency for the Development of Women and Children (ADWAC)	Masamba Joof Coordinator PO 828 Banjul 720 106 Omar Fatty /Accountant
African Center for Democracy and Human Rights Studies	Bernadette Cole 462 342 392 517 (home) bernadettecole@ yahoo.com. Hannah Forster, Executive Director 46 23 42.
Anglican Mission Development Ministries (AMDM)	Rt. Rev. S Tilewa Johnson 227 405 225 966 229 495 (fax) Mr. Tunde Taylor-Thomas 22 24 32 (office) 49 56 37 (residence)
Christian Children's Fund	Ousmane Cham 392 693 391 450 370 624 (fax) Michelle Joof Johnson Office Assistant
Concern Universal	John Stewart 494 473 PO 2164 Serrekunda
Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	Celeste Staley – Head of Programming; Simon Cole, Head Management; Barkesu Coker, Project Officer; Tayib Thomas, Project Manager. 227 120/224 652
Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)	Marina Parade
World Food Program/UNDP	Mr. Dalal Resident Representative 49 50 74 49 57 60 70 UNDP Kofi Annan Street Cape Point, Bakau,
Gambian Food and Nutrition Association (GAFNA)	Albert Cox (vacation), 390 433, 390 434, 390 435 (fax) Executive Director Ali Sey and Landing Jibba Camp Managers Mr. Gaye (follow-up) Accountant

ORGANIZATION	CONTACT
International Society for Human Rights	Sheikh E.T. Lewis PMB 457 Serrekunda 395 039 37 898 (fax) amblewisset@hotmail.com
Red Cross	Andrew Jarju 392 405 393 179
SUD journalist	Mamadou Moussa Ba 22 23 59 22 23 94 (fax)
Tango	Fatou Faye, dir PMB 392 Serrekunda 220 390 525 226 300 fax tango@ganet.gm
UNHCR	Etta Baldeh Jassey
Gambian National Army	Col. Baboucar Jatta, Armed Forces Chief of Staff; Lt. Col. Lawrence Jarra, Commander Gambia National Guard Marina Parade Army Headquarters Tel (200) 22 52 00
Media	
The Daily Observer	Mr. Bubacarr Baldeh, Director Mr. Amadou Samba, Proprietor Mr. Andrew Dacosta, Manager 49 66 08; 49 68 77; 78 Fax 49 68 78
Government	
The Presidency	Anthony Taylor
VP	Isatou Njie-Saidy. Office Coordinating the National Security Council
Foreign Affairs	Ansumana Ceesay Acting Deputy Permanent Secretary 20-17-22
Interior	Ousmane Badji, Secretary of State Mam Njie, Permanent Secretary Sako Drammeh, Assistant Superintendent, Dept. of Immigration Tel: 22 87 10; 22 87 11; 22 83 77;
Agriculture	Mamadi Ceesay 228 402
Conacilss	Nancy Niang 372 549 392 713
Mouvement des Forces Démocratique de la Casamance (MFDC)	Alexander Djiba Spokesman of MFDC and ranking official in Gambia Aluar1@yahoo.com

ORGANIZATION	CONTACT
Senegal	
Association des Sereres et des Diolas, Association culturelle Aguene-Diamone (ACAD)	Aba Diatta, President 1st Deputy Mayor of Zig 637 48 17 Cheikh Pape Samba Ndiaye Serère Clairvoyant Banna Dieme Jola Fetishier
Association pour le développement de Nyassia (ADAN)	
AGADA	Martin Mane 991 31 79
Association des jeunes agriculteurs Senegalais/Association pour la promotion de l'arrondissement de Nyasia (AJAC/APRAN)	Demb Keita BP 069 Zig 991 1415 (apran) 991 3305 (dom) 634 8925 gieapran@telecomplus.sn dembakeita@yahoo.fr
Association Nationale pour l'Alphabetisation et la Formation des Adultes (ANAFa)	Djibril Gueye 825-4850 bp 10358 Dakar liberte anafa@metissacana.sn
Appropriate Technology International	
Association Nationale des Imams	
CARITAS	Louis Georges Biagui, Head of Development Sector Henri Coulibaly, Head of Human Aid sector 991 10 54
Church World Services	Lowel Fuglie (vacation) PT E BP 5338 Dakar Fann 864-1204, fax 864-411 Rene Sow (program assistant) rsow@sentoo.sn
Plateforme des organisation paysannes du sahel (CILSS)	El Hadj Malick Sow Pres de Federation CNCR 825 56 65
Conseil National de concertation de cooperatives ruraux (CNCR)	Lamine Sonkho (Conseiller Tech) Mamadou Cissokho (former head of CNCR)
Collectif des Cadres Casamançais	Pierre Goudiaby Atepa 825 24 24 865 11 11 atepa@atepa.com

ORGANIZATION	CONTACT
Commission de médiation et paix	
Conseil des ONG d'Appui au Développement (CONGAD) Including: Program SUD (Solidarité-Urgence-Développement)	Helene Rama Niang Executive Director BP 4109 Dakar 824-41-16 824 44 13 FAX Sicap Amite 2, 3089 Bis congad@telecomplus.sn Abdul Aziz Sall, archives 825-65-73 Samba Barry Head Programme Sud in Zig 991-40 95 655-93 24 sambabarry@ifrance.com progsud@sudinfo.sn
Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	Dakar: Vewonyi Ajvan Mballo Ndiaye (823-6621) Zig: Ameth Diouf Deputy Chief of Project Francois Sagna, Project Assistant 991-4018
Comité Régional de Solidarité des Femmes pour la Paix en Casamance (CRSFPC)	Seynabou Male Cisse President 991 20 84 991 6 27
DYNA ENTERPRISE	
European Union (EU)	Andrea Nicolaj (vacation)
Friedrich Ebert	Mme Sow Head Civil Society Program 823 0150
Groupe de Réflexion et d'Action pour la Paix en Casamance (GRAPAC)	Aba Diatta, 1st Vice President Deputy Mayor of Zig 637 48 17 Mme Keny, Treasurer Martin Mane, founding member
Group pour la recherche et développement rural (GRDR)	Lamine Ba 825 86 12 825 86 13 fax Amite III, Villa 4459 BP 5001 Dakar GRDRZIG@SENTOO.sn Joachim Diene (not present) Abdou Mane 991 27 82 or 89

ORGANIZATION	CONTACT
Handicap International	Benedicte Hossenlopp, Chef du Projet for prevention of accidents (Zig) Doudou Fall, Asst Chef du Projet Rue 335, Quartier Boucotte BP 936 Ziguinchor 991-34 49 hanizig@telecomplus.sn Dakar Office: Rue 6, Villa 224 BP 15331 Dakar-Fann 825-35 67 825 72 77 (fax) hanicap@telecomplus.sn
Institut de recherche pour le développement (formerly Orstom)	Cheikh Gueye www.orstom.sn info@ird.sn
Kabonketoor ("to forgive oneself" in Jola)	Marguerite Coly Kény, President Cite Biagui #10 991 15 51
Kagamen: Association pour la promotion de la mère et de l'enfant	
MALAO 824-0933 824-0933 fax 825-5654 aagboton@telecomplus.sn cagbojohn@sentoo.sn	Raphael Lambal Christian Agboton-Johnson BP 5142 Fann-Hock
Mouvement des femmes pour la paix (MOFEPAC)	
Observatoire de conflit du Sénégal	
Organisation nationale de droits des hommes (ONDH)	
Open Society	Kim Brice [on vacation] Karim Traore N. 1 rue wagone Diouf (plateau – ave faidherbe) 1 st etage a droite 823-0983 osiwa-dakar@osiwa.org
Oxfam America	Jane Sparrow Niang Regional Director BP 7200 Dakar 824 29 52 824 29 55 (FAX) JsparrowNiang@ Oxfamamerica.org Oxfam-us@enda.sn Rosalie? (conflict resolution) 824-2452, 26

ORGANIZATION	CONTACT
Oxfam Great Britain	Sidy Diawara 865 13 00
<i>Programme d'Action (PACT)</i>	? Barry
<i>Rencontre Africaine pour la Défense des Droits de l'Homme (RADDHO)</i>	Alioune Tine 824 60 56 824 60 52fax BP 15246 Dakar Fann Malime Mbow Adj to sec exec 632-4787 Sadik Niasse 633-8713 Omou Calsoume (femme et famille) 633-4828, 825 4417 Abdoulaye Seck (documts) 658 3979 Benedict Lambal Emile Dieme 991 34 64 991 34 64 fax BP 919 Zig
Red Cross	Jerome Dasyva Zig Regional President
<i>Resseau des femmes africaines ministeriales et parlementaires</i>	Adja Rokhaya Seye Samake (PDS Louga deputy) 967-1162, 643-6396
Synergies Africa	Hassan Ba
TOSTAN	Molly Melching Sara Rassmassman Tall (USAID funder of Tostan) x 530
UNIFEM	Yacine Fall, dir 823 52 07 Seynabou Gueye Tall, programme officer 823-5207 unifsen@telecomp-plus.sn 19 Rue Parchappe, BP 154 Dakar
World Education	Dan and Nancy Devine 550 7418
World Vision	Tory Ulson Pt E (// rue A to south) 868 1717
GOS	
Presidency	Cherif Seye, Communications 849 7680
Interior	Khalifa Gueye Direction des collectives locales, 821 0394 Rue Felix For

ORGANIZATION	CONTACT
Military	Mamadou Diatta Chef de cabinet de la ministere de la force armees 642 60 26 Colonel Ndao of gendarmes, President of the commission de moritoire d'armes légères. Officers from Ziguinchor
And-Jëff	Landing Savane 644-1872 Noah Cisse Principal of Zig Lycee
Local Government	Governor Sarr (pre-PDS) Aba Diatta (adj mayor)
Mouvement des Forces Démocratique de la Casamance (MFDC)	Abbé Diamacoune
JOURNALISTS:	
Sud	Demba Ndiaye 640 58 96 El Hadj Guisse 823-1777 Ibrahima Gassima
West African Journalists Association (WAJA)	Alpha Abdallah Sall 822-36-25 fax 822-17-61 waja@africaonline.com.gh