THE IMPACT OF THE THEORY OF LIBERALISM ON THE UNITED NATIONS' AND AFRICAN UNION'S APPROACH TO GLOBAL PEACE AND SECURITY

William Hermann Arrey (Ph.D)

Senior Lecturer and Chair, Department of Peace and Development Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences and International Relations, Protestant University of Central Africa, Yaoundé, Cameroon, Email: warrey64@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: *This article presents a critical analysis of the impact (influence) of the theory of liberalism on the United Nations' (UN) and Africa Union's (AU) approach to global peace and security. There are various and sometimes conflicting theories of international relations relating to how world politics functions, including international and regional peace and security. Which theory of international relations and peace would explain the United Nations' role in promoting worldwide peace and security, as well as the African Union's role in promoting regional peace and security within the African continent? Even though this question is difficult to answer and no single theory can fully capture the complexities surrounding the issues at hand, this article contends that the liberal peace framework has had a profound influence on the creation of the United Nations and the African Union, as well as their roles in international and regional peace and security. To this purpose, the study adopts a qualitative critical research strategy with secondary data collection and analytical approaches which comprise characterizing, thematizing, and contextualizing the topic at hand. The paper explains how liberalism influenced the essential thinking, values and norms, institutional legitimacy and mandate. It also conceptualizes and operationalizes peace and security concerns at the UN and AU. This is tied to UN-led global action which, when paired with the AU's considerable continental role, illustrates liberalism's impact in terms of laws, conventions, principles, and practices, facilitating cooperative peacebuilding efforts. Despite some critical theoretical and practical shortcomings, this paper argues that liberalism is still essential to achieving the UN's and AU's, agenda for global peace and security.*

KEYWORDS: African Union, Global Peace and Security, Theory of Liberalism, United Nations.

BACKGROUND

International Relations (IR) scholars are constantly formulating and developing concepts, paradigms, models, and theories to explain the intricacies of the current international security environment, as well as the players operating in the international security landscape (Vreÿ, 2005). Although IR theories may be used for practical challenges such as fostering international peace and security, they also give unique insights into how the world works in a global environment that can be gleaned by researching the core areas of international relations (Engel & Pallas, 2015).

Different IR theories provide alternative explanations for how to achieve international peace and security. This article contends that the foundations of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) such as the UN and the AU, as well as their roles in fostering peace and security at the international and regional levels, were liberal in distinct ways. Liberalism, by providing a framework for multilateral collaboration among institutions based on its principles and ideals, better explains the origin and function of the UN and AU in promoting peace and security.

Next to this introduction, the article is structured as follows: while the second section explains the methodology adopted, the third section introduces the assumptions of the liberal theory in comparison with the realist approach to international relations, which then paves the way for the fourth section that discusses how the attempts of promoting international peace and security by international organizations relied quite heavily on the major assumptions of liberal theory and represented an embodiment of liberalism. The fifth section examines the role and functions of the UN and AU in promoting peace and security through the lens of liberalism. The final section concludes by summarizing the study's major findings.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative research strategy, constructed around a critical review of theoretical and empirical literature and a desk-based inquiry. As such, the paper uses mainly secondary sources of data from diverse sources such as books, journal articles, media news, international reports, and the internet. The collected data is critically analyzed by way of characterizing, thematizing, and contextualizing the topic at hand.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE THEORY OF LIBERALISM AS OPPOSED TO REALISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Theories are helpful not only for giving a framework for researching international relations, but also for shaping the conduct of nations, diplomats, international organizations, and other international players (Engel & Pallas, 2015). The utility of theoretical approaches in international relations can be found in the fact that they provide lenses to understand the world's social dynamics, thus shaping perceptions of what matters in international politics and informing decision-makers and security issues (Vreÿ, 2005). Thus, in order to have a good understanding of the political events that occur every day around the world, it is crucial to know the theories around which the international relations discipline revolves. Each international relations theory works as a lens to see, comprehend, and make sense of issues in the real world with certain weaknesses, strengths, and some explanatory power. Liberalism, Realism, Social-Constructivism, Structuralism, Marxism, and Post-Colonialism are the main theoretical approaches to international relations and have strong and remarkable legacies for future

generations. Among these theories, scholars such as Baylis et al. (2008) have claimed that realism and liberalism have been the leading schools of thought, for they provide the most comprehensive and best-developed answers to the most recurring features of international relations and human life, like diplomacy, peace, conflict, and war.

There are several perspectives on international organizations and their activities in the international system that represent commonly held ideas about how the world works and what role international organizations play in the greater scheme of world affairs (Gutner, 2017). They depict diverse characters and dynamics in international politics that are entrenched in rich philosophical traditions, and they provide a distinct explanation for how international institutions are founded, maintained, and play a role in global affairs governance (Pease, 2008).

Realism offers the effects of power distribution in the international system as a tool for maintaining peace and security, providing a theoretical lens through which to examine and compare peacekeeping with other types of state behavior in which states compete for power through and over peacekeeping, marking great power competition for power, status, and prestige through international organizations (Antunes & Camisao, 2017). In this context, international rivalry entails the self-interested pursuit of disputed commodities like power, security, prosperity, influence, and prestige, frequently relative to those seen to constitute a challenge or threat (Mazzar *et al*, 2018). Thus, realists believe that the international system and security environment are the most significant drivers of state conduct, that nations behave independently of one another, and that sovereignty should be regarded as holy (Vreÿ, 2005). Realism is framed around the unitary sovereign state primarily based on a view of humanity whereby people are purely self-interested and required to guard their interests through military capacity and a balancing power with primary intent on survival and ensuring that its national interest is maintained at any cost (Engel & Pallas, 2015). They frequently use the example of having no one to call in an international emergency (Antunes & Camisão, 2017) emphasizing anarchy, power politics, and violence (Buchan, 2002). Realists believe that International Governmental Organizations are either founded by a hegemon or formed through great-power collaboration and that they serve as hegemonic extensions or as great-power directorates whose activities are inexorably tied to the powerful governments that dominate them (Pease, 2008). As a result, the fact that realists remain skeptical of the chances of establishing peace and security through multilateral cooperation does not do enough to inspire the reflection in this paper. Boke (2019) argues that while realism considers national interests, power, strategy, and influence as the main drivers of any third-party intervention decisions, liberalism advocates global power intervention regardless of the existence of national interests if genocide, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, or humanitarian disaster takes place.

Liberalism, as a theory of international relations, asserts that human nature is good; those states can cooperate through international institutions and international law, in contrast to realist thinking, and that there are actors on the global stage other than states, such as international organizations, transnational nongovernmental organizations, multinational corporations, and even individuals (Toksöz, 2017). Cooperation is at the heart of liberal internationalist thought so that collaboration can lead to interdependence providing mutual advantages for both parties engaged, lowering the danger of conflict, and increasing the possibilities for peace among nation-states (Jehangir, 2012). Also, liberalism provides the normative function of democratic peace theory, which transmits the concept that democracies rarely go to war with each other (Mazarr *et al,* 2018). As liberalism favors the role of supranational institutions such as the UN and AU in the promotion of peace and security, adopting it can assist better in grasping the complexities of the UN and AU's mandates and controls in promoting peace and security, as

well as the interactions between the principals and various levels of their agents' activities in the field.

In general, many IR theories take into account non-state actors as well as state actors while realist theories claim that the only actors worth analyzing in international relations are states. However, acknowledging the existence of other actors still makes states the most important actors in international relations, especially when it comes to pursuing peace supported by organizations set up by states, or by individuals who act in the name of states. For example, even though liberal theory includes several non-state actors, peace is not a goal for any of them *per se* in international relations (Toksöz, 2017). Thus, while all theories contribute to the study of the function of the UN and AU in promoting international peace and security, liberalism is more subtle in characterizing the role of these institutions in which the key actors collaborate as groups with the ultimate purpose of fostering global peace and security.

THE THEORY OF LIBERALISM IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Liberalism has always been a fluid phenomenon, a dynamic blend of philosophical concepts and political-economic activity, since its theory and practice have been mutually constitutive, evolving alongside one another throughout the colonial, Cold War, and post-Cold War eras (Rampton & Nadarajah, 2017). As a result of broadening and deepening the post-Cold War security understanding, new concepts such as human security and the responsibility to protect have emerged, indicating a shift in emphasis away from a state-centric security perspective and toward a holistic and inclusive conceptualization in support of broader human security objectives (Vrey, 2005). As a result, liberalism is a defining feature of modern democracy; however, when discussed within the realm of international relations theory, it contains a variety of concepts and arguments about how institutions, behaviors, and economic connections contain and mitigate the violent power of states, particularly when citizens and international organizations are considered (Meiser, 2018). Hence, understanding the function of liberalism ideology in fostering international peace and security through organizations such as the UN and AU is adequate.

Liberal World

Liberals value institutions and consider them as autonomous players in shaping global politics (Toksöz, 2017). Historically, the liberal gesture rose to prominence after World War I, laying the groundwork for the League of Nations, referring to Kant's concept of *Perpetual Peace* (Jehangir, 2012) though it failed to deliver on peace promises, it has resurfaced as a reformed doctrine in the form of neo-liberalism/liberal internationalism, in the international system governed by the post-World War II (Meiser, 2018). This thought, shaped by how liberals see global politics, envisages that the Pacific states' membership would be oriented toward improving international and domestic cooperation, economic interdependence, and acceptance that international law and organizations would be used to overcome the challenges posed by the international system (Vreÿ, 2005).

So, the liberal world's central claim is based on Kantian ideas that shaped the major tenets of liberalism in international relations: the existence of a world government would facilitate peace, and republics were more peaceful than autocracies, implying that peace and a state's domestic political system were linked, and more trade meant more peace (Ibid). Toksöz (2017) unpacks these liberal world concepts as follows: first, that the existence of a world government would facilitate peace; this became the foundation of the liberal argument that anarchy can be

mitigated through international organizations and international law, thereby establishing the strand of liberal institutionalism. Second, a state's domestic political system influenced whether the state was more or less inclined to wage war on other nations, and this laid the groundwork for what is now known as the *Democratic Peace Theory*, which contends that democracies attack non-democratic states rather than one another. And finally is the assumption that greater commerce/trade meant better peace, which supported the economic liberalism strand and, in the long run, led to further globalization.

Besides, the broadest account of the liberal world order, found in the work of Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry (1999) and cited in Meiser (2018), describe three interlocking factors: To begin, international law and agreements are accompanied by international organizations to establish a global system that reaches well beyond the borders of a single state. The United States is the ideal example, since it pools resources for common goals, maintains near-constant diplomacy with foes and friends alike, and provides a voice in the international community to all member nations. Second, the promotion of free trade and capitalism by powerful liberal states and international organizations such as the WTO, the World Bank, and the IMF results in an open, market-based international economic system. The third component of the liberal international order is international norms: human rights, democracy, and the rule of law are all promoted by liberal principles and when a state violates these criteria, it faces sanctions. Therefore, as Meiser (2018) argues in the context of the liberal world, the international institutions, organizations, and norms of this world order are built on the same foundation as domestic liberal institutions and norms: the goal is to restrain the "violent power" of states in international politics.

Liberalism and the Democratic Peace Theory

Individualism, human rights, universality, freedom from authority, the right to be treated equally under the protection of the law, and the obligation to respect and regard others as ethical subjects, as well as freedom for social activity, are central to liberalism's key ideas (Jehangir, 2012). Kant (1675) was a liberal thinker who emphasized peace between people supervised by institutions such as the judiciary and the representative form of government in which leaders use their authority with the permission of free people living in the political order. As Toksöz (2017) asserts, liberalism, as a theory of international relations, affirms that human nature is good and that if people's rights are secured, countries are civilized and pacified, ruled by representative governments and states can cooperate through international institutions and international law.

Derived from liberal world assumptions, the defining feature of liberal peace theories is that peace is a function of the superiority of liberal norms and values where the prospects for global conversion to liberal democracy depended on the prevalence of democratic norms globally and the development of democratic values and attitudes within nations (Buchan, 2002). This concept of liberal peace was influenced by pantheism and humanism which held that the world as a whole had a shared destiny (Ghaderia, 2011). Thus, for liberals, peace can be achieved in several ways: first, economic interdependence discourages states from using force against each other because warfare threatens each side's prosperity; second, international institutions and regimes can overcome selfish state behaviors, primarily by encouraging states to forego immediate gains for the greater benefits of long-term cooperation; and third, the spread of democracy is seen as the key to world peace (Özkeçeci-Taner, 2002). These entail that the norms of liberal peace such as bilateral responsibility, bilateral agreement, multilateralism, and common profits, create a liberalistic culture of clash solving as economic relations along with

international cooperation that clears the stage for the improvement of the peace (Ghaderia, 2011).

This begins with the proposition that democracies will not attack other democracies since liberal governments are just as capable of fighting as illiberal governments, yet they have seldom waged brutal wars: *the democratic peace theory* (Attia, 2016). As a result, conflict against non-democratic countries is unavoidable, because they are viewed as oppressive instruments against their people, threatening freedom in liberal countries as well (Buchan, 2002). To justify this, proponents of democratic peace theory provide two reasons why democracies do not fight each other. The first rationale is a structural/institutional limitation; democracies maintain mutual peace because of constitutional checks and balances that bind the hands of decision-makers and the entire complex democratic civil society structure, and the second reason that democracies are regarded as more peaceful is the recognition that democracies share cultural/democratic values that support peaceful forms of internal dispute resolution, which come to apply beyond national boundaries to other democratic governments (Özkeçeci-Taner, 2002).

In general, as Pereira (2019) confirms, the liberal peace discourse has its influence on four debates in international relations: the *victor's peace*, which understands peace as resting on a military victory; a *hegemony victory* wherein institutional peace rests on liberal-internationalists values and where states agree on how to behave and how to determine their behavior; the *constitutional peace* that lays on the liberal Kantian argument, assuming that democracy, free trade, and some cosmopolitan values may bring peace to the nations; and finally, the *civil peace* which advocates for the defense of basic human rights and values, besides the liberal thinking of individualism and human rationality.

However, the notion that only liberal civil societies could eradicate violence was matched by the not altogether unproblematic assumption that the liberal and democratic nations defending them would act peacefully. But, regardless of its criticisms, liberalism's assumptions about the world depict a rosier image and place a strong emphasis on peace and cooperation.

THE ROLE OF THE UN AND AU IN PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY: A *LIBERAL PERSPECTIVE*

This section examines how the attempts of promoting international peace and security by the UN and AU relied on the major assumptions of liberal theory and represented an embodiment of liberalism.

UN and the Promotion International Peace and Security from a Liberal Perspective

The foundational thinking of the UN can be traced back to the failure of the 1815 concert and the 1919 settlement to prevent two world wars. As such, with the human, economic and material calamities experienced as a result of these wars, it was of utmost importance for world leaders to design an international system that would prevent the recurrence of such calamities (Mazzar et al., 2018). Following these two World Wars, the leaders of the international community undertook the conferences of Yalta and Potsdam, and the UN was officially founded in 1945, upon the ratification of the UN Charter with 51 Member States which voluntarily came together to create a forum with the aspiration to avoid future wars through diplomacy and dialogue among nations (Kutbay, 2015). The UN was established to address a wide variety of international issues, including economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian issues, and its primary goal is to maintain international peace and security, as outlined in Article 1 of its

Charter. As a condition of membership, the sovereign states that joined the organization as members promised to settle their differences peacefully to preserve future generations from the scourge of war (Peck, 1998). With the birth of the UN, liberalism again influenced policy-making elites and public opinion in several states after WWII, although these flames of hope were soon extinguished by the return of Cold War politics (Vreÿ, 2005).

Several of liberalism's normative dimensions have been manifested in the creation and the role played by the UN in international peace and security. To start with, the idea that international institutions can promote peaceful cooperation among states is a basic element of liberal thinking. Institutional liberals claim that international institutions help promote cooperation between states. They emphasize international institutions as a means of reducing international conflict and promoting mutual understanding and common interests (Fidler, 1996). Basic to the neoliberal institutionalists is the idea of common interests that states could achieve together. Liberal thinking declared that warfare is an unnecessary and outmoded way of settling disputes between states as the solution to war and conflict is to be found in the mobilization of the international society to eliminate those institutions that make war possible (Gottschalk, 2012). One of the primary purposes for which the UN was established, as is stated in Article 1 of the Charter, is to *"maintain international peace and security" and to take "effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace."* Subsequently, the UN establishes and maintains international peace and security where collective security is based on the principle of a liberal world and liberal peace. In this case, in an attack, all states have to stop the aggressor except in a legal right for self-defense (Gottschalk, 2012). Therefore, the establishment of the collective security regime, as provided under the UN Charter, constituted a major turning point in the management of international crises under liberal thinking as a foundational milestone.

The concentration on discussions and diplomacy to settle the conflict and provide security to international politics is another liberal principle mirrored in the UN. According to MacMillan (2007), while most liberals considered war and the use of force to be justifiable in some situations, it was widely recognized as a failure of logic and an obstacle to the liberal vision of political life. In this respect, Article 33 of the UN Charter stated that:

> *The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice (UN, 1945).*

The mechanism for dealing with issues concerning international peace and security as laid down in Chapters VI and VII of the UN Charter reflects the fact that states in liberal settings are expected to respect the norms of the institutions they belong to. Thus, the UN, in using the Charter, is the primary custodian of collective legitimization in global politics and continues to guide the practice of states and broader debate on critical issues such as the use of force (Kutbay, 2015). Because liberal internationalism recognizes the role of power through the collective security system and the permanent membership of the Security Council, arguments that the Security Council does not currently reflect the power structure or the changing nature of power in the international system must be taken seriously (Fidler, 1996).

In terms of its structure and function, the UN Charter lays out the general framework for UN activities, its purposes, membership, structure, and arrangements for the maintenance of international peace and security and economic and social cooperation (Engel & Pallas, 2015).

As the UN is mandated with the responsibility to maintain international peace and security in Article 1(1) of the UN Charter, with the UN Security Council (UNSC) playing a principal role, liberal internationalism can welcome new permanent members into the Security Council by relying on the rational assumption of improving the Security Council's performance in peacekeeping, peacemaking, and humanitarian intervention (Fidler, 1996). Further, the General Assembly is the chief deliberative policy-making and representative organ showing a form of liberal democracy as it includes representation of all member states and a forum for multilateral discussion of a broad spectrum of international issues, and the fact that it has incorporated non-state actors into many of its committees and bodies is another way that liberalism's key influence can be seen (Engel & Pallas, 2015). In essence, liberals believe that trade and economic intercourse are a source of peaceful relations among nations because the mutual benefits of trade and expanding interdependence among national economies will tend to foster cooperative relations (Fidler, 1996).

The influence of liberalism on the UN is also reflected in human rights. The touchstone for the human rights regime is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, promulgated by the United Nations in 1948 along with the human rights law instrumentalities that have followed in its wake which have collectively provided the international community with an aspirational ethical constitution, which is a significant milestone for international ethical cooperation (Langlois, 2001). The prominence of human rights shows the influence of liberalism on the UN as it has adopted numerous international treaties on human rights, administered by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), and also the creation of the Millennium Development Goals, which were created as a blueprint for ending extreme poverty and hunger by 2015 followed by the post-2015 agenda, called the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (Engel & Pallas, 2015). Therefore, to achieve sustainable global peace, social and economic development must be achieved and climate change must be addressed, and this realization is a central tenet of liberal thinking. Also, the fact that the UN has been one of the prominent international actors in global democracy promotion efforts can be marked by the inherent liberal characteristics of the democracy promotion agenda (Cevheri, 2019). Therefore, under liberal thinking, the UN's engagement in supporting democratic governance, peace, and security shows a growing body of comparative experiences on democracy assistance that has led to several emerging insights such as "democracy has political as well as developmental dimensions" (Tommasoli, 2010).

The UN peacebuilding operations in several parts of the world can be discerned from liberal theory. Peacebuilding interventions launched under the auspices of the UN and other agencies in war-torn countries with liberal enthusiasm as the UN concept and practice of peacebuilding have been primarily influenced by the liberal peace theory where methods and technologies were developed from various generations of approaches to armed conflict management and resolution starting from the 1992 Report of the Secretary-General entitled *An Agenda for Peace* (Cavalcante, 2014).

Moreover, the UN has increasingly recognized the role of regional organizations in undertaking some of its own assigned tasks because of the additional burden emerging from the diversification of its role that relied on the four Ps: preventive diplomacy or conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding (Moolakkattu, 2010). This is in terms of understanding and applying collective security within the UN context where the international community has a collective responsibility to protect (R2P) civilians in any state suffering gross human rights violations, even if their government does not take responsibility to protect them, or is itself guilty of atrocities against them (Jordaan, 2016). Generally, the underlying UN

system and its peace operations are the ideals of liberalism although there are certain hindrances to success in some contexts due to incompatibilities of the liberal values. This now takes us to the role of the AU in the promotion of international peace and security at the regional level.

AU and the Promotion of Regional Peace and Security from a Liberal Perspective

The Organization of African Unity (OAU) was founded in 1963 as a continental institution for decolonization purposes, focusing primarily on securing the sovereignty of Africa's states and supporting state capacity and legitimacy (Vanheukelom et al., 2016), though it was unable to continue to ensure the demanding issues (Yihdego, 2011). The organization's inability to intervene timely to avoid and manage disputes renders its record in the field of security-related operations unimpressive owing to a lack of funds, a lack of clear mandates, and logistical inadequacies (Moolakkattu, 2010). Following the end of the Cold War and the failure of the international community to prevent the Rwandan genocide, liberal thinking influenced the foundational milestones for the creation of the AU, suggesting that African states would have to address African problems primarily through their efforts by equipping continental institutions (Moolakkattu, 2010). As a result, the AU arose as a home-grown movement that placed the fate of the continent in the hands of its people, with the overarching goal of strengthening solidarity, collaboration, and support among African countries and peoples to address the region's challenges as a whole (Murithi, 2007). As a result, the formation of the AU is attributable to changes in Africa's political, peace, and security as well as socioeconomic needs, in the context of broader global changes following the Cold War (Powell, 2005). These global changes have caused a shift in the concept of security, both regionally and globally, from the traditional narrow, state-centered to the broad and comprehensive human-centered conceptualization of security (ibid). This means that liberal thought was one of the elements that encouraged the establishment of the AU as a continental entity primarily concerned with the promotion of peace and security in Africa. According to this thinking, the AU's human-centered approach to pan-Africanism required it to adopt rules, norms, decision-making processes, and goals distinct from those of the preceding continental entity (Tieku, 2019).

Furthermore, the notion of collective security, which was developed primarily at the global level, has become a key concept for regional and sub-regional security, and African nations have adopted it to handle both interstate and intrastate conflict (Jordaan, 2016). As a result, the establishment of the AU ushered in far-reaching changes to the pan-African peace and security agenda, particularly about the parameters of sovereignty and intervention for human protection purposes, as well as elements of the prevention-reaction-rebuilding continuum, articulated in the *responsibility to protect framework* (Powell, 2005), which can be conceived of as the African version of liberal thinking that makes Pan-Africanism provide a foundation for peace and security (Murithi, 2007).

The aspirations and principles of the AU, which have been described as a determination to promote unity, solidarity, cohesion, and cooperation among the people of Africa and African states, have been reiterated in the *2001 Constitutive Act* to pursue socioeconomic development, building partnerships between governments and civil society, conflict prevention as a prerequisite for the implementation of the development and integration agenda, the determination to protect human rights, and the determination to protect the environment (Yihdego, 2011). As stated in *Article 3 of the 2001 Act,* among the core objectives of promoting democratic principles and institutions, coordinating and harmonizing policies between existing and future regional economic communities to protect human security appeared to be the AU's newly emerged objectives based on the main liberal tenets. The principles of peaceful dispute

resolution and prohibitions on the use of force and interference in the internal affairs of other states have been reaffirmed as principles in *Article 4 of the Act*, supplemented by the Union's ability to intervene in response to grave circumstances such as genocide and crimes against humanity, respect for democratic principles and good governance, rejection of an unconstitutional change of government, and promotion of democracy (Yihdego, 2011). In general, the *AU Constitutive Act* is a unique expression that has led to the core liberalism values of respect for democracy and human rights for the ambition of a peaceful and prosperous continent by 2063.

The AU's normative transformations ushered in substantive normative changes, such as the shift from strict adherence to the principle of noninterference to the AU's right to intervene, and the prominence given to human rights and democracy in the *Constitutive Act* indicates the prominence of human security, which underpins the AU's peace and security regime and more explicitly takes its point of departure from realism to the liberal notion of human security (Yihdego, 2011). That is why the AU has made democracy and strong political governance one of its top goals for Africa's growth and stability (Omotola, 2014). These changes are most visibly manifested in the areas of peace and security, human rights, democracy, and intervention, which is consistent with the paradigm shift within the framework of the *Constitutive Act* from state security to human security, as it recognizes the development of strong democratic institutions and culture, good governance, and respect for the sanctity of human life and humanitarian law (Yihdego, 2011).

In general, the *AU Constitutive Act* is renowned for its emphasis on safeguarding people from dire conditions and promoting human and peoples' rights, as well as democracy, good governance, and development at the heart of liberal ideology. Liberalism has affected the movement of conventional limits of state security to human security under the AU's new security paradigm, indicating that the idea of human security is inherent in the AU's acceptance of a people-oriented vision of peace and prosperity.

Furthermore, as liberals argue that states develop and adhere to institutions primarily for political, economic, and other policy considerations and benefits (Yihdego, 2011), AU is compelled to establish institutional structures to implement the newly adopted norms, and the Union's *Constitutive Act* established nine principal organs, as well as the Peace and Security Council (PSC) and the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), as part of its institutional machinery. Moreover, AU has also in recent years, established an ambitious and proactive continent-wide peace and security architecture (APSA) via its PSC as an operational structure for the effective implementation of decisions made in the areas of conflict prevention, peace-making, peace support operations, peace-building, and post-conflict reconstruction (Moolakkattu, 2010). This reflects and represents an institutional expression of the transition to human security that is broadly acknowledged at the continental level and is founded on liberal thinking. As a result, liberal norms underpin the AU's emerging peace and security agenda, such as the *responsibility to protect*, which lays out provisions for military intervention in a member state's internal affairs, if necessary, to protect vulnerable populations from egregious human rights violations (Powell, 2005).

With these modifications, the AU's *Constitutive Act* becomes the first international treaty to acknowledge an international organization's power to act for human protection objectives. At the same time, it embeds itself in a strong security framework that leverages the strengths of African regional institutions and the UN, as well as a broad backing from other international players (ibid). As a result, the AU PSC is defined as a standing decision-making agency for

conflict prevention, management, and resolution, as well as a collective security and early warning system to promote a fast and efficient response to conflict and crisis (Vanheukelom et al, 2016). Yihdego (2011) confirms this, stating that African governments established the AU to act as a facilitator of collaboration, with their shared objective being the growth of the continent and, eventually, their development aligning with the neoliberal institutionalism approach. These institutions and mechanisms are established to accelerate democratic development and socioeconomic good governance in Africa, indicating that African leaders have come to value democracy and good political governance as prerequisites for Africa's development and stability (Omotola, 2014). The AU's promotion of liberal ideals reflects a significant shift in Africa's attitude to pan-Africanism. The AU Commission used the space created by liberal internationalists to develop a more expansive version of liberal values, which the AU Assembly adopted in January 2009 as the *African Charter on Democracy, Elections, and Governance*, which contains unprecedentedly elaborate and, in many cases, very innovative responses to African governance challenges, such as military coups and democratic backsliding (Tieku, 2019).

In addition, the principles of development under NEPAD, governance through the African Peer Review Mechanism, human rights and the rule of law, participation, the AU's contact with civil society, and gender equality (Murithi, 2007) are all indicators of liberal influence on the AU. Thus, the AU has a more extensive institutional infrastructure than its predecessor, a bigger mandate, and manages an agenda that encompasses the whole spectrum of Africa's development, peace and security issues (Vanheukelom et al, 2016). As a political theory, liberal intergovernmentalism may be used to explain African integration and cooperation since it recognizes that domestic choice is impacted by economic interdependence and sub-national actors (Njie, 2019). This is a significant victory for the AU in terms of gradually but steadily socializing the African political elite to embrace liberal ideals and norms as the foundation for interstate cooperation.

Furthermore, Tieku (2019) has identified how the AU has been relatively effective in addressing the needs of the African political class under liberal thinking: first, the AU contributed to changing the mindset of the majority of the African political class by socializing them to accept liberal values as the foundation for international cooperation in Africa; second, the union increased the agency of African governments in the international arena; third, under liberal thinking, the African premier or president has been relatively effective in addressing the needs of the African political class; fourth, the international organization centered in Addis Ababa established several important standards, including one encouraging the political elite to exchange power peacefully; fifth, the pan-African organization tempered the actions of African governments; and sixth, the AU established decision-making mechanisms that have aided in the prevention, management, and resolution of crises throughout Africa.

In general, the theory of liberalism has influenced the AU's founding milestones, principles and standards, structure, and operationalization to promote peace and security in Africa, with democracy, peace, and development as fundamental pillars for achieving the aspirations of the AU's agenda 2063.

THE SYNERGY BETWEEN THE UN AND THE AU IN THE PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

In the area of promoting international peace and security, the UN is a special partner of the AU. Its legal standing is based on Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, and it frequently functions as a parallel to the UN Security Council, transmitting communiqués to the Security Council, which may ultimately be ratified in the form of UN Security Council resolutions (Berhe & Waal, 2017). Historically, this bond has undergone several transformations; when the UN Charter was drafted, there were only a few independent African states, but as African countries decolonized throughout the 1960s, Africa's status at the UN began to change as newly independent African countries became members of the UN and learned to use the world organization as a platform to advance interests such as economic development and decolonization (Lehmann, 2008).

Recognizing the importance of regional organizations, the UN Security Council is hesitant to diminish its legal power under international law (Berhe & Waal, 2017). As the UN Security Council leads on larger international security matters, the AU and regional economic communities (RECs) signed a Memorandum of Understanding to institutionalize frequent meetings on the allocation of tasks (Vanheukelom et al., 2016). This synergy can be seen in UN peacekeeping missions, the deployment of missions of regional or continental organizations in the continent, with or without UN support, co-deployment (that is, the deployment of UN peacekeeping troops alongside those of regional organizations), and the sequencing of activity by a regional organization and the UN mission (Moolakkattu, 2010). The UN is also strategically and systemically linked to Africa and the AU as the UN system as a whole is more important in Africa than everywhere else on the planet as the vast bulk of UN forces and its specialized organizations are stationed in Africa (Berhe & Waal, 2017).

As a result, the UN serves as a critical building component in the AU's evolving peace and security system, despite recent experience revealing conflicts between the AU and the UN. First, while there is much discourse about Africa, there is little talk about Africa itself and its position at the UN (Vanheukelom et al., 2016); second, since the fundamental spirit of collaboration was tested by the international intervention in Libya in 2011, there has been a lamentable propensity for a spirit of sibling rivalry at the intermediate levels of the two organizations; third, the AU recognizes the need to build African capacity to respond to crises when the UN is unwilling or unable to do so, and the UN must be held accountable for its obligations in Africa (Powell, 2005). Lessons learned from re-hatting in Burundi indicate that effective transfers from AU to UN authority may necessitate more established cooperation between these two organizations (Ibid). All of this has prompted the UN to establish a ten-year capacity-building initiative in support of APSA (Vanheukelom et al., 2016). It highlighted the UN and AU's shared commitment to preserving peace and human security, supporting human rights, carrying out post-conflict rebuilding, and boosting Africa's growth and regional integration (Ibid). Additionally, the three African non-permanent Security Council members continued to serve as a vital connection between the two Councils, increasingly voicing African viewpoints and collective stances on topics of significance to the continent (Powel, 2005).

In general, the interface between the UN, which has primary responsibility for international peace and security, and the AU, which has primary responsibility for African peace, security, and stability, demonstrates the influence of liberal institutionalism in achieving common goals at both the continental and international levels, despite existing challenges that require careful consideration.

CONCLUSION

Theories of IR are useful to understand what happens in the global order. The influence of the liberal world and liberal peace in this situation goes beyond institutional formulations and norms to the conceptualization, operationalization, and practices of promoting peace and security in the world. As a result, under the clothing of liberal philosophy, the UN and AU are defined by persistent and interrelated sets of norms, mandates, behavioral roles, activities, and expectations. These institutions, founded on liberal norms and values, serve as tools to foster peace and security, which are bolstered by democracy, development, and good governance. This is particularly so because of the realization that there would be no economic growth without peace and stability, and without economic development, it would be difficult to preserve democratic institutions or peace and stability in member states or the system as a whole (Sesay, 2008). Since its creation, liberal institutionalism has affected significant global and continental normative and institutional changes, with the UN and AU increasingly dealing with peace and security concerns (Vanheukelom et al., 2016). The worldview of liberalism affected the UN's and AU's foundational milestones, principles and standards, institutions, and operationalization to promote peace and security, and it remains vital to achieving both the AU Agenda 2063 and the 2030 UN SDGs for international peace, democracy, and development, as well as advances in human security.

REFERENCES

Attia, N. (2016). "The democratic peace theory: Validity in relation to the European Union and 'Peaceful' cooperation between the United States and China." *International Journal of Peace and Development Studies. Vol.7(2)*, 15-17.

Baylis. J, Smith. S, Owens. P, (2008), *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Boke, C. (2019, April 11). Third-party Intervention to Civil Wars: Realist, Liberalist and English School Theoretical Perspectives. https://behorizon.org/third-party-intervention-to-civil-wars-realist-liberalist-and-english-school-theoretical-perspectives/ (access data 19/03/2023).

Buchan, B. (2002). Explaining War and Peace: Kant and Liberal IR Theory. *Alternatives 27*, 407-442.

Cavalcante, F. (2014). "The Influence of the Liberal Peace Framework on the United Nations Approach to Peacebuilding in Guinea-Bissau." *RCCS Annual Review. Open Edition Journal URL: http://journals.openedition.org/rccsar/564*, 141-161.

Cevheri, E. (2019). United Nations and Democracy Promotion: Liberalism under the Guise of a Neutral Rhetoric. *International Journal of Society Researches*, 1910-1939.

David Rampton and Suthaharan Nadarajah. (2017). "A long view of liberal peace and its crisis." *European Journal of International Relations*, 441-465.

Fidler, D. P. (1996). "Caught Between Traditions: The Security Council in Philosophical Conundrum." *Maurer Law*, 412-451.

Gavrila, M. A. (2013). "Liberal and Realist Considerations of UN Effectiveness." *E-International Relations*, p. 1-3. Available at: https://www.e-ir.info/2013/05/02/liberal-and-realist-considerations-of-un-effectiveness/ (Access date: 17/03/2023)

Ghaderia, M. (2011). "Peace-based curriculum based on the theories of 'difference' and 'similarity.'" *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3430-3440.

Gottschalk, K. (2012). "The African Union and its Sub-regional Structures." *Journal of African Union Studies*, 9-39.

Gutner, Tamar L. (2017). *International Organizations in World Politics*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE/CQ Press.

Jehangir, H. (2012). Realism, Liberalism and the Possibilities of Peace. *E-International Relations,* P. 1-8. *Available at https://www.e-ir.info/2012/02/19/realism-liberalism-and-the-possibilities-of-peace/*(Access date: 18/03/2023)

Jordaan, E. (2016). "Collective Security in Africa: The Tension Between Theory and Practice." *Strategic Review for Southern Africa, Vol 39, No 1*, 160-184.

Oksamytna, K and Karlsrud, J. (2020). *United Nations Peace Operations and International Relations Theory: An Introduction.* Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3665340 (Access date: 16/03/2023).

Kutbay, E. Y. (2015). Maintenance of International Peace and Security: A Historical Assessment of the Evolution of United Nations. 125-134.

Langlois, A. J. (2001) *The Politics of Justice and Human Rights: Southeast Asia and Universalist Theory,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lehmann, V. (2008). *The Relationship between Africa and the UN: From Disenchantment to a more Effective Cooperation.* Tarrytown, New York: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

MacMillan, John (2007) "Liberal internationalism", in Griffiths Martin (ed.), *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century: An introduction*. London: Routledge.

Meiser, J. W. (2018). "Introducing Liberalism in International Relations Theory." *E-International Relations, pp.1-4* Available at https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/18/introducing-liberalism-in-international-relations-theory/(Access date: 08/03/2023)

Michael J. Mazarr, Jonathan Blake, Abigail Casey, Tim Mcdonald, Stephanie Pezard and Michael Spirats. (2018). *Understanding the Emerging Era of Internation Cooperation: Theoretical and Historical Perspectives.* RAND Corporation.

Moolakkattu, J. S. (2010). "The Role of the African Union in Continental Peace and Security Governance." *India Quarterly, Vol. 66, N. 2*, 151-165.

Mulugeta Gebrehiwot Berhe and Ale de Waal. (2017). *Peace Mission in Africa: Constraints, Challenges, and Opportunities.* World Peace Foundation.

Murithi, T. (2007). *Institutionalizing Pan-Africanism: Transforming African Union values and principles into policy and practice.* Institute for Security Studies.

Njie, H. M. (2019). *Do the objectives of the African Union's Agenda 2063 aspirations harmonize with a Pan-African and African Renaissance Vision? – A critical review.* Lundut University.

Omotola, J. S. (2014). *The African Union and the Promotion of Democratic Values in Africa: An Electoral Perspective.* African Institution of International Affairs.

Özkeçeci-Taner, i. (2002). "The Myth of Democratic Peace: Theoretical and Empirical Shortcomings of the 'Democratic Peace Theory.'" *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations, Vol.1, No.3*, 40-50.

Pease, K. K. S. (2008). *International organizations: Perspectives on governance in the twenty-first century*. Prentice Hall.

Peck .C. (1998), *Sustainable Peace: The Role Of The Un And Regional Organizations In Preventing Conflict.* New York and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Pereira, M. M. (2019). The liberal peace and its contesting universal values: a theoretical approach to the development of hybrid forms of the political order in post-conflict Societies. *Brazilian Journal of International Relations, V8. N2. Available at https://doi.org/10.36311/2237-7743.2019.v8n2.10.p427*, 427-453.

Powell, K. (2005). *The African Union's Emerging Peace and Security Regime.* Institute for Security Studies.

Sandrina Antunes & Isabel Camisão. (2017). *Realism. In R. W. Stephen McGlinchey, Getting Started with International Relations Theory* (pp. 15-22). Bristol, England: E-International Relations Publishing.

Sesay, A. (2008). *The African Union: Forward March or About Face-Turn?* Sweden, Uppsala : Claude Ake Memorial Papers.

Sindima, H. (1990). "Liberalism and African Culture." *Journal of Black Studies, Vol. 21, No. 2*, 190-209.

Steele, B. J. (2007). "Liberal-Idealism: A Constructivist Critique." *International Studies Review, Volume 9, Issue 1, Available at https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2007.00644.x*, 23-52.

Susan Engel and Josh Pallas. (2015). *International Relation Theory and The UN: A Short Primer.* The University of Wollongong.

Tieku, T. K. (2019). The African Union: Successes and Failures. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*, 1-25.

Toksöz, I. (2017). "In search of peace on the silk road: From Theory to Practice." *Acta Via Serica, Vol. 2, No. 1*, 7-30.

Tommasoli, M. (2010). *Democracy, Peace, and Security: The Role of The UN.* United Nations. Available at: https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/democracy-peace-and-security-the-role-of-the-united-nations.pdf (Access date: 05/02/2023)

Vanheukelom, J. Bilal, S & Woolfrey, S. (2016). The political economy of regional Integration in Africa: what drives and constraints regional organissations? Synthesis Report. *The Centre for Africa-Europe Relations*. https://ecdpm.org/work/the-political-economy-of-regional-integration-in-africa-what-drives-and-constrains-regional-organisations-synthesis-report (Accss date: 19/03/2023).

Vreÿ, F. (2005). "Theoretical approaches in international relations: The South African military as a foreign policy Instrument." *South African Military Studies. Volume 43, Number 2*, 39-64.

Yihdego, Z. (2011). "The African Union: Founding Principles, Frameworks, and Prospects." *European Law Journal, V 17. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0386.2011.00567.x*, 568–594.