Group Interest and the Escalation of Conflict in Africa: The Case of Angola, 1961-2002.
By

Ayibatari, Yeriworikongha Jonathan
Department of History and Diplomacy, Niger Delta University,
Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State.
Email: ayibatariyjonathan@gmail.com
Phone: 08137687570

Abiobio, Philip Humphrey
Department of Educational Foundations, School of Education.
Federal College of Education (Technical), Omoku Rivers State.
Email: abiophiloni@yahoo.com
Phone: 08038977901
&
Ebelegi K. Newton
Department of History and Diplomacy, Niger Delta University,
Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State.
Email: Ebelegi.co@gmail.com
Phone: 08032721833

Abstract

Over the years, the continent of Africa has experienced violent conflicts that has most times led to the loss of uncountable number of lives, and properties worth millions of dollars and consequently leading to sometime people internally been displaced, and other times resulting to the total devastation of villages, towns and settlements of different groups. Most of these conflicts occur as a result of deep-rooted interest of various groups in the society. These interests could be economic, political, cultural to mention but a few. Bearing in mind that conflict is an integral part of human life, using Angola as our case study, our aim in this paper is to bring to the fore, the fact that most of the conflicts in Africa over the years were started and consequently escalated and prolonged due to the interference from different interest groups; domestic and foreign who had vested interest to protect or promote.

Introduction

Conflict is a phenomenon which is an important part of human existence, and a natural part of our daily lives. This implies that there is no society that is void of conflict. However, conflict that occurs within a given society may be the result of several factors. For this reason, the works of classical socialists' theorists from Marx and Comte to Samuel and

Sorel's, explanations for social conflict, whether on a small or large scale, whether resulting from interactions between social groups or caused by external factors have been an issue of common concern for scholars and conflict resolution practitioners in society. In the same way that it is most time cumbersome to point to a single factor as being responsible for peace and order within a society, so it is difficult, to point to a single explanation for the emergence, escalation or protraction of conflict in every society. According to Faleti (2006), the case where a conflict has degenerated to the point of crisis, it is common that those involved will find it difficult to remember what actually led to the initial disagreement.

Bearing in mind that conflict is unavoidable in every society, this paper is however an attempt to X-ray various interest of parties to conflict in African society using the case of Angola as a case study.

Although this paper is not set to consider different theories of conflict and conflict management and resolution, we shall however anchor our discussion on the structural conflict theory. This conflict theory has however two sub-orientations. The first is the radical structural theory represented by the Marxist dialectical school with exponents like Marx and Engels, V.L.L Lenin, and so on. The second is the liberal structuralism represented by Ross (1993), Scarborough (1998) and the famous work of Johan Galtung (1990) on structural violence. It is also sometimes similar to trans-formative theory, which focuses on the reactions of individuals, groups, cultures, institutions and societies to change. Furthermore it pays attention to incompatible interests based on competition for resources, which in most cases are assumed to be scarce, as being responsible for social conflicts (Callier,2002). Theories like Marxism, in its thesis on "historical materialism" present conflicts as mostly tied to economic structures and social institutions.

The basic argument of the structural conflict theoretical framework is that conflict is built into the particular ways societies are structured and organized. This theory pays attention to social problems like political and economic exclusion; injustice, poverty, disease, exploitation, inequality and so on, as sources of conflict. Structuralists maintained that conflicts occur because of the exploitative and unjust nature of human societies, domination of one class by another, etc. This point however made by radicals like Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx, Joseph Lenin and MaoTse Tung, who blame capitalism for being an exploitative system based on its relations of production and division of society into the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The exploitation of the proletariat and lower classes under capitalism creates conflict. Thus, capitalists' societies are accused of being exploitative and such exploitation is a cause of conflict. This however, was the picture in most African colonial societies and especially that of Angola which is our focus. Capitalist conflicts, to

Marxist, will be resolved through a revolution where the bourgeoisie will be overthrown in a socialist revolution led by workers, bringing about the establishment of a socialist order led by the working people. Furthermore, it argues that there will be a "capitalist internationalism" a situation where workers all over the world unite, and will not be limited by state boundaries, since the state to them is an artificial creation of the bourgeoisie to dominate others for the protection of their group interest as group of exploiters of the lower class in the society.

Relatively, the Marxist tradition has been extended by Neo-Marxist, mostly of the underdevelopment and dependency school of thought; most of them from the developing world. Some of the best-known theorists are Andre Gunder Frank, Walter Rodney, Samir Amin, as well as Emmanuel Wallerstein who expounded the "World System Theory". This group of scholars seeks to explain the reasons for development and underdevelopment, and why the third world is not developing. They situate their analysis within the world capitalist system, and accuse the system of being structurally exploitative, retarding the developmental process of the third world countries. On his part, Walter Rodney while lending his voice in his book "How Europe Underdeveloped Africa", differentiates between underdevelopment and non-development. He is of the opinion that non-development takes place in a country when that country is not developing due to external forces-accounting for its stagnation. However, underdevelopment occurs when another external factor, a nation, is responsible for the situation such as Europe destroying the basis and foundations for African development through its various historical relations with the continent.

The emphasis of structural theory is thus on how the competing interests of groups tie conflict directly into the social, economic, and political organization of society as well as the nature and strength of social networks within and between community groups. Ross (1993:4) noted for instance that, in situations where economic and political discrimination and weak kinship ties are the defining characteristics of a society, the chances that negative forms of conflict will result are higher than in situations where the conditions are the exact opposite. In other words, when social, political, economic and cultural processes are monopolized by a group; it creates the conditions that make people to adopt adversarial approaches to conflicts. In the view of Khotari, a former director of the United Nations University's Program on Peace and Global Transformation, resource is a major cause of conflict between individuals and groups within political systems and between nations. As he puts it, the control and use of (natural) Resources lies at the heart of the deepening crisis in the world today (1979;6). According to Scarborough (1998), in situations where existing structures are tilted in favour of one group while putting the other(s) at a disadvantage,

where holders of certain powers or privileges are unwilling to acknowledge the rights of others to be different; or where people find it difficult to identify with the political and economic ideas of a political regime, the chances are that conflicts will emerge and escalate if nothing is done to correct such abnormalities.

Structural theoretical framework is however remarkably strong on the immediate and underlying factors that led to conflict. It presents a large number of such factors that makes the emergence and escalation of internal conflicts possible (Brown, 1996: 577). While economic and social factors are more common, political and institutional factors (the structure of the state, discriminatory political institutions; inter-group politics and elite cohesion or fragmentation), security factors (National security dilemma, regional military environment, refugee regimes, cross-border criminality, and civil-military relations); as well as ethnic factors: (demography and physical geography), are equally as critical.

The structuralist theoretical framework present factors such as those listed above as the major motivating factors that explain the emergence of destructive conflicts between individuals and groups. In most cases problems of over population, economic underdevelopment, un-integrated social and political institutions and available resources are the main factors responsible for the emergence of internal conflicts.

There may be a need to look at the position of structural conflict theory again because of its narrow focus on material interest. It is possible that in trying to explain the severity of internal conflicts, material interest may also be the result of certain psychological needs, which would better explain the intensity, duration and outcome of internal conflicts. To seek to explain intensity and protraction by focusing on material interest alone is therefore a problem. For instance, the interest of Gatekeepers (those who are in a position to direct proceedings during a conflict) and Shadow Parties (those who provide secret support for those engaged in the conflict) may not be material gain parse; rather, their involvement may be based on psychological needs that they have to be recognized as a people cannot be overlooked within the political community. This is the case in the involvement of the communist block led by the then USSR and the capitalist block led by the U.S.A and her allies in the internal conflict of Angola as a country.

The violent and devastating conflicts that has ever ravaged Africa, be it in the past or present, presents a unique case of how natural resources or wealth can ironically make a people poor. Paradoxically, what was intended to be a blessing by nature has turned in most cases into a curse in the case of most African states, of which Angola is a practical example that this paper is focused on considering. Militia uprising in Angola from the

early 1950s to the 1970s was all geared towards the control of resources in this case (Land) which was being controlled by the Portuguese. This is a fact in that many devastating conflicts in Africa both in the past and present are all linked to the struggle for resource control of natural resources. Conflict however, occurs when individuals or groups are not obtaining what they need or want, and are seeking their own self-interest. Adidu (2006) describes conflicts as the discord that arises when the goals, interest or values of different individuals or groups block or thwart each other's attempt to achieve their objectives. On the other hand, Nelson and Cluick (1997) defined conflict as any situation in which incompatible goals, emotions, and behaviors leads to disagreement or opposition between two or more parties. Tjosvold (1993) added that conflict involves incompatible behaviors, or in some other way making another action less-effective.

Portuguese Interest in the Escalation of Crisis in Angola
Historically, Angola became a major Portuguese trading area for slaves in the 17th and 18th centuries. Between 1580 and 1680, over a million African slaves were said to have landed in Brazil and other parts of the world. However, this was amid competition from other European powers. There was however strong resistance offered in the early 20th century by the Kongo, especially in Alvaro Buta's revolt in 1913-1915; by the Dembos, a section of the Mubundu; and by other ethnic groups in Angola, including the Ovimbundu, whose Bailundo revolt in 1902 is regarded as one of the greatest African revolts. In the far south, the resistance of the Ovambos was ended only with the defeat of the brave ruler Mandume in 1915. Fighting however, in various regions went on unabated until about 1920.

Forced labor and harsh policies of taxation were some of the main effects of Portuguese rule for the Angolan society. Educationally the Portuguese were very reluctant in giving the Angolans quality education; this in their interest would keep the majority of the Angolans from western education.

Infrastructurally, forced labor was used for some of the limited economic development. The Portuguese vigorously pursed coffee and cotton cultivation for export as well as mining of diamonds. Demographically the construction of the Benguela Railway by British interest between 1903 and 1929 led to Portuguese settlement of the highlands of Huambo. In 1945, the Portuguese government-initiated measures designed to encourage its excess population to emigrate to Angola. In 1951, Angola was formally declared an integral part of Portugal and in 1952, the settlement projects known as *Calonatos* began. Here the hiring of indigenous labor was forbidden and two distinct communities thus began to develop.

From the foregoing it is deduce-able that as early as from the 17th and 18th centuries, Portuguese had had a vested interest in the Angolan territory. This interest is political, economic and demographical. In the bid to protect these interests, as expected, it brought about conflicts between the two groups (The Indigenous People of Angola and that of the Portuguese). As earlier stated above, territorial acquisition, forced labor, harsh taxation are all sources of negative conflict.

Political Interest of Portuguese on Angola
In the 19th and 20th centuries, there seemed to be a prevailing atmosphere of political pride among European nations to own and control territories overseas. It was a matter of national and political pride for the industrializing nations to own colonies where by such colonies could serve as both sources of raw materials for the industries at home, as well as sources of ready markets for industrial finished goods. Hence Portugal was not willing to let go of her colonial territory of Angola even in the face of resistance from the indigenous people. Furthermore, there was a serious contention for territories in Africa among European powers, such as Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy etc. In the face of all these competitions, Portugal knew that letting go of her area of influence so easily due to local resistance, will definitely result to the re-occupation of the same by another European power. And this will imply political weakness on the part of Portugal among the comity of European powers. Hence Portugal employed stiffer measures to tighten her hold on Angola

Economic Interest
According to Anene (1966), when the Portuguese moved southward from the Congo, their principal aim was to extend an area for the acquisition of slave for the plantations in the New World. This explains the character of the relationship which developed between the Portuguese and the indigenous peoples. The stories of Portuguese activities in Angola up to the Nineteenth Century, is a chronology of military expeditions and dedicated commerce in black humanity. The un-relented raiding, and acquisition of slaves by Portugal, and other times by her African allies being encouraged and equipped by Portugal, brought about serious conflict and violence in Angola. Anene (1996) is of the view that the slave raiding activities resulted to not only the disruption of the indigenous order, but the fact that Portuguese depredations left Angola one of the most sparsely populated regions of Africa. This is an indication that the Portuguese from the very beginning of their contact with the people of Angola had encouraged and contributed to the escalation of negative violence in African society and Angola in particular.

However, even up to the 20ᵗʰ century when slave trade was formerly abolished and the eventual introduction of legitimate trade, the Portuguese introduced all kinds of forced labor, to coerce the people to work in various plantations. In the colonial era, Angolans were forced to work on railway construction sites without being adequately paid for their wages. Furthermore, being a region rich with mineral resources such as diamond and crude oil, the Portuguese for reasons of huge economic benefits were unwilling to let go of it. Hence Portugal continued to hold onto Angola, even at a time when every West African territory had been given Independence. This however, accounts for the late arrival of Angola as a sovereign nation in 1975.

Demographical and Geographical Interest

For purposes of demographic control in Portugal, the government of Portugal initiated policies that encouraged the migration of large number of Portuguese citizens to move into Angola for permanent settlement. This policy was however fully implemented in 1945, when after the construction of the Benguela Railway between 1903 and 1929 that eventually led to the settlement of Portuguese of the highland of Huambo. The above events led to the declaration of Angola as an integral part of Portugal in 1951. And in 1952 the settlement projects known as *Colonatos* began. In this policy the hiring of indigenous labor was forbidden and two distinct communities thus began to develop. A situation whereby purely European born Portuguese were given more preference over the indigenes even the *Assimilados* (African-born Portuguese) or people of mixed breed or *mixticos* as they were sometimes called.

Geographically, just like over settlers and non-settler colonies of Africa, evidence showed that the settler colonies in Africa such as South-Africa, Tunisia, Algeria, Zimbabwe, all had geographical conditions similar to that of Europe. Hence Angola presented a favorable geographical condition for the settlement of large number of Portuguese citizens. As it is expected, like else were in other settler colonies of Africa. The dispossession of land of the indigenous people by the foreigners led to serious conflicts among the different groups. The above description of events confirms Omer Coopers's (1999) opinion that in most cases territorial expansion inevitably took place at the expense of the indigenous people.

Nationalist Movement Interest

Like elsewhere in other colonies of Africa, in Angola, settler separatism and government economic and social policies which drew distinctions between Europeans and natives and *Assimilado* (indigenes who qualified for acceptance as Portuguese citizens) helped to awaken national consciousness, under a decree published in 1947, an indigene, to be accepted as an Assimilated (an assimilated or "civilized" person) had to fulfill four

conditions: he must have a clean police record; he must have economic means to support himself and his family; and he must apply for the status and receive the approval of the district governor. If accepted as an *Assimilado*, he would further his education, or could obtain employment in government service as a messenger, porter or servant in Portuguese consulates; he could also obtain similar positions in private enterprises. The *Assimilado* had to carry his card at all times, or he would cease to be recognized. Anene (1966).

The non-*Assimilados* (un-assimilated or "uncivilized" persons) were available for conscription to force labor, or else to migrant labour under contractual conditions over which they had no control. They were also deprived of all education, or at best, they might achieve a year or two in a village school. They were also denied the right to organize any mode of self- defense whether social, economic, political or cultural. There were also distinctions between "native" *assimilados* and *Mesticos* (people of European and African birth).

The above scenario brought about discontentment, violence and conflicts in Angola. Thus, in order to protect their collective interest as a group of oppressed people, the first indigenous political association was formed in 1913, Liga Angolana made up mainly of Mesticos. However, the main ideology and interest of this political association was the demand for economic and social advancement for Angolans within the Portuguese colonial system and not for total eradication of colonialism. However, due to differences in ideologies and colorations of vested interests of the various groups, several other political associations emerged, which were more radical in their approach. An example of such other associations was Gremic Africans (GA) 1929, Associacao Regional Dos Naturaisde Angola (ANANGOLA). Angolan communist party (PCA) 1956, Partido de Luta Des Africanos de Angola (PLAA) which was later merged with the popular movement for the liberation of Angola (MPLA). Several other political associations were formed apart from the ones mentioned above. Due to constrain of limited space, we shall focus our discussion on mainly three (3) political associations which came to the limelight during and after the liberation wars, which fought among them-selves for control of the newly independent state of Angola. They were; Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), National Liberation Front of Angola (FNLA) and as well as The National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) which was however a late comer among the political association. Although its leader and founder Dr. Savimbi had been a member of older political associations, but as a result of disagreement among the leadership of the movements, UNITA was formed in 1960.

As earlier stated above, the political associations that were formed for the liberation movements in Angola had various colouration of interest. And some of these differing interests led to conflicts among the association leadership that most cases resulted in violent and negative conflicts among them. The three main political association which acquired military status, that vigorously fought for the independence of Angola in the 1960s, The Popular Movement for The Liberation of Angola (MPLA) which had a Marxist orientation centered in the capital, Luanda and led by Agostinho Neto, it was however a city based movement and had more educated elements (*assimilados* and *mesticos*). The National Front for The Liberation of Angola (FNLA), a more radical political association led by Holden Roberto, was based in the north of the country and had strong ties to the United State of America (USA), and an ally to Mabutu Sese Seko, in neighboring Zaire. On the other hand, The National Union for The Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), an offshoot of the FNLA, was led by Jonas Savimbi and was supported by the country's longest ethnic group, the Ovimbundu.

Following a regime change in Portugal, these three revolutionary groups met with representatives of the new Portuguese government in January 1975, and signed the Alvor agreement that granted Angolan independence and provided for a three-way power sharing government. In the same year in November 1975, the Portuguese finally withdrew from Angola. However, it is important to point out here that the Portuguese failed to prepare Angola for independence, and as a result, the Portuguese handed over power to no definite government, but it handed over power to the people of Angola, which consequently left the three revolutionary movements fighting for the total control of the state. The (MPLA) in possession of the capital city Luanda and other crude oil rich regions announced to the world that they were the only recognized government in Angola. On the other hand (NFLA), operating from the northern part of the country, with the support of Zaire U.S ally. On the other hand (UNITA), drew the support of the largest ethnic groups.

It was an undeniable fact that the various liberation movements from the very beginning of their struggle appear to have one common enemy which was Portugal, but their different interest and ideologies resulted in the different groups fighting among themselves. There were actually instances of inter and intra group misunderstanding among them that escalated the conflict in Angola. The struggle was turned among ethnic and tribal sentiments that the people failed to form a united front for a single government.

The Political and Economic Interest
According to Robert Gilpin (1981) the distribution of power itself ultimately rest on economic base. So also, in the views of Geoffrey Blainey, the strong emphasis on adequate

finance suggests that it must have a niche in any explanation of war. Our discussion under this heading bothers on the financing of the conflicts and wars of independence and the consequent post-independence civil wars in Angola. The question is, how does states or revolutionary groups mobilize and pay for the cost of war? Military power from historical evidence stems from an economic base. Without wealth, soldiers cannot be paid, weapons cannot be procured, and food cannot be bought for the sustenance of the troops. Strategists, tacticians, and logicians would have little to work with. However, belligerents may perpetuate a conflict as a deliberate means of securing economic profits and political power. To do this they need resources generated by the war economy. In turn, the war will determine to some extent the impact of that war has on local population and even on the cause of the conflict. War economies can however take several forms which are not mutually exclusive. A politico-military faction can adopt several of them according to local resources. The behavior, and capacity of its troop, local and foreign political and commercial connections, and geographical circumstances that can aid the financing of the war.

In the narrow sense however, (the cost of war) means the actual money outlay, or expenditure in dollars and cents, directly involved in prosecuting the war. In the wider sense it includes many items, both direct and indirect; which are significant from the economic point of view. The real cost of the war in this sense may mean either the actual loss of lives and property or the diminution of the annual social output (Seligman 1919). Like Seligman, I am primarily concerned here with the narrow concept of Cost: the direct financial outlays to pursue military objectives. Thus, war finance is the means by which the state or groups (Revolutionaries) meets the cost for executing the war efforts.

From the foregoing, the question is, what is the relationship between the political economy of war (War Finance) and the escalation of conflict in the Angolan crisis?

Economically the conflict in Angola was financed with the revenue occurring from the exploitation of the various mineral resources. Been that the country is rich in mineral resources mainly of crude oil and diamond, the various revolutionary groups mounted a strong hold to positions where these minerals are situated and see to its exploitation for sales to mainly international agents who were ready to exchange the same with all kinds of materials that will be of help to the prosecution of the war. Apart from the financial support gotten from the international community by different revolutionary groups, it is quite deducible that the element of the availability and exploitation of local mineral resources was a major factor that help to sustain and prolong the conflict in Angola. For instance, MPLA, was majorly in control of the oil rich region, while on the other hand

FNLA and UNITA were mainly dealers on Diamonds. No wonder there was so much international community interest in the conflict of Angola. As a result of economic interest, many private local warlords and international private as well as co-operate bodies benefited from the business of the war. Although this is arguable, but it is still a fact that in every conflict or crisis, as the case may be, there are losers and those who benefited or make gain out of the same. Our arguments here is that the vested interest of the various revolutionary groups in whatever they believed, that they were fighting for, were actually financed through the exploitation of the mineral resources. Indeed, the Civil War in Angola from after 1975, when the Portuguese withdraw were actually fought with the sole aim of which of the group will finally be in power to control the entire natural resources of the country which were basically oil and diamond.

Super Power Interest (The Cold War in Angola)
Without gain saying, any civil war or conflict is difficult to resolve, but the most notable fact is that tension is usually compounded when third parties and the rest of the world starts to intervene. Under this section we shall consider the Angolan Civil War and see how it was defined by the Cold War dynamics.

Immediately upon achieving its independence in 1975, Angola fell into a brutal civil war that lasted from 1975 to 2002. Apart from the violence, the Angolan civil war is also note-able for the role that foreign super-powers played in the domestic conflict. This was expected in that Angolan independence occurred at the height of the cold war. The global struggle between communism and capitalism; Hence there was no such thing as a solely internal affair of the Angolan conflict.

The roots of the Angolan Civil War are in its Independence from Portugal's Colonial rule, which had lasted for nearly 500 Years. After World War II, independence movement surged in Angola, as they did in other colonial nations around the global community. In Angola however, these movements were championed by three main independence movements. On one side was the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA). A Marxist Oriented organization that found support among the generally urbanized Nmbundu ethnic group. The second group was the National Liberation Front of Angola (FNLA) which was supported by the rural Bakongo people and proposed recreating the historic Kongo Empire after independence. Finally, it was the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) which had a strong following among the rural Ovimbundu people. Like many other African countries; it appears that these three ethnic groups never had a common cultural unity; they were forced to live and exist in one country due to Portuguese colonization. Not because they shared a common identity or

goals for the future. As each group prepared for independence, their various leaders started thinking about what independent Angola would look like, and that meant defining the country's position in the cold war. This was however a difficult time for many new countries all over the world, a post-colonial state was expected to immediately declare allegiance to either communism or capitalism, and the decision could result in gaining allies or facing economic sanctions and even invasion in most cases. In the case of Africa, the countries that were adequately prepared by their colonial masters for independence had the opportunity of declaring their stands been an infant state as a member of the non-aligned movement. The case of Angola was a precarious situation been that power was not given to any specific government, but rather the Portuguese in their departure address stated that they have handed over power to the people of Angola. Hence, Angola became an arena for contention between the super powers to have a foot hold in Angola as quick as possible.

The MPLA envisioned a Marxist future for Angola and started seeking Support among communists' nations. Cuba immediately became their top ally, backed by the USSR and China. UNITA and FNLA opposed the MPLA and its urban intelligentsia, who they alleged as complicit with Portuguese colonizer, so they turned to the other direction. UNITA gained the support of south-Africa, and the FNLA gained the support of the United States of America (USA).

Although looking at the situation from the surface, it appears that the three (3) groups were fighting among themselves for the interest of power and resource control, but in the real sense, in my opinion, the war was actually hijacked by the super powers of the communists and the capitalists block for the sole interest of the propagation of their collective group interest in Angola been a new state. This however resulted to the massive support given to the (MPLA) by the communists' nation of Fildel Castro's Cuba been backed by the USSR and China. In fact, the conflict in Angola seriously escalated when thousands of Cuban troops were mobilized into Angola to fight on the side of MPLA against the other groups FNLA and UNITA. On the other hand, the United States of America (USA) not willing to openly get involved in the conflict, however diplomatically gave their backing to the other groups through South-Africa. It is however ironically that in this case the USA finds South-Africa, An apartheid regime as an ally. Been that as a nation, the USA had always been against the apartheid regime of South- Africa, as a matter of foreign policy, but in this case for purposes of national and ideological interest, the United States decided to work with the South-African government. However, I am of the Opinion that the USA took this position because she considers communism as a greater global threat than that of the practice of apartheid, by the South-African government at the time. Thus, FLNA and

UNITA received the support of the United States of America (USA) and her allies in the form of weapons and other logistics. On the other hand, the MPLA received not only material and financial support, but also that of the actual deployment of Cuban troops into Angola to help fight against the other groups and the invading army of South-Africa. The deployment of the Cuban troops into the battle field escalated the conflict and eventually brought about a turning point in favour of the MPLA for victory against the other groups. In claiming that the Angolan war was result of super-power rivalry, the US Press echoed the words of Henry Kissinger. As secretary of state he repeatedly claimed that the US was forced to intervene in Angola because the Soviet Union was already providing military aid to the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) in the form of Cuban Troops (Talbert 2002). The US support for Savimbi, the leader of UNITA was estimated to be about $50 million US Dollars as at 1989, the year that George Bush Senior came to power. Two military supply flights on a day maintained a UNITA campaign that became increasingly brutal and destructive. While in his early days, Savimbi had enjoyed some support among his own *Ovimbundu* people, by this time he was reduced to naked coercion. The war escalated at this point that men were forced to fight for his army, women were dragooned into sexual slavery and peasant farmers had their food seized to feed his army. Those who challenged his authority, were accused of witchcraft and burnt alive along with their families (Talbert 2002). There is no gain saying however that the conflict in Angola was escalated as a result of super power interest and rivalry, this paper also dared to opined that the rivalry among the super-powers were intensified not only based on ideological grounds of the cold war, but rather, the various powers intensified their support for the various groups for what they stand to gain economically from the trade on arms and ammunitions and the exploitation of the mineral resources of Angola which were crude oil and diamond. This however has a connectivity with the political economy of war and war financing that I have considered above. Furthermore, as a result of the war economy that a few people both domestic and international were benefitting from the prosecution of the war, they were more likely to see the continuation of the war rather than seeing it coming to an end.

Escalation of War and Refugee Problems

Over the years since after World War II, conflict-induced movement of people across national borders has remained one of the most complicated challenges confronting the world. Millions of refugees in countries around the world continue to live with little hope of finding solution to their plights. This however has posed a major challenge even to the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) and other host countries, the international community and even to the refugees themselves. According to a UN report (2004), the number of refugees' asylum seekers and internally displaced persons (IDPs) worldwide

has for the first time in the Post World War II era exceeded 50 million people. However as expected most of the refugees are usually women and children, many travelling alone or in groups, in a desperate pursuit for sanctuary, but often falling into the clutches of human traffickers (UN Report 2014).

According to the 1951 United Nations (UN) convention on the status of refugees, a refugee is a person who owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership to a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country, or who not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or unwilling to return to it. In addition to the element of the 1951 convention and its 1967 protocol, the 1969 Organization Of African Unity (OAU) convention governing the specific aspects of refugee problems explains that the term "refugee" shall also apply to every person who, owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or events seriously disturbing public order in either part or the whole of his or her country of origin or nationality, is compelled to leave his or her place of habitual residence in order to seek refuge in another place outside his or her country of origin or nationality. Furthermore, the 1984 Cartagena Declaration on refugees, states that a refugee is a person who has fled his or her country of origin because their lives, safety or freedom have been threatened by generalized violence, foreign aggression, internal conflicts, massive violation of human rights or other circumstances which have seriously disturbed public order.

The end of Angola's civil war in 2002 marked the conclusion of more than a quarter of a century's armed conflict that began with the war of independence from Portugal (1961-1975) which was immediately followed by a civil war (1975-2002). Armed conflict, insecurity and human rights abuses during the independence struggle, and the ensuring civil strife, uprooted significant numbers of Angolans. According to a UN report (2013), over four million Angolans were displaced internally, while another six million fled the country to seek refuge in other neighbouring countries. Due to socio-economic problems arising from the influx of refugees in their host countries, Zambia for instance, enacted The Refugee Control Act of Zambia (1970) to restrict refugees' enjoyment of certain rights and privileges, including freedom of movement, right to employment, right to education and other basic rights, on the basis of their refugee status. These policies were undertaken by the Zambian state in order to checkmate the resultant problems arising from the influx of refugees from Angola.

Summary and conclusion

So far, this paper has considered the Angolan crisis and its subsequent escalation. However, conflicts escalate due to various reasons, including lack of compromise or consensus between parties. This paper has thrown more light on conflict and its escalation due to various group interest. To be more objective, a final source of conflict is more additional than basic, that is, it comes in after the conflict has started. Generally, conflicts have a definite tendency to escalate, i.e., become more intense and hostile, and to develop more issues, either what the parties say the conflict is all about. Therefore, escalating conflicts become more difficult to manage. The process of escalation feeds on fear and defensiveness. This brings to mind the theory of threat, which states that threat leads to counter-threat; usually with higher stakes and each go-round. Selective and distorted perception justifies a competitive and cautious approach as opposed to a trusting and cooperative one. According to Deutsch in his "Crude Law of Social Relations" (1973), competition breeds competition, rather than cooperation. The self-fulfilling prophecy comes into play. Each party believes in the perceived interest or intentions of the other and the inevitability of disagreement, and therefore takes precautionary actions which signals mistrust and competitiveness. (Blake, Shepard and Mouton,1964). When the other party now responds with counter action, this is perceived as justifying the initial precautionary measure, and a new spiral of actions and counter actions begins. Through the norm of reciprocity, stronger attempts to control are met with not only stronger resistance, but more contentious attempts to gain the upper hand. With each succeeding spiral of conflicts, polarization grows and the parties become more adamant and intransigent in their approach to the situation. Even when the intensity of the conflict may moderate for periods of time (times of temporary cease fire agreement), the issues remain and a triggering-event induces conflictual behavior with negative consequences, and the conflict has moved one or more step up the escalation stair case. When parties or groups become "Locked in" to a conflict they are usually unable to get out by themselves, and the intervention of a third part in the role of arbitrator, mediator or consultant may be required (Fisher, 1972, 1997).

The various group interest in the Angolan Crisis, including third party intervention in the form of Super-Power involvement, contributed to the escalation of the conflict in Angola. However, as a result of the continued prosecution of the war and periodical escalation of the conflict due to the vested interest of the various groups in it, it brought about in a large scale the destruction of lives and properties worth millions of dollars. Though the nation is rich in natural resources of crude oil and diamond, the nation remains one of the poorest nations in Africa which was mainly due to the prolonged conflicts of which most of her resources were tapped for the prosecution of the war. Thus, the war brought about

poverty, economic backwardness, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and consequently displacement of other people as refugees in Neighboring countries.

In conclusion we believe however, that conflicts are inevitable in society, it has been happening and it will continue as long as there are conflicting interests of man in every society. The continuity and escalation of conflict has always been due to the vested interests of the individuals or groups locked in it.

Refrences

Allen G.C. (1972). *A Short Economic History of Modern Japan 1867-1937* (Third Revised Edition) London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Abelshanser, W. (1998). *Germany: Guns, Butter and Economic Miracles*. In M. Harrison (Ed) The Economics of World War II Cambridge University Press

Ann Talbot (2002) *The Angolan Civil War and U.S Foreign Policy*, World Socialist Website April 13

Amuzegar , J. (1997) *Iran's Economy Under the Islamic Republic* I.B Tauri

Balderson, J. (1989), *War Finance and Inflation in Britain and Germany, 1914 – 1918.* The Economic History Review.

Ballentine, K. & Sherman J. (Eds). (2003). *The Political Economy of Armed Conflict: Beyond Greed and Grievance*. Boulder: Laynn Rienner Publishers.

Gilpin, R (1981) *War and Change in World Politics* Cambridge University Press.

Gartner S.S & Segura, G.M. (1998) "*War Casualties and Public Opinion*". Journal of Conflict Resolution, 42, 278 – 300.

Kiby A. & Ward, M.D. (1991). *Modernity and the Process of State Formation An Examination of 20th Century Africa*. International interactions, 17, 125.

John. J. Kalama (2012) *Conflict Resolution Without Violence: Emerging Political Development.* Pearl Publishers Port – Harcourt. Trends in Nigeria

Bassey & Oshita (2007) *Conflict Resolution, Identity Crisis and Development in Africa.* Malthouse Press Ltd.

Paul Collier, & Anthony J. Venabies *"Managing the Exploitation of Natural Assets. Lessons for low income countries"* (Revised 30th Octoboer 2008). Available at *http://user.ox.ac.uk/econpco/research/africa.htm* (Accessed May 5th 2018)

Shedrack G. Best (2006) *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. Spectrum Book Ltd.

Paul Collier (2008) *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and what can be done about it.* Oxford University Press.

T. A Imobighe Et al (2002) *Conflict and Instability In the Niger Delta. The Warri Case.* Spectrum Books Ltd.

Robert J. Mcmahon. (2013) *The cold War in the Third World*. Oxford University Press.

Springhall, John. (2001). *Decolonization since 1945; The Collapse of European Overseas Empires New York:* Palgrave Macmillan

Tracey J. Kinney (Ed) (2006) *Conflict and Cooperation: Documents on Modern Global History*. Oxford University Press.