Post-Conflict Security Sector Reform, and the Roles of the Military and the Police: The Case of Sierra Leone[*]

Akira W. Jingushi[**]

Abstract

Security sector reform (SSR), which aims at building effective and accountable security institutions, is increasingly recognized as essential for peacebuilding. In particular, the military and the police play critical roles as security providers and as the most visible state apparatus in post-conflict countries. While the roles of the military and the police and their division of labor are vague and often overlap in Africa and elsewhere, little attention has been paid to how and on what basis they are determined in the SSR process.

Through the theoretical lens of "hybrid peace," this paper analyzes the SSR process in Sierra Leone. The aim of this paper is twofold: First, it shows that the roles of the military and the police are not predetermined or unchangeable; rather, they are strongly conditioned by multiple, fluid factors such as history, culture, the perceptions of political leaders and the general public, and the security situation. Therefore, their roles could change during the post-conflict period when those factors tend to change quickly and substantially. Second, what external actors consider are ideal security institutions and practices are unlikely to be transplanted and rooted in a post-conflict country in their entirety. An understanding of both the political dynamics of the host country (demand side) and the policies of external actors (supply side) is needed.

In Sierra Leone, the military and the police had taken the path of decay after independence. When the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) started civil war in 1991, rather than the government suppressing it, the military colluded with the RUF to prey on ordinary people and also led several coups during the conflict. These events strongly affected the post-conflict SSR process. Sierra Leonean leaders initially sought to disband or downsize the military while expanding the role of unarmed police. Without a substantial external threat, the Sierra Leone military had failed to obtain identity or raison d'etre until the introduction of the Military Aid to the Civil Power policy in 2004 and the deployment of troops to international peace operations in 2008.

In contrast, an effective defense against the RUF dramatically altered the perception of the Operational Support Division (OSD), an armed wing of the police force, which had been notorious for its oppressive acts against the population as a de facto private force of the president. As a result, the OSD was expanded after the conflict, and remaining concerns about the military's growing role often fuel its further expansion. Meanwhile, in order to respond to the rampant domestic and sexual violence, the Family Support Unit (FSU) was newly established within the police by a local police officer. These examples show how local and historical contexts determined and changed the roles of the military and the police in post-conflict Sierra Leone.

The fact that external donors can have only a limited impact, and that a "hybrid" security sector tends to emerge, implies the importance of "flexibility" in the SSR process. A deeper understanding of the context of a country and the limits of external donors is essential to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of SSR.

Introduction

Peacebuilding, which aims to prevent the recurrence of conflict in a post-conflict country, emerged as a major agenda in the international society after the Cold War. Among the various approaches of peacebuilding, what we frequently witnessed until the early 1990s, namely, the rapid democratization through elections and the introduction of liberal market economy, were contended as counter-effective for preventing the recurrence of conflict. Since the late 1990s, therefore, state-building through institution-building has emerged as the mainstream approach in peacebuilding.[1] An underlying assumption behind it is that since the existence of frictions and disputes in society is somewhat inevitable, an institutional arrangement is essential for preventing them from escalating into armed conflict and absorbing their impacts on society. Thus, along with the building of political, economic, health, and educational institutions, security sector reform (SSR) which aims at rebuilding and reforming security-related organizations and institutions such as the military, police, and judiciary is recognized as important in peacebuilding.[2]

While SSR is an institutional guarantee for controlling and resolving frictions and disputes that unavoidably occur within society, at the same time, it is often expected to prevent the security sector from becoming a cause of conflict. In other words, the military and the police are, by definition, assumed to ensure the security and safety of the state and population. However, it is not necessarily difficult to find cases of coups d'état by politicized militaries, or the abuse of human rights by the police. The military and the police have often become a driving factor of conflict rather than maintaining security and order within society. Accordingly, the need for SSR in post-conflict peacebuilding has been recognized not only as a way to prevent social tensions from escalating into armed conflict but as a process to remove a cause of conflict.[3]

Taking into account these purposes and rationales of SSR, this paper examines the evolving roles of the military and the police in post-conflict settings by analyzing Sierra Leone as a case. Of the multiple organizations and institutions in the security sector, the military and the police have coercive authorities and physical means. In particular, in war-torn countries where institutional control and oversight over the military and the police tend to be weak or non-existent, the types

---

[1]   Roland Paris, *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[2]   As a part of the state-building process, Hideaki Shinoda notes, "The theoretical meaning behind 'SSR' is to ensure the security of each and every member of society, to execute the primary obligation imposed on the government under the social contract." Hideaki Shinoda, *Heiwa Kochiku Nyumon: Sono Shiso to Hoho wo Toinaosu* [Introduction to Peacebuilding: Reconsidering its Concept and Approaches], Chikumashobo, 2013, p. 131.

[3]   Development aid agencies promote SSR as they think military spending should be controlled to make limited funds available for social and economic development. Masaki Kudo, "Kaihatsuenjo no Shiten kara mita SSR" [SSR from the Viewpoint of Development Assistance], Yuji Uesugi, Hiromi Fujishige, and Tomonori Yoshizaki, eds., *Heiwakochiku ni okeru Chianbumonkaikaku* [Security Sector Reform in Peacebuilding], Kokusai Shoin, 2012, pp. 76-78.

of roles played by them can have significant impacts on a country's long-term peace and stability

Through analyzing the SSR process in Sierra Leone with a particular focus on the roles of the military and the police, this paper argues firstly that the SSR process is influenced and shaped by the local situation at the moment—namely, the conflict situation, the election and political process, and the perception of political leaders and the general public towards the military and the police—as well as by the culture and history of the country, among other factors. In particular, when a country is in an unstable and volatile situation during and immediately after a conflict, even fundamental matters such as the roles of the military and the police of the country cannot be considered as a given. These roles are determined in line with the circumstances on an ad-hoc basis and can evolve as the situation changes thereafter.

Second, this paper argues that as the local context strongly influences the SSR process, what donor countries, the United Nations (UN), and/or other international organizations envision as "the ideal security sector" cannot be realized in its entirety in most instances. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the UN have developed the SSR concept and standardized its assistance approaches in recent years. Nevertheless, the policies and norms promoted by the "supply side," such as donors and international organizations, are often forced to make certain compromises due to the perceptions and policies of local political leaders and other stakeholders, that is, the "demand side." As a result, a "hybrid" security system, which incorporates elements of both demand and supply sides, emerges. By analyzing the process leading to the emergence of this "hybrid" security system in Sierra Leone, this paper shows the limitations of a "supply side" centric analysis, which focuses only on donors' approaches and coordination among them.[4]

The next section examines the definition and concept of SSR developed by the UN and OECD. It contends that despite the importance of the roles played by local military and police in the context of peacebuilding, and despite the often complex and vague relationship between them especially in Africa, their roles and interrelationship have not been fully examined. Through the theoretical lens of "hybrid peace," it also discusses the theoretical significance of analyzing the process in which the roles of the military and the police are determined, as well as the reasons for choosing Sierra Leone as a case for analysis.

Then, this paper examines the roles of the military and the police in Sierra Leone and their transformations since its independence. It also outlines the conflict in Sierra Leone that lasted from 1991 to 2002, and how the military and the police performed during the conflict. This section

---

[4]   For the overemphasis on the "supply side" and the lack of the "demand side" in the area of disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR), which is closely linked to SSR, see Mats Berdal and David H. Ucko, "Introduction: The Political Reintegration of Armed Groups after War," Berdal and Ucko, eds., *Reintegrating Armed Groups after Conflict: Politics, Violence and Transition*, Routledge, 2009, pp. 2-3. See also, Ursula C. Schroeder and Fairlie Chappuis, "New Perspectives on Security Sector Reform: The Role of Local Agency and Domestic Politics," *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 2014, pp. 133-148. Most of the SSR research in Japan thus far has also focused on the "supply side." See for example, Uesugi, Fujishige, and Yoshizaki, eds., *Heiwakochiku ni okeru Chianbumonkaikaku*; Tomonori Yoshizaki, "Heiwakochiku ni okeru Chianbumonkaikaku (SSR)" [Security Sector Reform in Peacebuilding], NIDS Journal of Defense and Security, Vol. 14, No. 2, 2012, pp. 49-64; and Hiromi Fujishige, "Chianbumonkaikaku (SSR) ni okeru Shoakuta no Katsudo" [The Activities of Various Actors in Security Sector Reform (SSR)], *Heiwakochiku ni okeru Shosakutan no Chosei* [Coordination among Various Actors in Peacebuilding], Study Commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan in FY2006, The Japan Institute of International Affairs, 2007, pp. 31-65. Exceptions include, Yoshiaki Furuzawa, "Two Police Reforms in Kenya: Their Implications for Police Reform Policy," *Journal of International Development and Cooperation*, Vol. 17, No.1, 2011, pp. 51-69.

further analyzes the policies and decisions related to their roles in the SSR process, which had begun during the conflict and continued thereafter. It reveals how the history and the conflict impacted SSR. This paper concludes by examining the theoretical implications of this paper's analysis, as well as the practical issues of SSR assistance that Japan and the international community will face in Africa and elsewhere.

1. Security Sector Reform, and the Roles of the Military and the Police
(1) Security sector reform

SSR is a relatively new concept. It was in the late 1990s through the early 2000s that SSR began to appear in the policies of donor countries and international organizations as an assistance program of security-related institutions and organizations, including the military, the police, the judiciary, and the executive government and parliament.[5] It was in 1998 when SSR as a policy concept came to be widely known among the international community. Clare Short, then Secretary of State for International Development of the United Kingdom (UK), stated in her speech that the Department for International Development (DFID) would engage in SSR in cooperation with such bodies as the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and the Ministry of Defence (MoD) and promoted SSR on both the diplomatic and research domains.[6]

Three factors were behind the development of the SSR concept since the late 1990s. First, the end of the Cold War allowed the development community to engage in military- and security-related issues and to apply the existing concepts it had developed, such as democratic governance. Through these concepts, the development community was able to similarly promote SSR. Second, with the democratization of Central and Eastern European countries following the end of the Cold War, Western countries as well as international institutions such as the European Union (EU) and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) began to enhance their efforts for the democratization of civil-military relations in these countries. Third, as peacebuilding becomes a mainstream activity in post-conflict countries, SSR has come to be recognized as a useful concept that covers diverse but related activities such as transitional justice and disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR), and SSR has been increasingly considered vital to the success of peacebuilding.[7]

Since the 2000s, the conceptual development and the standardization of assistance related to SSR have rapidly progressed. In particular, the release of the OECD Development Assistance

---

[5]   Assistance for security institutions such as the military of other (developing) countries can be traced back to the colonial period. During the Cold War, both the Eastern and Western blocs, often on the pretext of development cooperation supplied weapons and other equipment as well as provided personnel training. In this regard, the activities partially overlap with current SSR. However, these activities were conducted against the backdrop of the East-West confrontation, and have different purposes from the assistance that is currently provided as a component of peacebuilding. In addition, the scope of these activities was narrow compared to SSR, which also targets parliaments and ministries that monitor and oversee the security sector as well as the civil society. Jane Chanaa, *Security Sector Reform: Issues, Challenges, and Prospects*, Oxford University Press for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2002, pp. 14-16.

[6]   Clare Short, "Security, Development and Conflict Prevention," speech at the Royal College of Defence Studies, May 13, 1998. See also, Short, "Security Sector Reform and the Elimination of Poverty," speech at the Centre for Defence Studies, King's College London, May 9, 1999; and Heiner Hänggi, "Security Sector Reform," Vincent Chetail, ed., *Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: A Lexicon*, Oxford University Press, 2009, p. 337.

[7]   Hänggi, "Security Sector Reform," pp. 337-338. See also, Dylan Hendrickson, "A Review of Security-Sector Reform," The Conflict, Security and Development Group Working Papers, King's College London, 1999.

Committee (DAC) Guidelines (2004) and Handbook (2007) as well as the Reports of the UN Secretary-General in 2008 and 2013 indicated the stance of the international community to promote SSR as a major agenda for peace and development.[8] Not only the donor countries and regions such as the UK, EU and the United States (US), but the African Union (AU) also unveiled policy guidelines on SSR in 2013. In April 2014, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution on SSR, which affirmed the importance of SSR for the stability and rehabilitation of post-conflict countries.[9]

SSR covers a set of efforts and processes which are aimed at improving state and human security through the reform of security-related organizations and institutions, so that they are managed and operated in line with principles such as democratic governance, the rule of law, and human rights. It encompasses a wide range of organizations and institutions; according to the definition of OECD DAC, the actors covered in SSR are classified into: core security actors (e.g., armed forces, police forces, gendarmeries, paramilitary forces, intelligence services, and customs authorities); management and oversight bodies (the executive, legislature, ministry of defense, internal affairs, finance, and civil society organizations); justice and the rule of law (judiciary and justice ministries, prisons, criminal investigation and prosecution services, human rights commissions and ombudsmen, and customary and traditional justice systems); and non-statutory security forces (liberation armies, guerrilla armies, and private security companies).[10]

While "no single model of a security sector exists," the Report of the UN Secretary-General points out that security sectors SSR aims for have the following common features: (1) A legal framework stipulating the legitimate use of force and accountability; (2) An institutionalized system of governance and management in the security sector, including systems for financial management and human rights protection; (3) Capacities, including personnel and equipment to provide effective security; (4) Mechanisms for interaction among security actors for coordination and cooperation among them; and (5) Culture of service that promotes integrity, discipline, impartiality, and respect for human rights and shapes the manner of operation by security actors.[11] To ensure that the security sectors in post-conflict countries are equipped with these features, an array of activities are implemented ranging from the development of relevant laws and institutions and the establishment of national strategies and programs on national defense and security, to the education and training of security sector staff and personnel, the provision of weapons and uniforms, and the construction of government buildings and barracks.

---

[8]   OECD DAC, *Security System Reform and Governance*, DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, OECD, 2005; OECD DAC, *OECD DAC Handbook on Security System Reform: Supporting Security and Justice*, OECD, 2007; United Nations, "Securing Peace and Development: The Role of the United Nations in Supporting Security Sector Reform," Report of the Secretary-General, A/62/659-S/2008/39; and United Nations, "Securing States and Societies: Strengthening the United Nations Comprehensive Support to Security Sector Reform," Report of the Secretary-General, A/67/970-S/2013/480.

[9]   UN Security Council Resolution 2151 (2014), April 28, 2014.

[10] OECD DAC, *Security System Reform and Governance*, pp. 20-21. OECD DAC uses the term "security system reform," noting that "security sector" may lead to misunderstanding that it pertains only to the armed forces. Ibid. pp. 29-30. On the other hand, the Report of the UN Secretary-General, while using the term "security sector reform," adopts the same scope and classification as the OECD for the actors included in "security sector." UN, "Securing Peace and Development," para. 14. This paper uses "security sector reform" as the widely-accepted term.

[11] UN, "Securing Peace and Development," para. 15.

(2) The military and the police in SSR

While SSR activities are thus wide-ranging, this paper focuses on the roles of the military and the police. The security situation in a country immediately after the conflict tends to be extremely unstable, and therefore, institutions with coercive power, such as the police and the military, play particularly critical roles. Indeed, the conclusion of a peace agreement has often failed to stop violence after conflict. For example, in El Salvador, homicide rates peaked four years after the civil war ended in 1992, which was five times higher than the pre-war rate.[12] In Africa as well, crimes involving violent acts are said to have risen following the conclusion of peace agreements in countries such as Mozambique and Liberia.[13]

Post-conflict violence is sometimes politically oriented, as peace agreements often fail to resolve the political and social grievances as the root cause of the conflict. In the absence of employment opportunities and the limited means for livelihood, economically motivated violence is not uncommon either.[14] Unless law enforcement agencies including the police can act against such violence, a culture of impunity that essentially condones criminal acts may become widespread, leading to a vicious cycle of crimes and violence. Meanwhile, the UN peacekeepers have not necessarily been effective in addressing such violence, especially those that are perpetrated at the local level with local motives.[15] Therefore, rebuilding capable police and military of the host country is essential for improving the security situation in the aftermath of conflict and for transitioning to the phase of reconstruction and development.

In addition, there is a symbolic meaning for the military and the police to fulfill their expected functions in the context of state-building. The 2008 Report of the UN Secretary-General states that actors that actually ensure security, such as the military and the police, are among the most visible institutions representing the state for the general population, and that the proper functioning of such institutions will help increase the general public's confidence in the state.[16] In countries split into multiple antagonistic factions, gaining the public's confidence and increasing the legitimacy of the state are among the most critical aspects of peacebuilding. If sufficient confidence and legitimacy of the state are achieved, it is less likely that small delays in economic and social development would cause instability, including the recurrence of armed conflict. Furthermore, securing the people's confidence in the military and the police will allow for effective collection of security intelligence during their daily patrols and investigations, as well as the legitimate exercise of coercive power. This in turn will help further increase the legitimacy of the state. Thus, building the public's confidence in the military and the police as institutions symbolizing the state is especially important at a time when peacebuilding through state-building has become the mainstream approach.

Despite the importance of the military and the police, and despite the surge of SSR research since the 2000s as SSR becomes one of the major activities of peacebuilding, insufficient attention

---

[12] Astri Suhrke, "The Peace in Between," Astri Suhrke and Mats Berdal, eds., *The Peace in Between: Post-war Violence and Peacebuilding*, Routledge, 2012, p. 1.

[13] Mats Berdal, *Building Peace After War*, Routledge for IISS, 2009, p. 49.

[14] Ibid., pp. 53-69.

[15] See, Séverine Autesserre, "Hobbes and the Congo: Frames, Local Violence, and International Intervention," *International Organization*, Vol. 63, No. 2, pp. 249-280.

[16] UN, "Securing States and Societies," para. 8.

has been paid to how the roles of the military and the police and their interrelationship are determined, transformed, and evolve in the SSR process.[17] This is not because the roles of the military and the police are already clearly delineated in the countries and regions where SSR has been undertaken, including Africa. Rather, as Jane Chanaa argues, "The character of many African security sectors is such that it is hard to distinguish between the roles of the main players."[18] This vagueness in Africa can be partly attributed to the fact that when the countries were under European colonial rule, their security sectors including the military were formed to maintain internal security and to support colonial rule, rather than to counter external threats; this situation largely continued even after the countries became independent.[19]

The section on police reform in the OECD DAC Handbook also notes that SSR in post-conflict countries is characterized by the tendency of their unstable security situations to facilitate "militarisation in security forces," including the police, and blur the roles of the military and the police.[20]

Notwithstanding these recognitions, however, little attention has been paid to the roles of the military and the police, the division of roles among various actors within the security sector, or the process in which their roles are determined. One of the reasons behind this gap may be the understanding and norm which have been enshrined by West European countries since the 19th century and which seem to be the assumption of the internationally-led SSR—namely, that the military is mostly responsible for external threats, in particular, ensuring the state's security from militarized aggression by other countries, and that the police is responsible for maintaining domestic order and security.[21] Under this assumption, the vague division of roles between the security sector actors, including the military and the police, is construed more as a problem that should be fixed than a situation that needs to be understood.

However, it can hardly be expected that what the UN as well as donor countries/organizations envision as ideal institutions and practices for peacebuilding, including SSR, would be transplanted and rooted in their entirety in local societies. In reality, the institutions and the concepts introduced by the international community are linked or merged in various ways with the institutions and the concepts that already exist in the host countries to form "hybrid" institutions and norms. Under these circumstances, if the main purpose of SSR as a component of peacebuilding is to prevent the recurrence of conflict and contribute to economic and social development, it is important to have an in-depth understanding of the causes and the process in which the security sector took on its current form or was maintained and developed, before donors pursue what they envision as ideal institutions and practices. Only after understanding the actual situation and historical background

---

[17] While not as the central theme, literature that focus on this issue include, Alice Hills, *Policing Africa: Internal Security and the Limits of Liberalization*, Lynne Rienner, 2000.

[18] Chanaa, *Security Sector Reform*, p. 40; see also, Hills, *Policing Africa*, p. 2.

[19] Hendrickson, "A Review of Security-Sector Reform," p. 21.

[20] OECD DAC, *OECD DAC Handbook on Security System Reform*, p. 176.

[21] Ibid., p. 164. This does not mean that militaries have no internal roles in developed countries. For an analysis of the militaries' internal roles in Western countries in recent years, see, Albrecht Schnabel and Marc Krupanski, *Mapping Evolving Internal Roles of the Armed Forces*, Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2012. For the overlaps and differences in the roles played in the field by militaries and the police deployed for international peace operations, see, B.K. Greener-Barcham, "Crossing the Green or Blue Line?: Exploring the Military-Police Divide," *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, Vol. 18, No. 1, March 2007, pp. 90-112.

of a country does it become possible to analyze what roles may be possible or desirable for the military and the police of the country to play, as well as what assistance the international community can provide effectively.

(3) "Hybrid peace" and SSR in Sierra Leone

"Hybrid peace" or "hybrid peace governance" is a concept that grew out of the recognition that the recent mainstream approach of liberal peacebuilding through "the promotion of democracy, market-based economic reforms and a range of other institutions associated with 'modern' states" does not necessarily deliver the expected results.[22] Specifically, "hybrid" refers to a condition where liberal norms and institutions promoted by the international community coexist, interact, or clash with the "illiberal" institutions, norms, and actors that have formed locally, either traditionally or in circumstances of war and violence.[23] The concept covers all hybrid conditions and governance forms in between the ideal Westphalian-type liberal state, and the illiberal or sometimes authoritarian and repressive state. Hybrid peace can thus take various forms in accordance with the degree of influence that traditional, informal and/or illegal actors, such as warlords and local chiefs, have on state institutions and governance.[24]

On the "hybrid peace" concept, Dominik Zaum rightly points out that "The insight that peacebuilding outcomes are no carbon copy of donor matrixes and UN Security Council mandates, but are the result of complex political arrangements reflecting the diversity of actors and interests as well as different (and, at times, conflicting) norms and values is arguably just stating the obvious"; and "It is difficult to think of a peace that is not a hybrid peace."[25] The significance of introducing the "hybrid peace" concept lies in the fact that, first, it renewed the focus on how the intervention of the international community interacts with local actors and contexts, and what forms of "hybrid" institutions and peace are created as a result; that is, the concrete mechanisms or processes towards hybrid peace. These mechanisms and processes are analyzed from various perspectives, including game theory, path-dependence theory, and critical theory.[26] Second, the introduction of the concept has led to the recognition of two practical questions: 1) how the impacts of a "hybrid peace" situation on the peace and development of that country both at the national and local level can be assessed; and 2) how the international community's approaches to peacebuilding can be improved

---

[22] Edward Newman, Roland Paris, and Oliver Richmond, "Introduction," Newman, Paris, and Richmond, eds., *New Perspectives on Liberal Peacebuilding*, United Nations University Press, 2009, p. 3. For a brief summary of the background of the discussion and issues on "hybrid peace," see, Hikaru Yamashita, "Heiwakochiku to 'Haiburiddo na Heiwa' Ron" [Peacebuilding and "Hybrid" Peace], Briefing Memo, The National Institute for Defense Studies News, Issue 185, March 2014 <http://www.nids.go.jp/publication/briefing/pdf/2014/briefing_185.pdf> accessed August 26, 2014.

[23] Anna K. Jarstad and Roberto Belloni, "Introducing Hybrid Peace Governance: Impact and Prospects of Liberal Peacebuilding," *Global Governance*, Vol. 18, No. 1, January-March 2012, p. 1.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Dominik Zaum, "Beyond the 'Liberal Peace'," *Global Governance*, Vol. 18, No. 1, January-March 2012, p. 124.

[26] Roberto Belloni, "Hybrid Peace Governance: Its Emergence and Significance," *Global Governance*, Vol. 18, No. 1, January-March 2012, pp. 27-32.

if "hybrid peace" is presumed.[27]

This paper shows that the policies and decisions on the roles of the military and the police —as well as their transformations—in the SSR process in Sierra Leone were outcomes of the interactions of various factors, including the approaches of the international community led by the UK, the situation of the conflict, the perception of political leaders, and Sierra Leone's history. This consequently led to the emergence of a security sector with "hybrid" features. By showing that even what can be considered basic, such as the roles of the military and the police, were not static in the fast-changing (post-)conflict situations, but were determined and transformed as a result of the interactions between the international community and local actors, this paper aims to contribute to the discussions on the mechanisms that generate "hybrid peace." In addition, this paper discusses what kind of issues "hybrid" institutions and peace raise for the current SSR efforts by the international community, including Japan.[28]

Against this theoretical background, this paper chooses Sierra Leone as a case study primarily for the following two reasons. First, peacebuilding in Sierra Leone is generally considered a success. Sierra Leone has largely maintained peace for more than ten years since the end of the war in 2002.[29] In March 2014, the UN Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone (UNIPSIL) was closed, marking the transition from peacebuilding to development.[30] Moreover, national elections were held peacefully in 2002, 2007, and 2012, respectively. In particular, the fact that the 2007 election changed the government in a peaceful manner further reinforced the reputation of Sierra Leone as a successful case of peacebuilding. The success of the 2007 election was remarkable from the SSR perspective as well since it was conducted without the presence of large-scale UN troops, and the local military and police generally succeeded in maintaining security. However, the success in Sierra Leone was not because the institutions were established or reformed exactly as the international community had initially envisioned. Rather, as will be discussed later, Sierra Leone formed "hybrid" forms of institutions and the security sector. It is worthwhile to examine what impacts these institutions had on the continuing peace and stability in Sierra Leone from both the theoretical and policy perspectives.

Second, in the development process of the SSR concept and approaches since the late 1990s, Sierra Leone was one of the first major SSR programs in the post-Cold War era, comprising of the reform of the military, the police, the judiciary, and their oversight institutions. Sierra Leone was also a unique case as the UK Government concluded an MOU with the Government of Sierra

---

[27] Gearoid Millar distinguishes between four levels of hybridity—institutional, practical, ritual, and conceptual. On this basis, he argues that the influence of external actors becomes weaker at the ritual and conceptual levels, and as a result, it is impossible for the international community to plan and manage "hybrid peace" and produce predictable circumstances and experiences that contribute to peacebuilding at the local level. Gearoid Millar, "Disaggregating Hybridity: Why Hybrid Institutions Do Not Produce Predictable Experiences of Peace," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 51, No. 4, July 2014, pp. 501-514. See also, Yamashita, "Heiwakochiku to 'Haiburiddo na Heiwa' Ron."

[28] For "hybrid" institutions and peace in the field of SSR, see the papers in *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 21, No.2, 2014, Special Issue on Security Sector Reform.

[29] Literature examining why war did not resume include Kieran Mitton, "Where is the War? Explaining Peace in Sierra Leone," *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 20, No. 3, 2013, pp. 321-337.

[30] UNIPSIL, "Drawing down—the end of UN Peace Operations in Sierra Leone," <http://unipsil.unmissions.org/Default.aspx?tabid=9611&ctl=Details&mid=12590&ItemID=20681&language=en-US> accessed August 19, 2014.

Leone in 2002 in which the former pledged to provide long-term assistance for a period of ten years. In addition, the UN peacekeeping operation deployed to Sierra Leone was the largest mission at that time with 17,500 personnel, demonstrating its commitment to engage proactively in the stability of Sierra Leone. Through examining SSR by focusing on the outcomes of the proactive—and sometimes interventionist—assistance of the international community led by the UK, several practical implications could be found on the usefulness of existing SSR approaches and their limits.

2. Security Sector Reform in Sierra Leone

This section analyzes SSR in Sierra Leone, with a particular focus on the policies and decisions regarding the roles of the military and the police. First, it examines the roles of the military and the police over the period between its independence and 1991 as well as the civil war period from 1991 to 2002. Then, it analyzes the internationally supported SSR process led by the UK.

(1) The military and the police since independence

The conflict that killed more than 50,000 people and displaced over 1 million Sierra Leone populations began with a cross-border attack by a small rebel group in March 1991.[31] As this implies, the military and the police in Sierra Leone were extremely weak when the war broke out, and the situation did not improve during the war. The main interests of Sierra Leone's military were not necessarily defeating the rebels but colluding with them to exploit the civilian populations, as well as to reap the economic benefits from diamond mining. This section provides an overview of the process of politicization and corrosion of the security sector in Sierra Leone from 1961, when Sierra Leone gained independence from the British colonial rule, until 2002, when the 11-year-long conflict finally came to an end.

Politicization and corrosion after independence
The military in Sierra Leone was established in the 1890s under the British colonial rule. The primary roles of the military during the colonial period were to suppress domestic uprisings and insurgencies. The military also took part in the two world wars of the 20th century. Sierra Leoneans fought against Germany in World War I in Cameroon, and against Japan in World War II in Burma.[32] When Sierra Leone gained independence in 1961, the military largely remained intact, aside from the replacement of British military officers with Sierra Leoneans. In the years that followed, however, the military underwent changes characterized by its politicization and corrosion.

First, from 1961 to 1991, Sierra Leone witnessed at least four military coup attempts, including the one that triggered the government takeover by the All People's Congress (APC) led by Siaka Stevens who held presidency for nearly two decades from 1968.[33] The causes of the coups

---

[31]　David Keen, *Conflict and Collusion in Sierra Leone*, James Curry, 2005, p. 1.

[32]　Ismail Rashid, "'Serving the Nation?': The Disintegration and Reconstitution of the Sierra Leone Army, 1961-2007," Lansana Gberie, ed., *Rescuing a Fragile State: Sierra Leone 2002-2008*, LCMSDS Press of Wilfrid Laurier University, 2009, p. 93.

[33]　Jonathan Powell and Clayton Thyne, "Coups d'état, 1950 to Present," <http://www.uky.edu/~clthyn2/coup_data/home.htm> accessed February 21, 2014.

were varied, and it was not necessarily the military that spearheaded them. With civilian politicians forming close relations with senior military officers, struggles for power among politicians were often translated into military coups.[34] Therefore, Stevens, who attempted to establish a dictatorial regime through enacting a constitution that stipulated a one-party system in 1978, did not trust the military and adopted a policy to weaken it. The budget and equipment of the military were curbed, and the troop strength was kept small—some 2,000 to 3,000 that were considered necessary for small-scale riot control. At the same time, to increase his influence over the military, Stevens appointed to senior positions his political cronies, as well as military personnel with whom he had ethnic ties. Furthermore, the Ministry of Defence did not play any substantive roles under the APC regime.[35] As a result, when the rebel group, the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), invaded the country from the Liberian border in 1991 and gained strength in Sierra Leone, the military was too weak to make any effective responses.

Under the British colonial rule, similar to the military, the key tasks of the police were to contain domestic uprisings and maintain stability. During the colonial era, the Sierra Leone Police was considered one of the best and well-disciplined forces in the British colonies in West Africa.[36] From the 1950s, when diamond-mining workers began frequently attacking the police, it was strengthened dramatically, with the number of police officers increasing from about 290 in 1939 to about 2,000 in 1960.[37] Then, in 1964, the newly enacted Police Act prescribed the roles of the police as including the maintenance of law and order and the protection of life and property. The police could enjoy a politically neutral position until 1978, when the new Constitution was established by Stevens.[38]

From the 1970s the police was also forced to transform amid the concentration of power in the hands of Stevens. In particular, the Internal Security Unit (ISU) (renamed Special Security Division [SSD] in 1979), which was established in 1972 as the armed police unit of the police, functioned as a de facto private security force of Stevens or his ruling party, the APC. ISU was given sufficient equipment at the expense of the military. The ISU was said to have received training in Communist countries, such as Cuba, Eastern Europe and China, as well as training provided

---

[34] Thomas S. Cox, *Civil-Military Relations in Sierra Leone: A Case Study of African Soldiers in Politics*, Harvard University Press, 1976.

[35] Comfort Ero, "Sierra Leone's Security Complex," The Conflict, Security and Development Working Papers, King's College London, 2000, pp. 18-19; and Paul Jackson and Peter Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict: Security Sector Reform in Sierra Leone*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 64. By the late 1990s the Ministry of Defence was seen no more than as a "post box" that merely approved the military disbursements according to the requests made by the military. Peter Albrecht, "Transforming Internal Security in Sierra Leone," *DIIS Report*, No. 7, 2010, p. 18.

[36] Joseph P. Chris Charley and Freida Ibiduni M'Cormack, "Becoming and Remaining a 'Force for Good': Reforming the Police in Post-Conflict Sierra Leone," *IDS Research Report*, No. 70, September 2011, p. 9.

[37] Erlend Grøner Krogstad, "Security, Development, and Force: Revisiting Police Reform in Sierra Leone," *African Affairs*, Vol. 110, Issue 439, pp. 267-8. Krogstad contends that the police was strengthened not only because of the unstable security situation, but also based on the British experience and recognition that Sierra Leone needed a strong police to maintain its regime as an independent country following its independence from colonial rule.

[38] Charley and M'Cormack, "Becoming and Remaining a 'Force for Good'," p. 10.

by British and Israeli personnel in the capital city of Freetown.[39] The ISU/SSD was deployed to suppress popular uprisings and protests, including during elections and the 1977 anti-government protests by university students. The ISU/SSD soon became feared by the civilian population for its brutal crackdowns.[40] The relationship between the ISU/SSD, which Stevens privileged and strengthened, and the military, which Stevens was wary of and weakened, also deteriorated, to the point of skirmishes occurring between them in 1985.[41]

Coupled with the increasing politicization of the police, skills and performance became irrelevant to police recruitment and promotions, resulting in widespread nepotism. By the beginning of the conflict in 1991, the morale of the entire police except for the SSD had decreased considerably, and consequently, the police in general also lost public confidence. Meanwhile, although the SSD was not given sufficient vehicles or communication equipment, it was, with some 800 personnel, effectively the only institution that could maintain a capable force to fight the RUF.[42]

Sierra Leone conflict, 1991-2002

The Sierra Leone conflict cannot be understood simply as the struggle for power between the government and the RUF. The conflict emerged and progressed as a result of a complex mix of various factors, including the government's corruption and nepotism, the structure of the Sierra Leonean society and economy from which many young populations were excluded, easily extractable diamonds, the civil war in Liberia and the motives of Charles Taylor, and intervention by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the UN, and private military companies. While taking into account these complicated factors, this part examines in particular the roles of the military and the police during the conflict, and the evolving perceptions of political leaders and civilian populations.

The RUF, which crossed into Sierra Leone from Liberia in March 1991, was initially a mixed force comprised of the National Patriotic Front of Liberia led by Taylor that was fighting another conflict in Liberia, mercenaries from Burkina Faso, and some Sierra Leoneans.[43] At the beginning, the RUF had less than 300 personnel. However, it rapidly gained strength in the course of the war, and ultimately, the number of RUF personnel who participated in post-conflict DDR reached over 20,000. According to an interview survey of ex-combatants, about 80% of them were incorporated into the RUF through kidnaping. RUF thus expanded not necessarily because its political cause and claims could obtain support from the general public.[44] Despite the goals of overthrowing the

---

39 Ibid., p. 12; Ero, "Sierra Leone's Security Complex," p. 18; and Krogstad, "Security, Development, and Force," p. 274. According to Krogstad, Stevens initially divided the ISU into two units that received training from the countries on the Eastern and Western sides of the Cold War, respectively. Stevens expected that tensions between them could be used to prevent the coups d'état by the ISU. Nevertheless, the antagonism between the two units could not be controlled, and when the ISU was reorganized into SSD, all units were placed under a single command.

40 Based on their brutal acts that were committed according to the wishes of the government, the people referred to the ISU as an acronym for "I Shot You" and the SSD as "Special Stevens' Dogs."

41 Ismail Rashid, "'Serving the Nation?'" p. 94.

42 Ibid., p. 19.

43 Keen, *Conflict and Collusion in Sierra Leone*, p. 37.

44 Macartan Humphreys and Jeremy Weinstein, "What the Fighters Say: A Survey of Ex-Combatants in Sierra Leone," *CGSD Working Paper*, No. 20, 2004: pp. 26-27. Of course, considering the ex-combatants' fear of prosecution for participating in the RUF, this figure of kidnapping should be discounted.

corruption-ridden government and creating a democratic and egalitarian society in Sierra Leone, the RUF lost public backing by continuously committing atrocities against civilians, such as the cutting off of the arms, the abduction of women and children, sexual violence, and forced labor for diamond mining.[45]

Nevertheless, the already-corroded Sierra Leone military could not deal with the rebels effectively. For economically impoverished soldiers, it was more attractive to mine diamonds and to rob money and goods from civilians, than to put their lives in danger by fighting the RUF. Intense fighting between the military and the RUF were therefore rather rare, occurring mostly in the diamond-producing areas.[46] Once it became difficult for the RUF to purchase weapons from Liberia, the military colluded with the RUF and even sold its weapons to the RUF.[47]

As the RUF steadily gained strength, the military also staged several coups during the conflict. Accusing the APC government of rampant corruption and power abuse and committing to end the civil war, the National Provisional Ruling Council (NPRC) led by Valentine Strasser staged a coup and swept into power in April 1992, one year after the beginning of the conflict.[48] To crush the RUF, the NPRC rapidly expanded the size of the military from 3,500 personnel at the beginning of the conflict to over 15,000. Most were criminals or young, jobless people, however, and they received hardly any military training; the military failed to quash the RUF, and if anything, violence against civilians intensified further.[49]

Subsequently, in January 1996, a coup d'état led by Brig. Julius Maada Bio overthrew the NPRC government. However, with pressure from the international community, multiparty elections were held in February and March 1996 for the first time since the introduction of the one-party system in 1978. The Sierra Leone People's Party (SLPP) won the elections, and Ahmad Tejan Kabbah assumed the presidency. While defeating the RUF was a pressing issue for the new government, Kabbah hesitated to use the politicized and corroded military. Instead, Kabbah employed the Executive Outcomes, a private military company that was primarily comprised of ex-South African military personnel of the apartheid era, as well as the Civil Defence Forces (CDF) made up of Kamajors and other vigilante groups. The RUF incurred heavy losses, and in November 1996, the Abidjan Peace Accord was reached.[50]

The CDF was comprised of several militia organizations such as Kamajors. These militias were based on the ethnic identity of their origins and were established to ensure the security of their communities. Therefore, it is said that these organizations swore allegiance not to the state leader but to the leaders of their own communities. When Kabbah took office, he succeeded in

---

[45] Keen, *Conflict and Collusion in Sierra Leone*, pp. 41-43.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Ibid., pp. 107-121.

[48] Mimmi Söderberg Kovacs, "Bringing the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly into the Peace Fold: The Republic of Sierra Leone's Armed Forces After the Lomé Peace Agreement," Roy Licklider, ed., *New Armies from Old: Merging Competing Military Forces after Civil Wars*, Georgetown University Press, 2014, pp. 196-197.

[49] Ashlee Godwin and Cathy Haenlein, "Security-Sector Reform in Sierra Leone: The UK Assistance Mission in Transition," *RUSI Journal*, Vol. 158, No. 6, p. 32. It is said that the personnel also included "ghost soldiers" that joined only for obtaining salaries and food rations. International Crisis Group, "Sierra Leone: Time for a New Military and Political Strategy," *Africa Report*, No. 28, 2001, p. 6.

[50] During the negotiating process for the peace accord, the RUF strongly requested the withdrawal of the Executive Outcomes, as stipulated in Article 12 of the Abidjan Peace Accord. Abidjan Peace Accord <http://www.sierra-leone.org/abidjanaccord.html> accessed February 21, 2014.

garnering the support of the CDF by appointing Sam Hinga Norman, whom Kamajors pledged their loyalty to, as the Deputy Minister of Defence.[51] On the one hand, the military was not given adequate equipment, food, or salaries on schedule, and it simply lost the capacity and morale to defeat the RUF. On the other hand, the CDF was able to maintain its morale and effective capabilities and was given trainings from the Executive Outcomes.[52]

In May 1997, however, a group of the military staged a coup once again. While Kabbah fled to Guinea, the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) took power. The direct cause of the coup was the Kabbah and SLPP government's "plot" to decrease spending on the military and use the savings to provide equipment, food, and other supplies to the CDF.[53] In his letter to the ECOWAS Chairman, AFRC leader Johnny Koroma noted that priority was given to Kamajors over the military for the provision of ammunition, food, and other supplies, and criticized Kabbah that "This was enough indication of the preference for the private army over our Armed Forces, foreshadowing the ultimate replacement of the Constitutional Defence Force by Mr. Kabbah's hunters."[54] For the military, Kabbah's preferential treatment of Kamajors and belittling of the military were reminiscent of the Stevens regime's favoring of the ISU/SSD over the military.[55] Subsequently, the AFRC decided to invite what was supposed to have been its adversary, the RUF, into the regime and established the AFRC-RUF coalition government. Under the AFRC-RUF government, the police were alleged to have had close relations with Kabbah, and many police officers became a target of repression.[56]

However, the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) succeeded in regaining the control of Freetown, and Kabbah reassumed the presidency in March 1998. After a temporary lull of the situation, the death sentence to the RUF leader Sankoh in October 1998 re-intensified the fighting with the RUF. The RUF raided Freetown in January 1999, leaving many dead and bringing most of the city under its control. While ECOMOG later recaptured the capital once again, the fighting sparked stronger calls among the international community that the conflict should quickly be brought to an end; in July 1999, the Lomé Peace Agreement was concluded. Although several incidents such as the hostage-taking of the personnel of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) occurred intermittently, the RUF became nearly unable to fight back militarily following the intervention of the UK and Guinea. Following the Abuja Ceasefire Agreement in November 2000, the disarmament of the forces predominantly made up of the RUF and the CDF was completed in January 2002, and President Kabbah formally declared the end of the conflict.

---

[51] Ero, "Sierra Leone's Security Complex," pp. 21-22.

[52] In reality, as of 1997, although the official number of military personnel was 18,000, the actual number was around 8,000. In contrast, Kamajors is said to have had a troop strength of roughly 20,000. Ibid., p. 22.

[53] International Crisis Group, "Sierra Leone," p. 7. Kabbah and his aides were developing a plan to make proactive use of the CDF, while slashing the number of military personnel from 18,000 to 3,000. Ero, "Sierra Leone's Security Complex," p. 20.

[54] Letter from AFRC Chairman Major Johnny Paul Koroma to ECOWAS Chairman Sani Abacha, August 1997, <http://www.sierra-leone.org/AFRC-RUF/AFRC-0897.html> accessed February 21, 2014.

[55] Ero, "Sierra Leone's Security Complex," p. 21.

[56] Charley and M'Cormack, "Becoming and Remaining a 'Force for Good,'" p. 15.

(2) A tale of two reforms: military and police

Given the incapacity of the military and the police to quell even a small rebel group, as well as the record of their egregious behavior, including the repetition of coups and violence and exploitation against civilians, it was unquestionable that SSR was essential for peacebuilding in Sierra Leone. Considering the loss of public confidence in the corrupted security sector, it was also obvious that simply strengthening the military and the police by providing training and equipment could not be the answer to the problem. A fundamental reexamination of the military and the police is needed, including their raison d'etre and missions.[57] As SSR was commenced in around 1998, the situation of the conflict and the performance of the military and the police strongly affected the direction of SSR, including the status and the roles of the military and the police.[58]

Military reform

As Peter Albrecht argues "More than anything, the Sierra Leone SSR process was designed to contain the armed forces," military reform was the central component of the SSR in Sierra Leone.[59] Different from the police, therefore, the military was a target of fundamental examination including its raison d'etre.[60] During Kabbah's exile in Guinea, the complete demobilization of the military and expansion of the police, like Costa Rica, were proposed and discussed seriously. This proposal might be unsurprising given the past human rights violations committed by the military, the forced exile of Kabbah due to a military coup, and the fact that Sierra Leone hardly faced any serious external security threats with an expectation to receive security support from Nigeria. Furthermore, the record that the armed police unit, the SSD, effectively protected Freetown from RUF attack in January 1999 also corroborated the proposal to disband the military and strengthen the police.[61] In fact, when Kabbah returned to power in 1998, the military was demobilized temporarily.[62] Nonetheless, by December 1999, the military was ultimately reinstated due to continuing instability, and amid concerns that demobilized soldiers might join or form a rebel group for their livelihood and survival.[63]

The decision to retain the military did not mean that the roles and status of the military were also determined, let alone dispelling the distrust of the military. "National Security Policy: Proposals and Recommendations," announced in 2000, for example, proposed that the CDF would be reorganized into the Territorial Defence Force (TDF) to assume defense roles at the community level and provide assistance to the military as necessary using local intelligence and knowledge. However, there arose the issue of whether it would be the Ministry of Defence or the Ministry of

---

[57] Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, p. 20.

[58] In around 1998 when the UK government started providing assistance, the SSR concept was still under development, and hardly any efforts were made to link military reform and police reform. By around 2000, however, there began to be a recognition that both activities needed to be implemented in an integrated manner. Ibid., p. 54.

[59] Albrecht, "Transforming Internal Security in Sierra Leone," p. 51.

[60] With regard to the military, the 1996 Abidjan Peace Accord and the 1999 Lomé Peace Agreement state only that ex-combatants of the RUF, CDF, and other armed groups wishing to be integrated into the military would be permitted to do so if they satisfy the requirements. The agreements do not state how the military would be reformed specifically.

[61] Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, pp. 58-59.

[62] Ibid., p. 12.

[63] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

Internal Affairs that would manage the TDF. In addition, as the integration of some CDF personnel into the national military proceeded based on their individual preferences under the Military Reintegration Programme, the TDF concept gradually lost political momentum and priority. Then, building a single unified military naturally became the only viable option for the Sierra Leone's defense structure.[64]

Subsequently, the Defence White Paper was released in 2003. Its aim was to share with the people the progress of the military reform, as well as to provide the basis for the forthcoming Defence Review. The White Paper included the past, present, and future direction of defense as well as the agendas of military reform.[65] The White Paper was prepared under the leadership of the Ministry of Defence, based on discussions with the subcommittees on the defense and financial affairs of the Parliament and relevant government agencies. The publication of the White Paper was considered "a watershed in the history of governance and management of defence" in Sierra Leone.[66]

Chapter 1 of the Defence White Paper contains a section titled "Threats and Challenges," which is divided into "Threats," "Small Arms," "Ex-Combatants," and "Corruption." In the "Threats" section, it states that national security threats can come from outside and inside the country, and that civil authorities, particularly the police, take the lead for ensuring domestic security, while the military protects the integrity of territorial land, air, and waters from aggressors and refrains from intervening in domestic issues without a formal request from civil authorities.[67] Meanwhile, it notes that the greatest threats presently facing the people of Sierra Leone are socioeconomic problems, such as poverty, unemployment, lack of housing, poor education, and inadequate health support.

In the sections of "Small Arms," "Ex-Combatants," and "Corruption," the White Paper recognizes that these issues are all either problems of crime, such as illegal possession of arms, or socioeconomic problems, such as the unemployment and dissatisfaction of ex-combatants. Thus, facing threats seemed to simply fall outside of the military's jurisdiction.[68] This recognition that the primary security threats to Sierra Leone lie not with external but internal sources was also affirmed in the Defense Review conducted from 2003 to 2005.[69] Based on this perception of threat, the military was given no more than an abstract role: defending against external threats. The Defence White Paper touches only on the military's supportive role for civil authorities and participation in peace operations, which were later adopted as concrete tasks of the military.

---

[64] Ibid., pp. 77-78.

[65] Republic of Sierra Leone, "Defence White Paper: Informing the People," 2003, chapter 1, para. 2.

[66] Al-Hassan Kharamoh Kondeh "Formulating Sierra Leone's Defence White Paper," Peter Albrecht and Paul Jackson, eds., *Security Sector Reform in Sierra Leone 1997-2007: Views from the Front Line*, Lit Verlag, 2010, p. 159.

[67] The Constitution enacted in 1991 identifies the principal function of the Armed Forces of Sierra Leone as preserving the safety and territorial integrity of the state, participating in its development, safeguarding the Sierra Leonean people's achievements, and protecting the Constitution. Republic of Sierra Leone, The Constitution of Sierra Leone, 1991 (Act No. 6 of 1991), article 165.

[68] Republic of Sierra Leone, "Defence White Paper: Informing the People," 2003, chapter 1, para. 10-13.

[69] Paul Jackson and Peter Albrecht, "Introduction: The Roots of Security Sector Reform in Sierra Leone," Albrecht and Jackson, eds., *Security Sector Reform in Sierra Leone 1997-2007*, p. 12.

The reform and reconstruction of the Sierra Leone military made gradual progress with international assistance led by the UK. However, as noted, the central issue at the beginning was how to contain the military and strengthen the police on the matter of domestic security. Therefore, the role of the military was not made necessarily clear, and as a result, the military lost a professional identity.[70] This further resulted in the deterioration of the relationship between the military and the police.[71] Under this circumstance, the introduction of two policies was particularly important.

First, the Military Aid to the Civil Power (MACP) policy was introduced in 2004. This policy sets out under what conditions and how the military can support civil authorities, especially the police, even if relative stability and territorial integrity are maintained. MACP allows the military to assume defined tasks and/or address specific situations in order to support the police under the authorization from the National Security Council (NSC) chaired by the President.[72] MACP has been so far invoked on several occasions. In particular, during the 2007 and 2012 presidential and parliamentary elections as well as the elections of local-level chiefs, the military was deployed in advance to key areas such as polling stations, providing support to the police without excessive intervention.[73] Thus, the MACP policy defined the ways in which the military would be engaged in domestic security issues and their procedures. This in turn contributed to clarifying the differences in the roles between the military and the police, and made it easier to prevent the military's arbitrary intervention in domestic politics. In addition, the policy also contributed to improving the deteriorating relationship between the military and the police.[74] In recent years, however, concerns have been raised within the government of Sierra Leone over the easy and frequent use of MACP. These concerns are, as will be discussed later, closely related to the debates over the strengthening of armed police.[75]

Second, the 2003 Defence White Paper lists participation in peace support operations as one of the future challenges, and states that the military would receive the training for such operations. It also refers to the long-term aspiration to participate in such missions as peace enforcement and disaster relief overseas.[76] The participation in international military operations, including UN peacekeeping, was considered to elevate national pride and boost operational capabilities, as well as bring in additional revenue to the Sierra Leone government.[77] In January 2008, six years after the conclusion of the war, Sierra Leone committed one infantry company to the ECOWAS Standby Force, and actually deployed one infantry company to the UN Assistance Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) from 2009 to 2013. Furthermore, since June 2013, Sierra Leone deployed a battalion of some 850 personnel, the largest international deployment since the end of the conflict. While these deployments depended on equipment and other supports from the US and other countries, participating in these overseas operations was critical for shaping the new role and identity of the military and developing the capabilities and disciplines that could meet international standards.

---

[70] Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, pp. 152-153.
[71] Alfred Nelson-Williams, "Restructuring the Republic of Sierra Leone Armed Forces," Albrecht and Jackson, eds., *Security Sector Reform in Sierra Leone 1997-2007*, p. 125.
[72] Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, pp. 152-153.
[73] Godwin and Haenlein, "Security-Sector Reform in Sierra Leone," p. 33.
[74] Alfred Nelson-Williams, "Restructuring the Republic of Sierra Leone Armed Forces," p. 125.
[75] Albrecht, "Transforming Internal Security in Sierra Leone," p. 53.
[76] Republic of Sierra Leone, "Defence White Paper: Informing the People," 2003, chapter 1, para. 20.
[77] Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, pp. 154-155.

There seems to be a huge potential for these deployments to become one of the major tasks of the Sierra Leone military in the future.[78]

Police reform

By 1991 when the conflict began, the police lost almost all public confidence, as did the military, due to pervasive corruption and its inability to maintain public order and security. When Kabbah assumed the presidency in 1996, he strongly felt that the legitimacy of the state as a security provider needed to be boosted as various rebels and self-defense groups flourished in the country. Therefore, Kabbah requested the UK to support police reform as part of the reform of civil administrative organizations.[79] In the same year, an advisory council on police reform chaired by Kabbah and a council to review specific reform proposals were established within the government of Sierra Leone.[80] While these initiatives temporarily stagnated due to the coup in 1997, they resumed when Kabbah returned to power in 1998. Due to a combination of various factors, including that Kabbah himself was the chair of the advisory council, that a temporary lull in fighting gave room for reform, that Kabbah perceived restoring law and order an urgent issue, and that funding assistance from the donor was available, police reform became a priority agenda for the Kabbah government.[81]

In August 1998, the Policing Charter was unveiled, articulating the roles of the police, the government, and the general public. The Charter prescribes that to return the communities to peace and prosperity, the police acts in a manner that will "eventually remove the need for the deployment of Military and Para-Military Forces from our villages, communities and city Streets."[82] It meant that the police, not the military, should play a leading role for maintaining domestic security, or in other words, "police primacy." The Mission Statement of the police that it prepared based on the Charter also states that the police "takes primacy in the maintenance of law and order." Thus, "police primacy" is a key concept to understand the roles and nature of the Sierra Leone police after the conflict.[83]

The Commonwealth Police Development Task Force (CPDTF) comprised of police reform experts mainly from the UK was dispatched to Sierra Leone to support police reform. Among the most contentious issues facing the CPDTF was the treatment of the SSD.[84] As already noted, the SSD relentlessly used force to suppress uprisings as the de facto private security force of Stevens

---

[78] In terms of the number of personnel per capita, Sierra Leone has deployed more personnel than Nigeria until its withdrawal from Somalia in 2015. Godwin and Haenlein, "Security-Sector Reform in Sierra Leone," p. 33; and Alhaji Saidu Kamara, "Sierra Leone Sends 850 Soldiers to Somalia," *Sierra Express Media*, March 28, 2013. In addition, the police have established a PKO bureau and have so far deployed personnel to UN PKO missions in Haiti, Darfur, and Somalia. Godwin and Haenlein, "Security-Sector Reform in Sierra Leone," p. 36; and Historical Background of the Sierra Leone Peacekeeping Operations Department, <http://www.police. gov.sl/content.php?p=21&pn=Peace%20Keeping%20Operations> accessed February 25, 2014.

[79] Albrecht, "Transforming Internal Security in Sierra Leone," p. 26; and Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, pp. 52-54.

[80] Charley and M'Cormack, "Becoming and Remaining a 'Force for Good'," p. 13.

[81] Ibid., p. 14.

[82] The Policing Charter, August 1998 <http://police.gov.sl/about/objectives/> accessed November 12, 2015.

[83] Sierra Leone Police Mission Statement, 1998 <http://www.police.gov.sl/content.php?p=6&pn=Objectives> accessed February 21, 2014.

[84] Krogstad, "Security, Development, and Force," p. 262.

and the APC, and was feared by the people. Furthermore, due to the preferential treatment given to the SSD over other police units, it was believed that the existence of the SSD would undermine the unity of the police. The Kabbah government therefore considered its disbandment.[85]

The Policing Charter, which was unveiled in the early stage of the police reform, did not necessarily emphasize "security," but rather the police's contribution to "development" through its reform. The armed SSD, therefore, was assumed to be trimmed down eventually. In fact, the CPDTF report attached importance to police management and control as well as community policing, and did not make any reference to the SSD.[86] However, in January 1999, when the SSD effectively prevented the RUF's invasion of the western area of Freetown, the perception of the SSD changed significantly not only among the Sierra Leonean government and people, but also among international police reform experts.[87] External experts began to send their proposals to the UK government for strengthening the police by providing weapons and equipment to the SSD. As an agency for international development, DFID initially hesitated to provide weapons and equipment which it deemed was outside the scope of its primary mandate. Nonetheless, DFID began to gradually recognize the necessity following discussions within the UK government, in particular, the FCO and the MoD.[88]

Erlend Krogstad points out that the term "police primacy" was gradually construed as an obligation of the police to have the ability to tackle other armed groups. He further states that the inherent logic of "security-development nexus" concept used by DFID shifted to mean that establishing an armed presence of the police would give the people a sense of reassurance, which then was necessary for development. The SSD which used to scare the people and was seen as a drawback to development was now, ironically, perceived as an indispensable actor for development and democratization.[89] Indeed, it was the SSD, which was renamed the Operational Support Division (OSD) in 2003, that succeeded UNAMSIL's responsibility to maintain local stability when the UN mission withdrew from the eastern part of Sierra Leone in September 2004.[90]

As a result of this change in perception towards the SSD, it expanded from making up just roughly one-fifth of the entire police force in the late 1990s, to one-third by 2005.[91] Moreover, amid persistent concerns over the military's involvement in domestic security issues through the MACP, further strengthening and expanding OSD have remained as an attractive option within the government.[92] In fact, prior to the 2012 elections, despite the tight financial situation of the Sierra Leonean government, the OSD purchased weapons totaling approximately $4.5 million, including machine guns and grenade launchers, under the pretext of protecting citizens from terrorism.[93]

Increasing the importance of the OSD as well as expanding its size and capabilities are not

---

[85] Albrecht, "Transforming Internal Security in Sierra Leone," p. 27.

[86] Krogstad, "Security, Development, and Force," pp. 270-271.

[87] Ibid., p. 275; and Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, pp. 58-59.

[88] Krogstad, "Security, Development, and Force," pp. 272-273.

[89] Ibid., pp. 277-278.

[90] Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, p. 103.

[91] Krogstad, "Security, Development, and Force," p. 264.

[92] Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, pp. 143-144.

[93] Richard Downie, *Building Police Institutions in Fragile States: Case Studies from Africa*, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2013, p. 13. However, this revelation triggered public criticisms, and the weapons were ultimately handed over for the military's use for AMISOM.

without concerns. For example, during the 2007 election period, presidential candidate Ernest Bai Koroma employed a former RUF commander and his subordinates as his bodyguards. After winning the election, Koroma had them trained overseas and employed them as officers of the OSD's Presidential Guard Police Unit, raising concerns over the risk of the politicization of the OSD.[94] Furthermore, Krogstad notes that the actual job of the ISU during the Stevens era and the job of the present OSD are the same, and that senior officers of the OSD in fact perceive that the training received in Cuba during the ISU days is relevant even now. This indicates that the police reform has not necessarily resulted in changing the mentality of the OSD personnel.[95]

Thus, despite the history of crackdowns on citizens, the raison d'etre of the SSD/OSD was gradually recognized by both the government of Sierra Leone and donor countries in the face of an unstable security situation during the police reform. Moreover, with underlying concerns over the military's involvement in domestic issues, the momentum for the OSD's expansion and strengthening has remained even after the end of the conflict, while on the other hand, concerns have begun to emerge over its politicization.

Within the Sierra Leone police organization, lying at the opposite end from the SSD/OSD in terms of the nature of the mission, is the Family Support Unit (FSU). Its predecessor, the Domestic Violence Unit (DVU), was first established in 1999 within a police station in the eastern part of Freetown to address domestic violence against women. The DVU was established against the backdrop that many women were abducted and/or forced into marriage with RUF soldiers during the conflict, and that as a result domestic violence was rampant in the country. Subsequently, in 2001, the mandate of DVU was expanded to include addressing the exploitation of children and sexual crimes, in addition to domestic violence, and the unit was reorganized into the FSU.[96] Furthermore, the FSU began to be introduced at other police stations. As of early 2011, 43 FSUs were operational across the country.[97]

The FSU was remarkable as it originated at the initiative of a single Sierra Leonean police officer, rather than external donors such as the UK. The FSU was a particularly groundbreaking effort in Sierra Leone, where family matters were normally handled by the traditional and cultural mechanisms of society, rather than by the police.[98] It was also remarkable that an initiative that began at one police station then caught the attention of the international police reform support team, which in turn led to the proliferation of FSUs nationwide, and to the UN's provision of support for the training materials for FSU officers. Furthermore, at the request of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), it was decided that similar units would be created at police stations in Liberia. To support the establishment of the FSU in Liberia, Sierra Leonean FSU officers were

94   Maya M. Christensen and Mats Utas, "Mercenaries of Democracy: The 'Politricks' of Remobilized Combatants in the 2007 General Elections, Sierra Leone," *African Affairs*, Vol. 107, Issue 429, p. 538.

95   Krogstad, "Security, Development, and Force," p. 280.

96   Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, p. 58; and Saa Matthias Bendu, "Police Family Support Unit: The Scourge of Sierra Leonean Men," Sierra Leone 365 <http://sierraleone365.com/feature-stories/police-family-support-unit-the-scourge-of-sierra-leonean-men> accessed February 24, 2014.

97   Downie, "Building Police Institutions in Fragile States," p. 9.

98   Charley and M'Cormack, "Becoming and Remaining a 'Force for Good'," p. 32.

dispatched to Liberia.[99] Thus, the FSU and the SSD/OSD were (re-)established and strengthened with very distinctive and contrastive missions and roles in their common pursuit of police reform, in order to respond to various needs in Sierra Leonean society.

Under the banner of SSR in Sierra Leone, military reform and police reform were carried out under contrastive directions and policies. While the cut-down or even dismantling of the military were seriously considered based on its notorious records of coups, violence and abuse against civilians, the police was expected to play a leading role in maintaining domestic security. That said, the reforms of the military and the police also had several points in common. First, in the face of ongoing conflict, realistic measures were strongly demanded rather than pursuing an ideal. As a result, the military escaped from being abolished, while the continuation and strengthening of the OSD/SSD were decided. As decisions were often made on an ad-hoc basis, strongly conditioned by the situation of the moment, the military in particular was not necessarily given a clear role at the beginning. Its role only gradually became clear as Sierra Leone transitioned from conflict to peacebuilding and reconstruction. Similarly, the role of the police was not necessarily static, as demonstrated by the establishment of the FSU in response to the post-conflict local situation. In addition, the roles of the military and the police were not determined independently, but the policies and decisions on their roles were mutually and closely linked. The initial plan to downsize the military was conceived on the premise of expanding the roles of the police or armed police unit. Furthermore, with underlying concerns over the military's involvement in domestic security affairs through MACP, it seems the expansion of the OSD has continued to be a real option within the government.

Conclusion

This paper analyzed the policies and decisions on the roles of the military and the police in the case of post-conflict SSR in Sierra Leone, by looking at a range of factors such as the historical background, the situation of the conflict, and the perceptions of various actors, both internal and external. This conclusion summarizes several findings and examines the challenges facing the SSR efforts of the international community including Japan.

First, as Paul Jackson and Peter Albrecht succinctly argue that "SSR is governed by context and entry points and is, above all, an evolutionary process guided by individuals," this paper showed that even the seemingly basic matters, such as the roles of the military and the police, are often not predetermined or unchangeable; rather, they are influenced by multiple, fluid factors, such as historical context, the situation of the conflict, and the ever-shifting perception of political leaders.[100] In Sierra Leone, the frequent coup attempts by the politicized military prompted President Kabbah—he himself a victim of a coup—to give serious considerations to abolishing the military. However, following the introduction of MACP in 2004, the military was given a newly clarified role of helping the police maintain public security in the country. The military also explored its new raison d'etre through participating in peacekeeping operations abroad and seems to have succeeded to some extent.

---

[99]   Interview of Kadi Fakondo, Assistant Inpector General of Sierra Leone Police by Arthur Boutellis on May 5, 2008, Innovations for Successful Societies, Princeton University <http://www.princeton.edu/successfulsocieties/content/focusareas/PL/oralhistories/view.xml?id=229> accessed February 24, 2014.

[100] Jackson and Albrecht, *Reconstructing Security after Conflict*, pp.206-207.

Meanwhile, the abolishment or scaling down of the SSD/OSD, like the military, was considered due to its egregious acts against the general public before the conflict. However, the perception towards the SSD/OSD saw a dramatic shift after it protected the capital city from the rebel group during the conflict, coupled with the real need to ensure security amid an unstable situation at the beginning of the SSR process. Therefore, the SSD/OSD was given a proactive role in peacebuilding in Sierra Leone. Some momentum to expand and strengthen the SSD/OSD also seemed to persist, based on the continuing distrust of the military.

Thus, in an extremely fluid situation during a conflict, the raison d'etre of the military and the police can be fundamentally questioned. The perception and policies towards the military and the police can change considerably, as the surrounding situation rapidly changes. Even if a division of roles between the military and the police is decided, political moves to further clarify or expand the roles under certain limitations can persist. This may continue in the context of domestic politics even after the externally-led SSR comes to an end.

Second, the Sierra Leone SSR proceeded as liberal and illiberal ideas were mingled together as the "hybrid peace" thesis predicts. In particular, the international police reform support team initially intended to downsize or abolish the SSD/OSD, assuming that it did not fit with the "liberal" model of the police. However, in the face of the conflict, and on the basis of the changing interpretation of the "security-development nexus" concept, the continuation of the SSD/OSD was later positively legitimized. Nonetheless, the moves to further expand and politicize the OSD also indicate that the liberal ideas that formed the basis of the police reform project have been forced to make compromises in the local context and politics. At the same time, the non-changing mentality of OSD personnel implies the persistence of illiberal ideas even after the reform.

Particularly noteworthy from the perspective of "hybrid peace" may be that institutions and organizations such as the FSU that are deemed to be more in line with liberal ideas were, in reality, initiated not by the international community but by local initiatives. Contrary to the all-too-common dichotomous representation of "enforcement of liberal ideas and institutions by the international community" vs. "resistance with illiberal ideas and institutions by the local government and society," in the FSU case, a liberal institution that deviates from traditional norms of the local society was indeed proposed by a local actor and later accepted by the international community.[101] This suggests the limits of simplistic dichotomies, such as "international community = liberal" vs. "local society = illiberal." Moreover, it shows the importance of a detailed analysis of the processes and mechanisms through which the international community and the local society interact.

Meanwhile, the fact that the hybrid security sector in Sierra Leone has so far succeeded in maintaining stability in the country also suggests that failing to realize the ideal security sector initially envisioned by donors and the international community does not necessarily equal the failure of SSR. The case of Sierra Leone seems to suggest the necessity of a framework that can evaluate "hybrid" security sectors created through interactions with local society initiatives and demands.

Finally, the "hybrid peace" concept and the case of Sierra Leone suggest challenges facing the international community including Japan in effectively providing SSR assistance. The international

---

[101] See Yamashita, "Heiwakochiku to 'Haiburiddo na Heiwa' Ron."

community cannot place the SSR process under full control even in the most favorable situation. Especially if the international community lacks political will, as well as political and economic means to induce or coerce the local government and leaders, the influence of the international community will be further limited.[102] In Sierra Leone, the international community seemed to be able to exert relatively strong influence as the UK political leaders committed long-term support for SSR, and more importantly, Sierra Leone was exceptionally open to external support. Nonetheless, the institutions were not developed as initially anticipated.

It is true that since the SSR concept was still under development and the UK did not have a clear vision of SSR when it began the support in Sierra Leone, its approach was forced to undergo some twists and compromises. Regardless of this unique situation, however, the international community would have little leeway when SSR is conducted during conflict, since security imperatives often overwhelm the initial vision of the security sector, as was the case in Afghanistan and elsewhere. In addition, after the military and the police are rehabilitated and the involvement of the international community is concluded, the security sector and institutions within the country can be easily distorted in the domestic political process with little room for influence from external actors.

This seems to suggest the importance of flexibility in SSR. If SSR progresses as a variety of recognitions and policies of a multiple actors both internal and external clash, merge, coexist and/or transform, the consequence will likely be a hybrid security sector and institutions. However, it is difficult to assess in advance how such a "hybrid" security sector functions as a whole and affects the security situation; they will become clear only gradually and perhaps retrospectively.

This does not deny the meaning of having a comprehensive and ideal vision for the security sector. However, sticking to achieving such a vision as the supreme goal may simply be futile; rather, a more realistic and effective approach for the external actor might be to focus its support on a specific area, which it considers most important, effective and efficient while flexibly updating its objectives and goals under certain principles, based on the local context and situations. At the very least, recognizing the limitations of external support and its influence as well as the importance of deeply understanding the historical and situational context of the host country is essential if Japan and the international community wish to implement more effective and efficient SSR in post-conflict countries.

---

[102] Mark Sedra, "Towards Second Generation Security Sector Reform," Sedra, ed., *The Future of Security Sector Reform*, Centre for International Governance and Innovation, 2010, p. 108.