Natural Resources as Drivers of Conflicts Escalation in Africa: Water, Arable and Pastoral Lands as a Case Study

الموارد الطبيعية كعوامل لتصعيد النزاعات في إفريقيا : المياه والأراضي الزراعية والرعوية نموذجا

Asma Rassouli*
University of Constantine 3
asma.rassouli@univ-constantine3.dz

Date of send:19/04/2026 **Date of acceptance**:03/06/2026 **Date of publication** ;11/06/2026

Abstract:

This study examines natural resource conflicts and the factors contributing to their escalation in Africa, with a particular focus on conflicts over water resources, as well as arable and pastoral lands, which are widely prevalent across the continent.

Drawing on a descriptive-analytical approach and a case study methodology, the study examines the phenomenon of natural resource conflict and provides an in-depth understanding of its various manifestations in relation to water, arable, and pastoral resources in Africa, through the analysis of selected applied cases.

The study concludes that the variable of natural resource conflict cannot be used in isolation to explain the escalation of conflicts, as it is intertwined with a set of structural and institutional factors that contribute to the complexity and intensification of these conflicts within the African context.

Keywords:

Africa - Arable and Pastoral lands - Conflict - Natural Resources - Water.

* ***Corresponding author***

Introduction

Natural resources constitute a fundamental source for ensuring the welfare and prosperity of societies. They represent one of the key pillars upon which processes of economic and social development are built, while also forming a crucial link in the chain of power relations and interactions among various international actors because of their strategic significance to economic activities. This has often transformed resources into catalysts for tension and conflict both within and between states, particularly in light of their scarcity on the one hand, and the growing pressures exerted on them as a result of climate change, environmental degradation, and rapid population growth accompanied by rising needs on the other. Consequently, competition over the exploitation and control of resources has intensified, leading to the escalation of conflicts in their various forms and levels.

The phenomenon of competition and conflict over natural resources is particularly visible in Africa. Despite the continent's immense wealth of natural resources, it remains one of the geographical spaces most vulnerable to resource-related conflicts, whether at the domestic level among local communities or at the regional level between neighboring states. These conflicts are intertwined with complex issues of development, security, and stability, particularly in light of worsening environmental degradation, resource scarcity, and weak management mechanisms. Such conditions have deepened socio-political tensions and escalated conflicts between competing parties, which may reach varying degrees of violence.

Water, in particular, is considered one of the most strategic natural resources for states, given the vital role it plays in preserving biodiversity and achieving multidimensional development. Due to the limited nature of this resource and the inadequacy of the infrastructure required to guarantee its supply in Africa, the continent has witnessed several conflicts whose primary aimed at securing access to water, especially in cases where water supplies are shared either among local communities or between states, such as the regional conflict over the waters of the Nile River. In addition to ongoing disputes over agricultural and pastoral lands, such as those occurring between herders and farmers in several Sahel countries as agricultural expansion increasingly encroaches upon grazing lands.

Against this background, the present study seeks to investigate the relationship between competition over natural resources and the escalation of conflicts in Africa, with the aim of reaching a comprehensive understanding of the factors that consolidate this correlation. It does so by focusing on a number of applied models of conflicts over water as well as arable and pastoral lands across the continent.

- **Research Objectives**

- To clarify the significance and characteristics of natural resources and the concept of conflict surrounding them.

- To review the main theoretical approaches explaining the relationship between natural resources and conflict.

- To highlight the manifestations of disputes over water, arable and pastoral lands by presenting the most prominent conflict hotspots in Africa.

- To analyze the different factors underlying the outbreak and escalation of resource-related conflicts on the African continent.

- **Research Problem**

This study seeks to answer the following central question:

To what extent does competition over natural resources—particularly water, arable and pastoral lands—contribute to the escalation of conflicts in Africa?

To address this main problem, the following sub-questions are raised:

- What characteristics make natural resources a source of competition and international conflict?

- How have theoretical approaches concerned with conflict and environmental issues explained the relationship between conflict over natural resources and conflict escalation?

- Is reliance on the factors of resource scarcity and climate change sufficient to explain the causes of intensifying conflicts in Africa?

- What are the most significant hotspots for water, arable and pastoral land disputes in Africa?

- How do the various political, economic, and cultural factors accompanying environmental pressures contribute to conflict escalation on the continent?

- **Research Hypotheses**

To address the main and subsidiary questions of this study, the following hypotheses have been adopted:

- **Main Hypothesis:** Competition over natural resources constitute a fundamental factor in the outbreak and escalation of conflicts in Africa, particularly through their interaction with other environmental, structural, and institutional factors.

- **Sub-Hypotheses**

- The escalation of conflicts over natural resources is not linked solely to scarcity or abundance, but also to environmental, economic, political, social, and even cultural factors.

- The worsening and escalation of resource-related conflicts are associated with the weakness of state institutions and the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of the mechanisms adopted for resource governance.

- The overlap of ethnic, political, and economic factors with conflict over natural resources increases the likelihood of greater complexity and intensity of conflicts.

- **Methodology**

This research falls within the category of qualitative research and is based on two principal approaches:

- **Descriptive-Analytical Method:** This method is used to describe the phenomenon of conflict over natural resources in Africa—particularly water, arable and pastoral lands—analyze its components and dimensions, and attempt to explain

the factors underlying its escalation through clarification of the key concepts and theoretical approaches related to the variables of this research.

- **Case Study Method:** This method is employed to provide an in-depth examination aimed at reaching a comprehensive explanation of the relationship between competition over natural resources and conflicts escalation in Africa, as well as identifying the various factors that have contributed, in one way or another, to shaping this relationship. Consequently, the research focuses on analyzing a selection of applied models representing the most prominent cases of conflicts over water, agricultural and pastoral lands on the continent.

- **Research Components**

To examine the relationship between competition over natural resources and the escalation of disputes in Africa, this study is structured around three principal components:

Firstly: The Conceptual and Theoretical Framework of Natural Resource Conflict.

Secondly: Manifestations of conflicts over Water, Arable and Pastoral Lands in Africa.

Thirdly: Factors Underlying the Outbreak and Escalation of Natural Resource conflicts in Africa.

Firstly: The Conceptual and Theoretical Framework of Natural Resource Conflict

In recent years, the world has witnessed profound economic and environmental transformations. These shifts have driven scholars and academics to increasingly investigate the nexus between conflict and competition over natural resources. Consequently, resource competition is now regarded as one of the most prominent variables explaining the outbreak of conflict in various regions—most notably across the African continent. Before delving into the intricacies of resource-based Conflicts in Africa, it is essential to first establish a conceptual framework for this phenomenon and review the primary theoretical approaches used to explain it. Such a foundation is vital to effectively analyze the nature of these conflicts and the underlying factors driving them.

1. The Conceptual Framework of Natural Resources and Conflict

1.1. The Concept of Natural Resources

Natural resources constitute the basis of economic growth and the advancement of human welfare. Historically, human interest in these resources began as an effort to meet basic daily needs; however, this interest gradually evolved into a strategic pursuit of their optimal and efficient economic exploitation. Today, the availability—or scarcity—of these resources, together with a state's capacity to exploit and invest in them, has become a primary determinant of its position within the global order.

Natural resources may be defined as any naturally occurring substance in the universe that can be harnessed by humans to satisfy diverse economic needs and promote social well-being[1]. Importantly, these resources remain latent and without

practical significance unless a human need emerges, prompting the development of the tools and techniques required to transform them from mere natural elements into economic assets that possess both utility and market value.

The term "land" refers to natural resources, which, according to macroeconomic theory, are considered one of the four factors of production alongside labor, capital, and entrepreneurship. Here, "land" encompasses everything the earth holds, harbors, and is surrounded by[2], including arable and grazing lands, water, forests, minerals, and various energy sources.

Natural resources are classified according to various criteria, such as their composition (organic or inorganic), geographic distribution, or scarcity. However, the most important classification is based on the lifespan and production cycle of the resource, as well as the time frame over which it can be exploited. Based on this criterion, resources are divided into the following:[3]

- Non-renewable or Exhaustible Natural Resources: These are finite assets with limited availability and slow replenishment rates. They diminish through consumption and remain susceptible to depletion even under prudent management. Key examples include minerals, crude oil, coal, and natural gas.

- Renewable Natural Resources: These resources can regenerate continuously if managed properly and not overused; otherwise, they may become depleted. Examples include groundwater, soil, and plants.

- Permanent Natural Resources: These are inexhaustible regardless of consumption levels, such as tidal energy, wind, and solar power.

Africa possesses vast reserves of both exhaustible and renewable resources. Estimates indicate the continent holds 30% of global mineral reserves and contributes 12% of global oil production, and holds 12% of global reserves. Furthermore, Africa contains two-thirds of the world's uncultivated agricultural land. Regarding marine resources and livestock, West Africa alone produces approximately 4.5 million tons of fish annually, and raises about 161 million head of cattle ranks Africa fourth globally in livestock production.[4]

1.2. The Concept of Conflict

The concept of conflict is regarded as one of the most complex and composite themes within the field of International Relations. Given the diversity of its sources, causes, dimensions, and scope—alongside the intertwined nature of its interactions and repercussions, both direct and indirect—reaching a consensus on a singular definition or a universal theory has proven exceptionally challenging.

The American sociologist **Lewis A. Coser** defined conflict as "A struggle over values and claims to status, power, and resources in which the opponents aim to neutralize, harm, or eliminate each other". [5]According to Coser, competition is a manifestation of conflict; it is an initial stage that can take various forms before evolving into advanced stages of conflict, which may become violent and cause material damage to the parties involved.

Professor **Nassif Youssef Hitti** defined conflict as: "An escalation between diverging trends and an incompatibility of interests between two or more parties, which leads them to reject the existing situation and attempt to change it."[6] From this definition, we understand that a dispute marks a transition point where parties move from conflicting interests and competition over them to direct and explicit confrontation. However, a dispute does not necessarily manifest as an armed clash like war; it can remain confined to political, economic, or cultural dimensions.

This distinction underscores the need to differentiate conflict from related concepts such as struggle, tension, crisis, and war:

- Struggle: The concept of a "struggle" is one of the terms most closely related to "conflict." **Professor Ismail Sabri Maqlad** defines struggle as: "A clash of national wills arising from differences among states in their motives, perceptions, aspirations, goals, capabilities, potentials, and resources. This leads them to adopt decisions and policies that diverge more than they converge."[7] This definition shows that conflict arises from differences in perceptions and goals, especially over acquiring or increasing access to resources. Such friction may influence policies affecting the interests of the disputing parties without necessarily escalating to direct military confrontation. When it does, it is classified as armed warfare—the final stage of international conflict.

- Tension: A non-violent situation characterized by hostility, suspicion, and fear, reflecting perceived differences in interests between parties. It represents the stage that precedes conflict, which involves an actual and explicit clash between adversaries. [8]

- Crisis: A crisis is an advanced stage of conflict that can reach destructive levels due to its sudden nature. **McClelland** defines it as a sudden shift from normal behavior, characterized by a high frequency and intensity of events. Crises pose a direct threat to a state's core values and interests, forcing rapid decision-making to contain the situation and prevent a lapse into war. Consequently, crises often serve as the immediate trigger for the outbreak of hostilities. Crises often serve as immediate triggers for armed hostilities.[9]

-War: War is defined as the actual physical collision occurring through armed violence after all "soft" and less extreme measures have been exhausted. It represents the final stage of conflict.[10] While war cannot occur without the deployment of military mechanisms and armed confrontation, conflict itself may take political, ideological, economic, or cultural forms.

In conclusion, conflict begins with tension and may develop into a crisis stage, which can be either short- or long-term. In many cases, this stage may lead to an armed Conflict between the conflicting sides, whether they are states, groups, or tribes, as is the case in many of the conflicts across Africa.

1.3. The Concept of Conflict Over Natural Resources

As for conflict over natural resources, it refers to the disagreements and disputes surrounding access to natural resources, control over them, and the ability to exploit

them. In recent years, this type of conflict has expanded in scope and intensified in severity, escalating to high levels of violence. This has led to the worsening of several problems, including environmental degradation, forced displacement, and the disruption of development projects.[11]

Natural resource conflicts typically emerge from an imbalance between the economic needs of individuals, groups, or states and the inherent scarcity of resources. It may also arise from the mismanagement and unequal distribution of resources. According to a seminal study by **Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler**, states whose economies are heavily dependent on natural resource revenues are significantly more susceptible to this type of conflict. This vulnerability stems from intensified competition among various actors to dominate resource extraction and market control. Furthermore, this dynamic is compounded by perceptions of ethnic and political marginalization, coupled with a profound lack of distributive justice, both of which serve as critical catalysts in igniting these conflicts.[12]

2. The Theoretical Framework Explaining the Nexus Between Natural Resources and Conflict Escalation

Numerous theories in International Relations have sought to explain the relationship between natural resources and international conflict. Taken together, these frameworks focus on challenges related to resource scarcity, climate change, demographic structures, and ethnic factors, while examining their impact on the stability of states and societies. This section explores the main theoretical approaches used to understand resource-based conflicts in Africa in general, and those related to water, arable land, and pastoral territories in particular.

2.1.The Environmental Scarcity Approach: Thomas Homer-Dixon /ENCOP

Proponents of this approach examine the link between resource scarcity caused by environmental degradation and the outbreak of conflict. Their perspective is based on the hypothesis that environmental scarcity intensifies competition among groups and states over access to resources. This competition may escalate into armed conflict due to disputes over resource quotas, freedom of access, and sovereignty over contested territories.[13]

In this regard, a body of research has emerged examining the causal links between resource scarcity, environmental degradation, and the outbreak of conflict in developing and transitional states. Two influential research groups have led this work: the **"Toronto Group,"** led by **Thomas Homer-Dixon**, and **the Environmental Conflict Project (ENCOP)**, a joint initiative of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH Zurich) and the Swiss Peace Foundation in Bern.[14] Both groups focus on renewable resources to explain the connection between scarcity and conflict. They note that resources such as water and arable land are essential for food production, and competition over them often acts as a trigger for violent Conflicts.

The Toronto Group concluded that resource scarcity is rarely the direct trigger for war. Instead, they linked environmental scarcity to secondary problems like

poverty, state fragility, and mass displacement. These social stresses then create the instability that escalates into collective violence. Homer-Dixon identifies three specific types of armed conflict driven by scarcity: simple-scarcity conflicts, Identity-based conflicts triggered by environmental change, and relative deprivation conflicts, where marginalized social groups rise in rebellion.[15] In parallel, ENCOP identified seven distinct typologies of environmental conflict: transboundary migration conflicts, ethno-political conflicts, inter-state Conflicts stemming from colonial resource exploitation, Migration and displacement Conflicts, demographic conflicts, center-periphery tensions, and Conflicts over international waters (rivers and basins).[16]

Through a critical review of both the Toronto Group and the Environmental Conflict Project, a team of researchers at **the Peace Research Institute- Oslo (PRIO)** concluded that focusing solely on the link between environmental degradation and resource conflicts is insufficient to explain the underlying drivers of such conflicts. They argue that other variables—environmental, political, economic, and social—must be considered, as they act as missing links in understanding the connection between natural resource scarcity and armed conflict. Key factors include poverty, cultural dynamics, and the type of political system.[17]

It becomes clear that, although scholars differ in some views, there is broad agreement that a relationship exists between environmental scarcity and conflict escalation, particularly in Africa and developing countries more generally.

While environmental degradation may serve as a direct cause of conflict, it interacts with other social and political factors to produce violent forms of resource-based conflict. These include multi- ethnicity, lack of distributive justice, weak state institutions, and economic failure—all of which contribute to citizens' disillusionment with state institutions and create conditions of instability and conflict.

2.2. The Resource Abundance and Greed-versus-Grievance Approach: Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler

The thesis —advanced by **Paul Collier**, former Director of the Development Research Group at the World Bank, and **Anke Hoeffler** — focuses on the role played by the abundance of natural resources in fueling internal conflict, Their work suggests that the presence of vast resources is just as significant—if not more so—than resource scarcity in triggering war. In developing their framework, the two researchers relied on a study of a series of wars that took place in 161 countries between 1960 and 1999, during which 73 cases of civil war were recorded[18]. Through a comparative analysis of these conflicts, they concluded that there are two principal drivers of rebellion and conflict escalation: either greed or a sense of grievance. They argue that many conflicts are primarily caused by the desire and greed to control natural resources. This, in turn, generates a sense of grievance, igniting a conflict that may become protracted if external parties have an interest in its continuation—whether these are diaspora communities or states seeking influence, as was the case during the Cold War.

According to the researchers, the distinction between greed and grievance does not mean the two factors are separate. A rebellion may begin with a sense of grievance and then evolve into economic predation, such as seizing control of raw material exports to fund the activities of rebel groups. Conversely, a rebellion may be rooted in greed but use the rhetoric of grievance to mobilize as many fighters as possible.[19] In essence, individuals join rebel movements against their governments either out of greed or due to a sense of injustice caused by corrupt ruling elites, who often seek to control and exploit resources for their own private interests.

Collier argues that resource-rich countries are particularly fertile ground for this kind of internal strife. Essentially, the higher the share of natural resource exports, the easier it becomes to bankroll a rebellion—especially when combined with four key triggers: low education levels, high unemployment, economic collapse, and a deep dependence on resource rents.[20]

While Collier's model prioritizes greed as the primary driver of conflict in resource-rich states, he notes that most grievance-based indicators—such as political repression, power monopolies, and economic inequality—actually show very little statistical significance in the early stages of a civil war. His regression analysis suggests these factors are secondary, with one notable exception: ethnic dominance. He found that when a single ethnic group comprises between 45% and 90% of the population, the risk of conflict spikes. In these specific cases, greed and grievance converge into a single explanatory framework: either the dominant majority exploits the minority, or the minority is driven to rebel out of a preemptive fear of such exploitation.[21]

Based on the Greed versus Grievance thesis by Collier and Hoeffler, it is clear that the desire to capture and control natural resources is the central pillar of their explanation for conflict. In this framework, political or economic grievances are typically not the direct triggers of war; rather, the persistent pursuit of resource control generates new injustices. These newly created grievances sustain the cycle of violence, often reigniting old conflicts that had previously reached a resolution.

2.3. The Geopolitical Approach/ The Coming Anarchy – Robert D. Kaplan

The geopolitical framework proposed by American author and political thinker **Robert D. Kaplan** is considered a foundational approach to interpreting international conflict. His work establishes a direct link between geography, the environment, and natural resources, and the various conflicts and shifts in the balance of power within the international system. In his 2012 book: "**The Revenge of Geography"**, Kaplan sought to alert policymakers and academic researchers to the necessity of prioritizing geopolitical theories in their political analyses. Prior to this, he published a landmark article titled "**The Coming Anarchy**" in **"The Atlantic Monthly"** in 1994, which remains one of his most celebrated works on the interpretation of global conflict. where he explored the role that resource scarcity, crime, overpopulation, tribalism, and disease play in destroying the social fabric.

Kaplan explicitly linked environmental crises to the escalation of conflict—particularly in Africa, which he viewed as a bellwether for the world's future. He argued that global instability cannot be understood without examining the scarcity of natural resources, ethnic and cultural conflicts, the inevitability of geographical influence, and the shifting nature of warfare.[22] These four elements constitute the core of Kaplan's geopolitical approach to resource-related conflicts.

Kaplan argues that the causes of global violence and insecurity should not be confined to ethnic or religious factors alone. In his view, a more profound and influential driver lies beneath the surface:

the scarcity of natural resources and the resulting environmental pressures. Rapid population growth, water shortages, deforestation, pollution, and soil erosion are factors that will trigger mass migrations. These migrations, in turn, will intensify friction between different groups. [23] Driven by a population explosion and the pressure on the scarce resources—particularly water and arable land—social and political conflict becomes inevitable in multi-ethnic and multicultural societies that lack a unifying national identity.

He concludes that the world is heading toward a phase he terms "The Coming Anarchy" In this era, the likelihood of civil wars and localized conflicts spikes whenever the following specific set of factors converge: surging population size, resource scarcity, environmental degradation, the weakening of state institutions, and ethno-cultural friction. This represents the new face of global conflict—or what he calls "the wars of the future"—where the primary objective is no longer ideological, but rather the survival of communities and the protection of individuals from the existential threats posed by resource scarcity.

Having discussed these three approaches, we can conclude that they provide a comprehensive analytical framework for understanding the nature of competition over natural resources and the escalation of conflict across the African continent. This phenomenon cannot be reduced to a single cause; rather, it is the result of a complex interplay between a set of interlocking environmental, political, economic, social, and even cultural factors. This will become clear as we examine the most common types of resource conflicts in Africa: Conflicts over water, agricultural and pastoral lands. By looking at specific examples from major conflict zones across the continent, we will then analyze the key factors that cause these Conflicts to break out and intensify.

Secondly : Manifestations of Conflict over Water, Agricultural, and Pastoral Lands in Africa

The arid nature of much of Africa, combined with other factors, has exacerbated the continent's water crisis. This has negatively impacted the relationship between pastoralists and farmers, both of whom rely fundamentally on natural lands and pasturage. The scarcity of water has strained these relations, leading to frequent clashes; the competition over grazing lands and water sources in Darfur and the northeastern states of Nigeria serves as a primary example of this reality.[24]

In practice, five main geographic and geopolitical factors turn water into a flashpoint for strategic rivalry and confrontation between neighbors:[25]

- The degree of scarcity of water within a specific area.
- The extent of shared water supplies, whether within a single state or between neighboring countries.
- The nature of the relationship between states sharing those water resources.
- The availability and accessibility of alternative water sources.
- The extent of a country's international borders along shared river systems.

Based on these factors, we can conclude that water conflicts range from localized clashes between neighboring landowners over irrigation and grazing rights to armed confrontations between governments over their respective shares of a shared river basin.[26] Consequently, water-related conflicts can be categorized into four levels: [27]

- **Intra-community conflicts:** Where individuals within a single community clash over very small-scale water sources.
- **Inter-community conflicts:** Occurring on a slightly broader scale, where individuals within each community form a united front in a Conflict with a neighboring community.
- **National conflicts:** Where local communities or authorities within the same country compete for water located outside their specific geographic jurisdiction, often seen in inter-basin water transfers.
- **International conflicts:** Where one country challenges a neighbor's right to use water from a shared system, This is especially common regarding the rights of riparian states along international borders, or in cases where a river crosses boundaries and sparks Conflicts between upstream and downstream states.

In this section, we will examine several African conflicts where disputes over water, agricultural, and pastoral lands have been a central focus, covering the most prominent cases across the north, east, west, and south of the continent.

1. Nile Basin Conflicts:

The Nile Basin States are the countries through which the Nile River flows and which share its waters. These states include upstream countries, downstream countries, as well as countries crossed either by the river itself or by tributaries that feed into it. They comprise eleven states: Ethiopia, Uganda, South Sudan, Tanzania, Rwanda, Kenya, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Burundi, in addition to Egypt and Sudan, which represent the downstream end of the river. Competition over the Nile's waters has intensified among some of these states because of its strategic importance. As a result, the issue of sharing its waters has become one of the main causes of conflict among them,[28] especially since their economies depend heavily on it for agriculture, fishing, tourism, and hydropower generation.

The waters of the Nile have increasingly been used as a political weapon in managing regional conflict. Ethiopia, for instance, has used this issue as a pressure card to influence the policies of both Sudan and Egypt. At the same time, the strategic

involvement of Israel in the region cannot be ignored; they often leverage these same regional dynamics to advance their own strategic objectives in the area.

To better understand the dimensions of water conflict in the Nile Basin, it is necessary to examine the international legal agreements that have governed the sharing of the river's waters. which have played a decisive role in shaping the current regional landscape, and the most important among them may be summarized as follows:

- The 1891 Agreement: Signed between Great Britain (on behalf of Egypt and Sudan) and Italy (on behalf of Eritrea). It prohibited the construction of any projects on the Atbara River—the Nile's last major tributary before the Mediterranean—that might affect its flow into the main Nile.[29]

- The 1902 Treaty: Negotiated between Great Britain and Ethiopia, this treaty defined the borders between Ethiopia and Sudan. Under its terms, Ethiopia pledged not to undertake any projects that would alter the course or flow of the Nile.[30]

- The 1925 Exchange of Notes: An agreement between Great Britain and Italy in which Italy recognized the "prior rights" of Egypt and Sudan to the waters of the Blue and White Niles.It further stipulated that no works should be constructed which would significantly affect the amount of water flowing into the main river.[31]

- The 1929 Nile Waters Agreement: This specific treaty remains the primary source of debate regarding water allocation. Signed between Egypt and Great Britain (representing Sudan, Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania), it mandates that no irrigation or hydroelectric power generation projects can be established without Egypt's prior consent if they reduce the volume of water reaching Egypt, alter its timing, or lower its level; whether on the Nile itself, its tributaries, or even its lakes[32]. By granting Egypt the largest share and a "veto" right, this agreement became the central legal reference that Egypt holds onto to protect its historical rights against the claims of other states.

- The 1959 Agreement: This treaty was signed between Egypt and an independent Sudan as a supplement to the 1929 agreement. It formally allocated the Nile's annual flow—estimated at 84 billion cubic meters—by granting 55.5 billion m^3 to Egypt and 18.5 billion m^3 to Sudan. As part of this deal, Sudan approved the construction of the Aswan High Dam in Egypt, while Egypt consented to Sudan building, and Egypt consented to Sudan building two dams: one at Roseires on the Blue Nile and another on the Qirba River on the Atbara[33]. While Cairo and Khartoum view this as the legal bedrock of Nile water sharing, other riparian countries rejected and expressed reservations regarding this agreement. In general, the historical agreements became points of contention among Nile Basin countries—particularly Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda—which called for a revision of these agreements, deeming them unfair and not reflective of the needs of upstream states. They also argued that the agreements did not represent the will of their peoples, having been concluded by colonial powers during the occupation period without the participation of their national governments. Ethiopia, in particular, manifested its

rejection by pursuing, since the mid-1990s, an extensive policy of constructing facilities and dams along its waterways, announcing in February 2011 the commencement of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam construction.

- The Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) 1999: This initiative was established to foster cooperation among the riparian states and reform the mechanisms for using the river's flow. Its main goal was to ensure equitable resource allocation[34], achieving mutual benefits for all members while adhering to the principle of "no significant harm."

- The 2010 Entebbe Agreement (CFA): Within the "NBI" (Nile Basin Initiative) framework, several basin countries—led by Ethiopia—unilaterally signed a Cooperative Framework Agreement in Entebbe, Uganda. The agreement sought to regulate the fair and reasonable use of water resources. Egypt and Sudan strongly opposed it, as it effectively nullified their historical water shares. By facilitating dam construction and bypassing the 1929 and 1959 treaties, the agreement led Egypt to suspend its participation in the NBI. [35]

- Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD) Negotiations: After Ethiopia announced the GERD (Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam) in 2011, negotiations began between Egypt and Sudan on one side and Ethiopia on the other to place the project within a formal legal framework. Egypt initially demanded a halt to construction until a technical committee could evaluate the project's design and impacts. In 2012, a committee of experts from the three countries and international specialists was formed [36]; however, Ethiopia rejected the findings and continued construction, largely ignoring the diplomatic process. The central dispute today concerns the dam's filling schedule. Egypt insists on a gradual filling over 12–21 years to protect its water supply, while Ethiopia plans to fill it within six years to operate hydroelectric turbines and secure immediate economic returns.[37]

Despite various international mediations since 2011, no agreement has been reached. This long-standing deadlock raises the risk of military or conflict-based actions, which Egypt has not ruled out in several official statements.[38]

2. Conflicts in the Lake Chad Basin (Nigeria–Cameroon Conflict):

Lake Chad serves as the drainage area for one of Africa's largest continental basins, covering about 8% of the continent's land area in Central and West Africa.[39] Geographically, the Lake Chad Basin includes Chad, Niger, Cameroon, and Nigeria—the countries with direct access to the lake. Politically, the concept extends to all members of the Lake Chad Basin Commission, established in 1964, which also includes Algeria, Libya, Sudan, and the Central African Republic.[40]

In the early 1980s, the basin countries experienced several Conflicts over shared resources, driven largely by climate change. Increasing drought reduced the lake's surface, creating islands rich in fertile pastorage and agricultural land and triggering competition for control[41].This became the core issue in the border Conflict between Cameroon and Nigeria in the "Darak" area, where Nigerian communities began

occupying newly exposed Cameroonian islands. The drought also affected Nigerian fishing, pushing fishermen into Cameroonian waters.[42]

As fish trade expanded on Bakassi Island—also known as "Darak"—Nigeria established a military administration there and raised its flag in May 1987. It then occupied several other Cameroonian islands, replacing local residents with Nigerian settlers, mainly from the Hausa and Kanuri communities, which intensified the Conflict with Cameroon. The conflict continued until the International Court of Justice (ICJ) issued its ruling in October 2002. Under the guidance of the UN Secretary-General, a Cameroon–Nigeria Mixed Commission was tasked with implementing the judgment, which required the return of the territories to Cameroon and the complete withdrawal of Nigerian forces from Darak.[43]

3.The Conflict Between Namibia and Botswana over Kasikili/Sedudu Island in the Chobe River

This Conflict involves Namibia and Botswana over Kasikili Island (Namibian name) or Sedudu Island (Botswana name), located in the Chobe River. The island is flooded for several months each year, starting in March, making permanent habitation impossible. This case is notable as the first dispute over an international river in Africa to be brought before the International Court of Justice (ICJ). On May 29, 1996, Namibia and Botswana submitted their respective claims regarding territorial sovereignty over the island to the ICJ. They requested a ruling based on the principles of international law and the Anglo-German Treaty of 1890, which originally demarcated the colonial boundaries of the two nations in Southern Africa.[44] In 1999, the Court issued its judgment, ruling in favor of Botswana's ownership of the island. The Court's decision was based on the finding that the northern channel of the Chobe River around the island constituted the river's main channel. The ruling was widely welcomed and effectively ended a high-tension conflict that had previously seen the island occupied by Botswana's military forces.[45]

4.The Conflict Between Namibia and South Africa over the Lower Reaches of the Orange River

In fact, this Conflict mirrors the Kasikili/Sedudu Island conflict between Botswana and Namibia, as its primary focus remains the question of territorial sovereignty over the boundary line. However, it also encompasses Conflict over pastoral rights, access to water, and the resources located within or adjacent to the river course, most notably mineral deposits. The Conflict emerged following Namibia's independence from South Africa in 1990. At that time, South Africa anticipated that Namibia would relinquish its claims to the Orange River, while Namibia expected South Africa to waive its claims to the associated mineral wealth. In 1993, the two states reached a gentleman's agreement establishing the boundary along the thalweg. Nevertheless, a protracted Conflict persisted over the lower course of the river, where South Africa maintained control over the surrounding land, water, and mineral resources.[46]

Despite the resolution of several issues through bilateral understandings, the Conflict concerning the lower reaches of the Orange River remains unresolved. The boundary along this approximately 600-kilometre stretch continues to constitute a point of contention between the two countries. South Africa claims the northern bank and, by implication, the entire river zone, whereas Namibia continues to insist on a median boundary line. Consequently, Namibia has been actively seeking to revive negotiations with South Africa and to reactivate the 1993 gentleman's agreement, with the aim of reaching a mutually acceptable settlement and bringing this long-standing Conflict to an end.[47]

5.The Senegal River Basin Conflict (Mauritanian-Senegalese Conflict)

The Senegal River is one of Africa's longest and most renowned rivers. It rises in the Fouta Djallon mountains of Guinea and empties into the Atlantic Ocean after flowing through four countries: Guinea, Mali, Senegal, and Mauritania. The Senegal River basin has witnessed one of the most violent water-related conflicts in Africa, namely the Mauritanian–Senegalese Conflict over the Senegal River, which erupted on 9 April 1989 following a border incident involving citizens of the two countries—specifically, herders from the Mauritanian village of Sonko and farmers from the Senegalese village of Diawara. The clash resulted in the deaths of two Senegalese nationals, several injuries, and the detention of thirteen others in Mauritania. This confrontation constituted an unprecedented turning point in the history of relations between the two states since independence.[48] Despite the numerous similar incidents caused by encroachments involving Senegalese farmers and Mauritanian herders, the governments of both countries had generally worked to contain the situation, prevent escalation, and settle disputes swiftly.

In the aftermath of this incident, successive waves of violence followed, and the events of 1989 affected bilateral relations to an extent unprecedented in the history of the two countries. The communities of both states residing in each other's territory were subjected to brutal massacres, with the number of victims exceeding 200,000 people. Mauritanians in Senegal lost all their property, while all Senegalese naturalized citizens were expelled. Tens of thousands of black Mauritanians fled in panic after the crisis evolved from an interstate Conflict into an ethnic conflict.[49] The escalation of the Conflict led to the closure of the border between the two countries and the severance of diplomatic relations for three years, during which all mediation efforts failed to resolve the Conflict.

Efforts to restore relations between Mauritania and Senegal nevertheless continued, until Egyptian mediation finally succeeded during Egypt's chairmanship of the annual session of the Organization of African Unity in achieving a preliminary containment of the crisis. This was accomplished, on the one hand, through the cessation of hostilities between the two parties and, on the other, through the formulation of a plan aimed at pursuing a settlement of the Conflict in a manner that would facilitate the normalization of bilateral relations and ultimately restore them to their previous state.[50]

6. The Kenya–Uganda Conflict (Pastoralist Conflict / the Migingo Island Conflict)

With regard to the water-related Conflict between Kenya and Uganda, two prominent cases stand out: the pastoralist Conflict over access to water and pastoral resources, and the Conflict between the two states over Migingo Island. Concerning the first case, the Conflict erupted when herders from the Kenyan Pokot community crossed the border in search of water and pasture. Given the violent conditions prevailing in the border area between Kenya and Uganda—particularly as a result of cattle rustling and the widespread circulation of weapons—tensions escalated significantly. In response, Uganda deployed 5,000 troops to contain the violence between pastoralist groups from both countries, combat cattle raiders, and confiscate illegal weapons. The District Commissioner of West Pokot in Kenya also announced the government's intention to establish an administrative police camp in Katimor in order to monitor attacks and cattle raids along the shared border zone. In September 2012, Uganda released some of the livestock that had been seized from Kenyan Pokot herders during renewed cattle-raiding incidents.[51]

As for the Conflict between Kenya and Uganda over Migingo Island, it falls within the category of protracted territorial Conflicts fueled by historical claims and conflicting economic interests. Both states invoke their entitlement to the island by relying on maps dating back to the colonial period. At the same time, it is impossible to separate their unwillingness to relinquish the island from its pivotal role in the regional economy, particularly because of its exceptionally rich fishing grounds, most notably the highly valuable Nile perch.

Migingo Island is located in Lake Victoria in eastern Africa. It had not previously existed in its current form, but rather emerged as lake waters receded in the early 1990s due to climatic changes affecting the region. Despite its extremely small area—estimated at only 2,000 square metres—the island became a focal point of Conflict between Kenya and Uganda over sovereign ownership. The Conflict began in 2004, when Uganda deployed police and marines to the island in order to impose taxes on fishermen. Kenyan fishermen subsequently complained of harassment by Ugandan forces, including accusations related to illegal fishing in Ugandan waters. In response, the Kenyan government deployed marines to Migingo in a move that nearly triggered serious tensions between the two countries.[52]

The disagreement resurfaced once again when Kenyan police officers attempted to raise the Kenyan flag, which was subsequently removed by Ugandan forces after Ugandan officials protested the act. This development threatened to reignite the Conflict between the two countries. With the gradual expansion of human settlements on the rocky island, the two states reached an agreement in 2016 to establish a joint commission tasked with determining sovereignty over the island on the basis of historical maps and archival documents dating back to the period of British colonial rule in the 1920s. However, this commission has yet to issue any report.[53]

Thirdly: Factors Underlying the Outbreak and Escalation of Natural Resource Conflicts in Africa

A researcher in the field of resource Conflicts in Africa—whether those linked to mineral and energy wealth, or those caused by the search for water, as well as agricultural and pastoral lands—will find a set of factors that played a role in their outbreak and escalation. These range from natural and environmental factors to political, economic, and social factors, and even factors related to the international environment. The most important of these can be summarized in the following points:

1. Natural Resource Scarcity in light of the Impacts of Climate Change and Environmental Degradation

In actual fact, the causes of natural resource wars cannot be disconnected from the factor of scarcity, particularly in light of increasing demand driven by rapid population growth and the imperatives of economic development. The exacerbation of resource scarcity and the dwindling opportunities for access heighten frustration, creating openings for rebellion and internal conflicts. Moreover, these conditions provoke tensions that may evolve into interstate wars.[54] Climate change plays an instrumental role in determining the abundance or scarcity of natural resources, especially regarding water resources and arable land. Thus, climate change and environmental degradation act as catalysts for many African Conflicts, whether within states or between neighboring countries. Particularly as these factors compel affected populations toward displacement and forced mass migration from regions impacted by environmental problems to other areas, either within the same state or across borders. Such movements have led to the outbreak of Conflicts between groups in host regions (refugee areas). Matters are further compounded if there is a fundamental contradiction in the socio-economic activities practiced by these groups—for instance, when they are divided between farmers and pastoralists.[55]

Over the last decade, Africa has experienced the initial impacts of the global climate crisis, enduring severe periods of drought that have driven individuals toward infighting over resources. According to statistics provided by Amnesty International, approximately 3,600 people were killed between 2016 and 2018 due to Conflict involving farmers in Nigeria.[56]

2. Resource Sharing and Distribution Among Adjacent Groups and States

The geographical positioning of natural resources in Africa has played a significant role in generating Conflicts —not only internal but also interstate—given that African nations share and distribute these resources. For instance, the presence of border communities between two states, where one is pastoral and the other agricultural, creates a Conflict due to this economic contradiction rather than fostering cooperation and resource exchange. Such a Conflict may escalate into a struggle between the two states. The same applies to countries sharing water resources, as exemplified by the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD) crisis between Ethiopia on one side and Sudan and Egypt on the other.[57]

The impact of shared resources as a catalyst for Conflicts in Africa has been intensified, on one hand, by the influence of climate change on these resources in light of continuous population growth. On the other hand, the effect of arbitrary colonial border demarcation is evident; previous agreements between colonial powers failed to resolve the ownership of lands, lakes, or rivers. This has been further compounded by poor management and the failure to adopt successful sectoral policies.

3. Distributive Injustice under Ethnic Hegemony in African State Policymaking

Ethnic pluralism constitutes a double-edged phenomenon. On the one hand, it may function as a source of strength capable of reinforcing political and social transformation; on the other, it may represent a direct challenge to the nation-state and its social cohesion.[58] In the African context, the latter manifestation prevails. This is primarily attributable to the intersection of ethnic diversity with social and class disparities, whereby the distribution of power and wealth is frequently governed by ethnic considerations rather than by the principles of justice, the rule of law, and citizenship. Such a dynamic generates tensions and wars among groups, thereby undermining state-building processes and weakening efforts to consolidate a unified national cultural identity. Moreover, it constrains sustainable development and impedes the rational governance of the continent's natural resources.

These factors have significantly obstructed the trajectory of state-building in Africa, a process further complicated by external agendas that seek to exploit such volatile conditions. As a result, a range of structural challenges has emerged, impeding stability and the consolidation of cohesive nation-states. This environment has, in turn, facilitated the eruption of both internal and interstate Conflicts, largely driven by competition over access to resources. These challenges may be summarized as follows:

- Colonial intervention in the establishment of governance structures, designed to preserve influence over African societies in the post-independence period.[59]

- Institutional fragility and administrative dysfunction, resulting from the persistence of tribal influence and a collective memory anchored in ethnic affiliation rather than state identity.

- Military predominance and the recurrence of coups d'état, often justified by the need to eliminate civilian political corruption, which remains a major obstacle to the consolidation of durable civil states.[60]

- Socio-economic constraints, including stagnant economic growth, widespread poverty, and food insecurity exacerbated by environmental degradation. High levels of external debt and fragile educational, health and social infrastructure further intensify despair and frustration, thereby creating fertile conditions for rebellion through the security–development nexus.[61]

- Evolving security threats, where development is continuously undermined by instability. Beyond conventional conflicts, the continent increasingly confronts

emerging threats such as extremist organizations and transnational organized crime, including arms trafficking, drug smuggling, kidnapping for ransom, and irregular migration.

4. Colonial Policies and Their Legacy of Internal and Interstate Problems

The principal problems generated by European colonial policies in Africa—which have negatively affected the consolidation, strength, and unity of the nation-state—may be summarized as follows:

- The production of a fractured African citizenry, divided between regional and ethnic loyalties embedded in traditional social structures and the demands of modern social and political realities.

- The disruption of ethnic boundaries through colonial border-making, with the French colonies in West Africa constituting a paradigmatic example of fission and territorial partition. The disintegration of this regional entity ultimately led to the emergence of thirteen African states, which collectively had previously formed what was known as French West Africa.[62]

- The historical and sociological character of border Conflicts in Africa, which remains a defining feature of conflict dynamics on the continent. The first major political framework for addressing this issue emerged through the adoption by African states of the principle of the inviolability of borders inherited from colonization at the founding summit of the Organization of African Unity in 1963.[63] The application of this principle resulted in certain states inheriting vast territorial spaces from colonial rule, while others obtained considerably smaller territories. Moreover, the arbitrary demarcation of borders left numerous natural resources—particularly rivers and lakes—shared between two or more states, thereby generating persistent tensions along African frontiers.

5. The Problematic of Regional Cooperation and the Weakness of African Governments

The concept of African groupings and organizations has emerged in various forms, most of which were initially faltering and confined to narrow scopes. Gradually, this circle expanded until the establishment of the Organization of African Unity, which was subsequently succeeded by the African Union in 2001, alongside numerous sub-regional organizations such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC). Despite the role played by African organizations in resolving and managing certain **Conflicts** on the continent, it remains evident to observers of African affairs that opportunities for regional cooperation—aimed at fostering economic integration, political cooperation, social development, and the collective resolution of shared problems—remain limited. This can be attributed to the following factors:

- Political and security instability, which obstructs the developmental trajectory of African states.

- Foreign influence and the resulting preferential relations that hinder economic integration efforts in favor of ties with colonial powers. Furthermore, this foreign

influence extends into African regional organizations, directing the course of many among them, as they rely heavily on external donors for the bulk of their budgets. This significantly curtails their autonomy and their capacity to undertake independent initiatives.

- Weak political will among African states to achieve cooperation, coupled with the prioritization of national interests over regional commitments.

- Inadequate financial resources of African organizations, which has compromised their ability to address continental challenges in a swift and comprehensive manner. This has also impacted peacekeeping missions, conflict resolution efforts, and infrastructure development initiatives.[64]

- Overlapping memberships among regional organizations in Africa, which poses significant coordination challenges and creates potential conflicts of interest.[65]

6. The Role of External Interventions in Fueling Conflicts among African Groups and States

External actors have played a decisive role in intensifying resource-based Conflicts in Africa, whether in their outbreak, their prolongation, or their expansion through the involvement of additional parties. This has been particularly evident in the conduct of major former colonial powers, which have adopted renewed strategies aimed at preserving their traditional interests. These strategies have included arms transfers, the deployment of private paramilitary and security companies, and support for various armed groups, whether insurgent movements or pro-government militias. The persistence of a climate of disorder and violent contestation creates opportunities for these actors to intervene in shaping the policies of African states and directing them toward the realization of external interests, particularly in relation to the exploitation of the continent's diverse resources.

The policies of France, as a traditional power with longstanding influence in Africa, provide a clear illustration of this dynamic. Moreover, alongside the expanding strategic penetration of the United States and China, an increasingly influential role is also being assumed by Russia and other states seeking to establish a foothold on the continent through a variety of mechanisms designed to benefit from its wealth. Chief among these actors are Turkey and several Arab Gulf states, most notably the United Arab Emirates. Collectively, these policies, in one form or another, fuel conflicts both within and across African states.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be argued that conflict is a deeply rooted phenomenon on the African continent and one of its most defining characteristics. Since African states gained independence after a long period of colonial suffering—following the protracted suffering endured during the colonial period— the continent entered a new phase marked by political and security instability, driven by recurrent military coups and the outbreak of numerous interstate and local conflicts. These conflicts are primarily attributable to ethnic divisions, disputes over border demarcation, or competition over resources and contestation regarding rightful ownership.

Regarding the competition over natural resources, this study concludes that it represents one of the primary factors underlying many of the conflicts witnessed across the African continent, particularly those linked to water, arable, and pastoral lands. However, it cannot be considered the sole determining factor in the escalation of conflicts in Africa. The findings reached by this research are summarized in the following points:

- Theoretical approaches adopted as an explanatory framework for the relationship between conflict and natural resources—such as the environmental scarcity approach, "greed vs. grievance," and the geopolitical approach—have demonstrated that resources in themselves, whether renewable or non-renewable, cannot be considered a direct cause of the outbreak or escalation of conflicts. Instead, their causal role depends on the extent of their association with other factors, such as scarcity, mismanagement, and inequitable distribution within ethnically heterogeneous societies. These variables increase the intensity of such conflicts and the likelihood of their evolution into advanced stages of armed violence.

- Climate change and environmental degradation constitute a pivotal factor in explaining the relationship between conflict and natural resources. The scarcity generated by climatic changes—such as the shrinking of water basins and the contraction of agricultural and pastoral lands—combined with rapid population growth, weak resource governance, and the dominance of ethnic groups over decision-making in the vast majority of African political regimes, inevitably contributes to the eruption of conflict.

- By examining several applied cases of conflicts over water and arable and pastoral lands, it becomes evident that the latter experience high levels of escalation when centered on resources shared between states or local communities. This occurs against a backdrop of a colonial legacy that produced problems related to arbitrarily demarcated political borders—which failed to account for the social realities of African nations—as well as limited regional cooperation and the inability of regional institutional frameworks to provide effective solutions for the management of shared resources.

- The fragility and corruption of African political systems, compounded by the influence of tribalism and its dominance over the political landscape, have negatively affected the management of resources and distributive justice within society, thereby significantly contributing to the worsening of resource-related conflicts in Africa.

Based on these findings, the study reaches a principal conclusion: while competition over natural resources does serve as a catalyst for the outbreak and escalation of conflicts in Africa, this process is contingent upon a complex interaction among a set of structural, social, and institutional factors. In other words, conflicts cannot be reduced solely to the resource variable.

Margins:

[1]Safaa Abd al-Amir Rashm Al-Asadi, Geography of Natural Resources, 1st ed., Al-Fayhaa Printing, Publishing, and Distribution, Lebanon, 2017, p. 17.
[2]Anissa Ben Ramdane, Mustapha Belmokaddem, Exhaustible Natural Resources and Their Impact on Economic Growth: The Case of Petroleum in Algeria, Journal of Economic and Administrative Research, Mohamed Khider University of Biskra, Algeria, No. 15, June 2014, p. 295.
[3]Safaa Abd al-Amir Rashm Al-Asadi, op. cit .p.20.
[4] Ibrahim Karsany, Towards Africa: Opportunities and Challenges, Dubai Center for Public Policy Research, 10 January 2021, pp. 3–4, available at :https://bhuth.ae/assets/uploads/publications/research/ar/towards-africa-opportunities-and-challenges.pdf
[5] James E. Dougherty, and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Contending Theories of International Relations. Translated by Walid Abd al-Hay, 1st ed., El-Kadima for Publishing, Translation and Distribution & University Institution for Studies, Publishing and Distribution, Beirut, 1985, p. 140.
[6] Nassif Youssef Hitti, Theory in International Relations, Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi, Lebanon, 1985, p. 293.
[7] Ismail Sabry Makled, "The Phenomenon of Conflict in International Relations: The General Theoretical Framework," Journal of Social Sciences, Scientific Publishing Council, Kuwait University, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1976, p. 105.
[8] Ziyad Al-Ali Ali,Theoretical Foundations of International Politics, 1st ed., Dar Al-Fajr Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, 2017, p. 69.
[9] Ibid., p. 70.
[10] Sabry Makled Ismail, op. cit., p. 105.
[11] Matiru Violet, Peter Castro Alfonso, Conflict and Natural Resource Management, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, May 2022, pp.1-3, available at: http://bit.ly/4mfVzQr
[12] Humphreys Macartan, Natural Resources, Conflict, and Conflict Resolution, Journal of conflict resolution, Sage Publications, Vol. 49, No. 4, August 2005, p.510.
[13] Michael T. Klare, Resource Wars: The New Landscape of Global Conflict, translation. Adnan Hassan, Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi, Cairo, 2002, pp. 26–28.
[14] Hagmann Tobias, Confronting the Concept of Environmentally Induced Conflict, Peace, Conflict and Development, University of Bradford, Vol 6, January 2005, p.7.
[15] Ibid, p.8.
[16] Ibid, pp. 8-9.
[17] Ibid, p.10.
[18] Paul Collier, Anke Hoeffler, Greed and Grievance in Civil War, Policy research working paper, The World Bank Development Research Group, May 2000, p.15, available at: https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/359271468739530199/pdf/multi-page.pdf
[19] Ibid, pp.14-15.
[20] Maamar Mohamed Reda, Mokhtari Faycal, Resource Abundance and Scarcity: The Consolidation of Regimes or Corrupt Elites and the Intensification of Conflict in Society Algerian Journal of Management and Economics, University of Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed, Vol. 12, No. 2, 2019, p. 25.
[21] Paul Collier, Anke Hoeffler, op.cit, p.21.
[22] Robert D. Kaplan, The Coming Anarchy, The Atlantic Monthly, The Atlantic Monthly Company,vol.273, n°2, February 1994, p.54
[23] Ibid, p.55

[24] Ramadan Faraj Saad Sobhi, Natural Resources and Armed Conflicts in Sub-Saharan Africa, Journal of African and Nile Basin Studies, Arab Democratic Center, No. 13, October 2021, p. 303.
[25] Peter J.Ashton, Disputes and Conflicts over Water in Africa , in : Violent Conflicts, Fragile Peace: Perspectives on Africa's Security**,** N. Mlambo, Ed, Adonis and Abbey,London, 2007, p.121.
[26] Peter H.Glieck, The World's Water 1998-1999: Biennial Report on Freshwater Resources, Island Press, 1998, p.217
[27] Peter J.Ashton, Southern African water conflicts: are they inevitable or preventable?, In: H Solomon and AR Turton Eds, Africa Dialogue Monograph Series, n°2,The African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD), Durban, South Africa, 2000, pp. 75-76.
[28] Makhlouf Ramli, International Competition for Water in the Arab Region: Conflicts of the Nile Basin States as a Case Study. Academic Journal of Legal and Political Research, Amar Telidji University of Laghouat, Vol. 6, No. 1, 2022, p. 475.
[29] Mohamed Al-Amin Ben Aouda; Abdelkader El-Halli, Sudanese–Egyptian Alternatives Regarding the Sharing of Nile Waters and the Construction of the Ethiopian Renaissance Dam, Scientific Horizons Journal, University of Tamanrasset, Vol. 14, No. 1, 2022, p. 699.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Leila Kerfah, Water Conflict: A Case Study of Conflictual Interaction in the Nile Basin, Journal of African and Nile Basin Studies, Arab Democratic Center, Vol. 1, No. 1, March 2018, p. 102.
[33] Ibid., p. 103.
[34] Mohamed Al-Amin Ben Aouda; Abdelkader El-Halli, op. cit., p. 700.
[35] Nour Eddine Bidkan, The Nile Water Crisis between Ethiopia and Egypt, Center for Arab Unity Studies, 15 June 2022, available at: https://bit.ly/3zk35Ws
[36] Ibid
[37] Makhlouf Ramli, op. cit., p. 485.
[38] Mohamed Al-Amin Ben Aouda; Abdelkader El-Hali, op. cit., p. 703.
[39] Ezzeddine Abbou, Environmental Conflicts: The Cameroonian–Nigerian Conflict in the Lake Chad Basin a case study, Journal of Law and Human Sciences, Ziane Achour University of Djelfa, Vol. 15, No. 03, 2022, p. 529.
[40] Ahmed Amal: Environmental Drivers of Civil Conflicts in the Lake Chad Basin. Journal of African Studies, Faculty of Graduate African Studies, Cairo University, Vol. 44, No. 51, January 2022, p. 103
[41] Ezzeddine Abbou, op. cit., p. 537.
[42] José Antonio Pena-Ramos, Rafael José Lopes- Bedmar, Sastre Francisco Javier and Martinez Adrian, Water conflicts in Sub-Saharan Africa , Frontiers in Environmental Science Journal, Frontiers Media SA, vol.10, March 2022, p.9.
[43] Abbou Ezzeddine, op. cit., p. 544.
[44] Peter J.Ashton, Southern African water conflicts: are they inevitable or preventable?, op.cit, p.84.
[45] Mohamed Fouad Rachwan, Water Policies of International Rivers in Africa, African Readings Journal, Islamic Forum London, Issue 47, January 2021, p. 71.
[46] Ibid., p. 72.
[47] Maria Konokhova, Namibia Urges South Africa to Advance Talks Over Disputed Orange River Border , available at: https://url-shortener.me/JOF0
[48] Fouad Bouchlaghem; Bachir Saadouni, The Border Conflict between Senegal and Mauritania (1989–1991), Algerian Historical Journal, University of M'sila, Vol. 06, No. 01, 2022, p. 1248.
[49] Mohamed Fouad Rachwan, Water Policies in the Senegal River Basin, African and Arab Studies Journal, May 29, 2018, available at: https://afroar.com/
[50] Mohamed Fouad Rachwan, op. cit., p. 75.

[51] José Antonio Pena-Ramos, op.cit. p.13.
[52] Asmaa Hamdi, Meigingo… the Forgotten Island in the Heart of the African Continent, Pharos Center, 07/03/2023, available at:https://pharostudies.com/
[53] Murtada Al-Shadly, Meigingo… the Island that Sparked the Smallest War in Africa, Noon Post, 27/02/2019, available at:https://www.noonpost.com/26751/
[54] Mammer Mohamed Rida; Mokhtari Fayçal, op. cit., p. 17.
[55]Peter Tekwaj, Four Drivers of Resource Conflict and Four Proposals to Solve Ethnic Problems in African States, Gulf Insights, Gulf Research Center, Issue 162, 30/05/2021, available at: https://araa.sa/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=5665:4-4&catid=4454&Itemid=172
[56] Mustapha Khouas: Contemporary Conflicts in Africa: Roots, Challenges, and Peacebuilding, Qira'at Ifriqiyah Magazine, Islamic Forum London, Issue 54, October 2022, p. 44.
[57] Peter Tikwaj, op. Cit.
[58] Baghdadi Abdel Salam Ibrahim ,The Positive Dimension in Arab–African Relations and Ethnic Plurality as a Cultural Bond, 1st ed., Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, Doha, 2013, p. 118.
[59] Khayri Abd al-Razzaq Jasim; Mohammed Ali Daryoul, State-Building in Africa: A Study of the Challenges, International Studies Journal, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Baghdad, Issue 61, October 2015, pp. 71–75
[60] Ibid., p. 81.
[61] Arbi Boumediene, State Crisis in the African Sahel: A Study of the Causes and Challenges of State-Building, Qira'at Afriqiyah, Islamic Forum London, Issue 28, April 2016, p. 29.
[62] Rania Mohamed Taher Abdelwahab, The Crisis of Cultural Identity in Africa, available at: https://bit.ly/3EbWkCn
[63] Hamid Zaidi, African Organization and the Principle of the Intangibility of Borders Inherited from Colonialism, Revue Critique de Droit et Sciences Politiques, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou, Vol. 9, No. 1, 2014, p. 319.
[64] Ihab El Achik, Regional Organizations in Africa: Weaknesses in Solving Continental Problems, African Center for Research and Policy Studies, 05/03/2024, available at: https://afropolicy.com/
[65] Ibid.