ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

ETHIOPIA'S ROLE IN SOMALIA'S PEACE-BUILDING SINCE 1991

BY

MEAZA T/AREGAY BEYENE

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

APRIL, 2017

ETHIOPIA'S ROLE IN SOMALIA'S PEACE-BUILDING SINCE 1991

BY

MEAZA T/AREGAY BEYENE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

SUPERVISOR

DR. ASNAKE KEFALE

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

APRIL, 2017

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

ETHIOPIA'S ROLE IN SOMALIA'S PEACE-BUILDING SINCE 1991

BY

MEAZA T/AREGAY BEYENE

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

_____	_____
ADVISOR	**SIGNATURE**
_____	_____
INTERNAL EXAMINER	**SIGNATURE**
_____	_____
EXTERNAL EXAMINER	**SIGNATURE**

Acknowledgment

Firstly, I praise Almighty God for giving me the courage to accomplish this study. Secondly, I would like to greatly thank my Supervisor Dr. Asnake Kefale who had given me feedback on my overall work. Thirdly, I would like to thank my husband Genene Shiferaw (Msc in solid state physics) who helped me in overall activities of my study. Fourthly, I would like to express gratitude to the whole families of Yemane Beyene particularly Firehiwot Yemane who had a great contribution for effective accomplishment of my Master's Program. And finally, I said thanks so much to my families who helped me to reach on this rank.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgment i

Table of Contents ii

Acronyms v

Abstract vii

CHAPTER ONE 1

1. Introduction 1

1.1. Background of the Study 1

1.2. Statement of the Problem 3

1.3. Objective of the Research 5

1.3.1. General Objective 5

1.3.2. Specific Objectives 6

1.4. Research Questions 6

1.5. Methodology 6

1.5.1. Methods of Data Collection 7

1.5.2. Methods of Data Analysis 7

1.6. Scope of the Study 7

1.7. Significance of the Study 8

1.8. Limitation of the Study 8

1.9. Organization of the Study 8

CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUAL FRAME WORK OF PEACE-BUILDING AND MILITARY INTERVENTIONS 10

2.1. Introduction 10

2.1.1. The Concept of Peace 11

2.1.1.1. Negative Peace 11

2.1.1.2. Positive Peace 12

2.1.2. Definition and Concepts of Peace-building 12

2.1.3. The Meaning of Peace-building 13

2.1.3.1. How Peace-building is Maintained? 14

2.1.4. Difference between Peace-building and State-building 15

2.1.5. The Meaning of Peacekeeping 16

2.1.6. The Meaning of Peace-making 16

2.1.7. Intervention, Peacekeeping, Peace-building and Peace-making 16
2.2. The Traditional Perceptions of Non-intervention 17
2.2.1. The Drawback of the Principle of Non-intervention 18
2.2.2. The Causes for the Reaffirmation of the Principle of Non-intervention 19
2.2.3. The Concept of Intervention 20
2.2.3.1. Justification of Intervention 21
2.3. Non-use of Force against Others 22
2.3.1. Economic Sanction 24
2.4. Institutional uses of Force (article 42, UN Charter) 24
2.5. Military Intervention and Use of force 25
2.6. Use of force against others 27
2.6.1. Use of force for Humanitarian Purposes 27
2.6.1.1. Political and Legal aspects of Humanitarian Intervention 28
2.6.2. Use of force for the Purpose of Self-Defense (article 51, UN Charter) 29
2.6.2.1. Pre-emptive Self-defense 31
2.6.3. Use of force against Terrorist act 33
CHAPTER THREE: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF ETHIO-SOMALIA RELATIONS 36
3.1. Introduction 36
3.2. Historical Background of Ethio-Somalia relations 37
3.2.1. Ethio-Somalis Relations under the Reign of Emperor Menelik 38
3.2.2. Ethio-Somalis Relations under the Reign of Emperor Haileselassie 40
3.2.2.1. Ethio-Somalia Relations after Independence of Somalia (1960-1974) 46
3.2.3. Ethio-Somalia Relations under the Regime of Dergue (1974-1991) 48
3.2.3.1. The War between Ethiopia and Somalia over the Land of Ogaden 49
3.3. Ethio-Somalia Conflict on the Issue of Ogaden's Self-determination 52
3.3.1. Somalia's Position towards Ogaden and its Self-determination 52
3.3.2. Ethiopia's Position towards Ogaden and its Self-determination 53
CHAPTER FOUR: ETHIOPIA'S INTERVENTION IN SOMALIA 55
4.1. Introduction 55
4.2. The Involvement of Ethiopia in Somalia since 1991 55

4.2.1. The Effort of Ethiopia for Somalia's Peace process 56
4.2.2. Motivation of Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia since 1991 61
4.2.2.1. Political and Security Motives 61
4.2.2.2. Economic Motives 64
4.3. The Involvement of Ethiopia in Somalia between 2004 and 2009 66
4.3.1. The Legitimacy of Transitional Federal Government versus Islamic Court Union 66
4.3.2. The 2006 Military Intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia 68
4.3.2.1. Justification and legal Implication of Ethiopia's 2006 Military Intervention 70
4.4. Impacts of Ethiopia's 2006 Military Intervention 77
4.4.1. The Weakening of UIC 77
4.4.2. The Deployment of African Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) 79
4.5. Why Ethiopia's troop remained in Somalia until 2009 79
4.6. The Joining and Contribution of Ethiopia's troops in AMSOM group 81
4.6.1. Ethiopia's Position within AMISOM 82
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION 84
Bibliography 88
Appendices 100

Acronyms

AIAI:	Ali-Itahad Al-Islamiya
AMISOM:	African Union Mission in Somalia
AU:	Africa Union
CIA:	Central Intelligence Agency
EPLF:	Eritrean People‘s Liberation Front
EPRDF:	Ethiopian People’s Revolutionary Democratic Front
ESDL:	Ethiopian Somali Democratic League
FANSPS:	Foreign Affairs and National Security Policy and Strategy
FDRE:	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
GDP:	Gross Domestic Product
HoA:	Horn of Africa
HRW	Human Right Watch
ICG:	International Crisis Group
ICJ:	International Court of Justice
IGAD:	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
ISS:	Institute for Security Studies
IPSS:	Institute for Peace and Security Studies
NATO:	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
UIC:	Union of Islamic Court
OAU:	Organization of African Unity
OLF:	Oromo Liberation Front
ONLF:	Ogaden National Liberation Front
OPDO:	Oromo People‘s Democratic Organization
PM:	Prime Minister
RRA:	Rahanwein Resistance Army
R2P:	Responsibility to Protect
SALF:	Somalia Alliance Liberation Front

SPF:	Somali Police Force
SPM:	Somali Patriotic Movement
SRS:	Somali Regional State
SRRC:	Somalia Reconciliation and Restoration Council
TNG:	Transitional National Government
TFG:	Transitional Federal Government
UEDP:	United Ethiopian Democratic Party
UIC:	Union of Islamic Courts
UNHCR:	United Nation Human Right Commission
UNTAF:	United Nation Task Force
UNMGOS:	United Nations Monitoring Group on Somalia
UNOSOM:	United Nation Assistance Mission in Somalia
UNSC:	United Nations Security Council
UNSCR:	United Nation Security Council Resolution
US:	United States
USC:	United Somali Congress
USSR:	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WSLF:	Western Somalia Liberation Front

Abstract

The study is Ethiopia's role in Somalia's peace-building since 1991. The study investigated whether Ethiopia played a pivotal role for Somalia's peace building effort or all involvement in Somalia was merely to maximize its national self-interests? Qualitative research methodology has been used in the course of collecting and analyzing data by employing both primary and secondary sources as methods of data collection .Primary data are collected through key informant interviews from individual in various institutions. Secondary sources used in this study include books, journal articles and reports. Based on the above mentioned sources of data, the study has tried to answer the research questions that have aimed to show Ethiopia's role in Somalia's peace-building since 1991. Ethiopia and Somalia have a troubled relationship for a long period of time. The finding shows that Ethiopia had/has limited role in Somalia's peace building. This is not for selfish reasons. Based on the finding, there is justifications for Ethiopia that had/has very limited role. This are Somalia's instability and lack of a strong central government are perceived as serious threats to Ethiopia's national security and stability. Because of this, Ethiopia frequently intervened in Somalia since 1991. Consequently, its frequent interventions resulted some negative impacts on the processes of Somalia's peace-building. The result is in disagreement with the argument that Ethiopia has participated in many activities that have blocked peace-building efforts in Somalia in order to maintain a weak and divided Somalia. From the findings, it is concluded that Ethiopia is an important international actor with regard to combating international terrorism and extremism. Ethiopia greatly fought against different terrorist groups to maintain its territorial integrity unilaterally and multilaterally and it has striven to renovate peace and security in Somalia. However, the finding addressed two focal problems from Ethiopia side. These include Ethiopia's policy speculation and its media circus that try to show about the positive aspects of Ethiopian intervention in Somalia. For a long term solutions, firstly, Ethiopia should accept and consider its drawback in the process of Somalia's peace-building. Secondly, Ethiopia should be avoid its unilateral and military involvement and tries to strengthen a common policy orientation.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

The Horn of Africa is one of the most underdeveloped regions on earth. It has been known for decades as one of the hottest geographical spaces of internal dissidence and interstate conflicts (Menkhaus, 2011: 1). The prolonged absence of a recognized government in Somalia constituted the basis of anxiety in the community of states in that part of Africa. Somalia is found in the Horn of Africa, adjacent to the Arabian Peninsula (Klosowicz, 2015: 83, Lewis, 2002: 87). It is surrounded by Kenya to the South West, by the Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Aden to the East, by the republic of Djibouti to the North, and by Ethiopia to the North West, (Lewis, 2002: 87).

During the scramble of Africa in the nineteenth century, the Somali state was created by the colonial powers (Britain, Italy and France). Somalia itself did not exist as a single state during the colonial period. Somali territories were divided from north to south as French Somaliland, British Somaliland and the Italian colony in the South, Ethiopian Ogaden and British northern Kenya (Lewis, 2004: 493). After Somalia gained its independence in 1960[1] (Adjovi, 2013: 1186, Woodwell, 2007: 103, Arnold, 2008: 194), the Republic of Somalia sought to unite all Somali territories in to one state by a rejection of the colonial boundaries, including the Ogaden region of Ethiopia. However, that idea of a rejection of the colonial boundaries and Somali's irredentist view also brought war with Ethiopia in 1964, and later on this two countries fought a bitter war in 1977. Hence, Ethio-Somalia relations were further complicated during the regime of Mengistu H/Mariam in Ethiopia and Said Barre in Somalia (Arnold, 2008: 163).

After the demise of Said Barre regime, since 1991, Somalia totally collapsed. As a consequence, the crisis in Somalia has received significant regional and international attention over the years, with a variety of actors intervened in, to pacify Somalia (Adjovi, 2013: 1186, Aisha, 2012: 319, Bradbury, 2009: 9). Consequently, numerous peace-keeping operations by the United Nations (UN) have attempted to bring peace to the chaotic region

[1] When the former colonial territories of Italian Somaliland and British Somaliland were united in 1960 to create an independent Somalia, the new state adopted a flag which included a five-pointed star in its center; three of these points were intended to signify Somalia irredentism-what was then French Somaliland (subsequently Djibouti), the Northeast Frontier Province of Kenya, and the Ogaden (Arnold, 2008: 277).

(Colombo, 2010-2011: 149, Kidst, 2009: 16). Thereafter, the Security Council established the United Nation Assistance Mission in Somalia (UNOSOM), which was called UN Peace Making between 1992 and 1995, and US-led United Task Force in Somalia (UNITAF)[2] that was called Peace Enforcement Operations, and also subsequent reinforcement of the peace-keeping operation established UNOSOMII (Adjovi, 2013: 1186, Crocker, 1995: 4). However, all international interventions have failed to deliver security and restore a functional state (Eriksson 2013: 33, Colombo, 2010/11: 149, Adjovi, 2013: 1186, Bradbury, 2009: 9).

Ethiopia is clearly the dominant state in the Horn of Africa (Klosowicz, 2015: 91, Berouk, 2012: 89). As a result, "Ethiopia has gained the legitimacy of the international community to manage the Somalia's crisis, under the mandate of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), in November 1996" (Colombo, 2010/11: 141-142). Consequently, in terms of reconstructing of Somalia, Ethiopia has played a great role within Inter Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD)[3] (Clapham, 2006: 17, Eriksson 2013: 36). Ethiopia supported the efforts towards strengthening the capacity of IGAD to ensure peace and security in Somalia (Klosowicz, 2015: 91).

However, the post 1991 intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia, particularly the 2006 military intervention is subject to different interpretations. The legal justification of Ethiopia was to derive out the Union of Islamic Courts (UIC) forces from Somalia which was considered as a threat to Ethiopia's integrity. Different scholars, politicians and intellectuals, however, opposed the justification of Ethiopian official government as self-defense. Many well-known Somali politicians argued that, "under the pretense of fighting terrorism and Islamic extremism, and with the support of the U.S, Ethiopia was/ is pursuing its own political objectives in Somalia" (Klosowicz, 2015: 90). Moreover, Eriksson (2013), Jhazbhay (2007), Menkhaus (2010), Mays (2009), Moller (2009), and Tatek (2008), and

[2] UNITAF was a coalition of states mobilized by the U.S. It included the states of Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Egypt, France, Germany, Greece, India, Republic of Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom, and Zimbabwe. There were 37,000 troops mobilized for the intervention, with 25,000 coming from the U.S. (Ali, 2014: 114).

[3] IGAD is a regional grouping which comprising seven East African Countries (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda).

other writers argued that the long term goals of Ethiopia for its engagement in Somalia was/is predominantly national self-interests.

The focus of this thesis is to examine whether Ethiopia has a pivotal role in the effort of building peace in Somalia or its active involvement in Somalia was/is for only the purpose of maximizing its national self-interests. To reveal, the role of Ethiopia in the effort of Somalia peace-building, this study assessed and investigated the aspects of Ethiopia's intervention since 1991, particularly the 2006 military intervention.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Since, the collapse of Somalia, Ethiopia played an important role in Somalia's conflict. "Ethiopia's troops in Somalia also strengthen its position as a regional power which 'invested' in peace and security in the Horn of Africa (HoA)[4] in general and in Somalia in particular." In this respect, Ethiopia influences the region and the future development of Somalia (Newbery, 2014: 9). And Ethiopia has played a very constructive role in helping to convene Somali parties throughout the year of 1990s (Eriksson 2013: 36, Menkhaus, 2010: 145). According to Menkhaus (2010) and Bradbury (2009), however, Ethiopia and its Mogadishu-based Somali adversaries, the proxy war between Ethiopia and Eritrea, and Ethiopia's overt military intervention in 2006 have become an important additional obstacle to peace in Somalia. According to Bradbury (2009), since 1992, Ethiopia has regularly intervened militarily in Somalia either to weaken militant Islamist groups with designs on the Ogaden and/or to strengthen the hand of its favored allies among the Somali factions. Similarly, Eriksson (2013) argues, the long term goals of Ethiopia for its engagement in Somalia is predominantly focused on "geopolitical and national security interest rather than any deep benevolence towards Somalia."

Newbery (2014), argued that since Somalia is the first security threat for Ethiopia, the concern of Ethiopia in Somalia is national security issue (Newbery, 2014: 19). She has explained, the military engagement of Ethiopia in Somalia considered as positive and legitimate because of the issue of security is not only threat to Ethiopia but also to the (HOA) in particular and to the world in general. Although, the foreign policy of

[4] The HoA included the state of Somalia, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, South Sudan, Sudan, Eritrea, and Uganda.

Ethiopia is based on achieving economic and security interest, its active involvement in Somalia predominantly focuses on security concern rather than economic incentive (Ibid). Undeniably, Ethiopia aims to cooperate and build good trade and security relationship with Somaliland and Puntland but not interested to "Balkanized" Somalia (Ibid). The active involvement of Ethiopia in Somalia is considered as positive engagement in peace-building with the aim that "Puntland and Somaliland will function as 'building blocks' for future peaceful and united states" (Newbery, 2014: 9).

Somali blamed the active involvement of Ethiopia in Somalia. It military presence served to increase the degree of conflict by providing the militant Islamists who "spearheaded the resistance with a common platform" (Bradbury, 2009: 18). "Hence Ethiopia's vested interest in a federalist resolution of conflict throughout the Somali region, as a safeguard against any future resurgence of Somali irredentism" (Jhazbhay, 2007: 260). Furthermore, Ethiopia blamed for destroying of TNG in 2000-02 and attacking the rising of ICU in 2006 (Menkhaus, 2010: 139). Mankhaus holed that there is an argument "whether Ethiopia supports Somalia to exist on its terms or it ultimately prefers perpetuation of Somalia's collapse." According to Moller's (2009) explanation, Ethiopia had no worry about its intervention in Somalia rather it struggle with anti-Ethiopian faction for its own national self-interests.

Moreover, Braden Civins (2009) and Mays (2009) have explained that Ethiopian National Defence Forces (ENDF) with the collaboration of United States, supported the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) against the increasingly powerful Islamic Courts Union (ICU) in 2006. According to Tatek's (2008) explanation, all talks about radical and terrorist was used as means by Ethiopian government to forward its own objectives in Somalia.

Contrary with all these arguments, the former President Hassan Sheikh Mahmoud commending Ethiopia's significant role in bringing peace and stability in Somalia, said that Addis Ababa's continued support remains key to achieving national reconciliation and bringing about durable peace and security in Somalia (EBC, 2013). According to the former Ethiopia's spokesperson of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Somalia president lauded Ethiopia's role in regional peace-building as well as "fostering economic integration through developing regional infrastructure, trade and other social and economic

activities"[5].

This thesis focuses on the debate surrounding Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia since 1991. In a nutshell, the active involvement of Ethiopia in Somalia has been seen from different angles. Some writers like Newbery (2014) positively analyzed Ethiopian intervention as essential and necessary particularly with regards to security issue. Whereas others like Braden Civins (2009), Tatek's (2008) and Mays (2009), saw Ethiopian intervention as danger for the sovereignty of Somalia. Furthermore, other writers also have given an analysis on 2006 intervention as pre-emptive invasion to stop the relation of UIC with Al Qaida (Abdul, 2007: 6). Additionally, different writers have explained it as a "proxy war" between Ethiopia and its arch enemy Eritrea (Ibid).

The central question of this research is what Ethiopia contributed for the effort of Somalia's peace-building. There are also critical questions that need adequate answers, such as what the impacts of Ethiopia's intervention on Somalia's Sovereignty. In order to investigate these issues the thesis articulated different concepts, firstly, it focus on intervention with the context of the UN Charter. After the demise of Somalia since 1991, the trial of all international and regional actors to pacify Somalia was through intervention. Thus, this thesis explored the aspect and nature of Ethiopia's intervention since 1991, particularly the 2006 military intervention, and described its impacts. Secondly, for the study to be effective it should accurately reflect the role of regional actors (IGAD and AMISOM) in the effort of Somalia's peace-building. This required to gain some understanding about the regional hegemonic[6] role of Ethiopia within each regional actors to pacify Somalia. The central argument of this study is that Ethiopia did play a limited role in the effort of Somalia's peace-building.

1.3. Objective of the Research

1.3.1. General Objective

The overall objective of this study is to examine what explain for Ethiopia's involvement in Somalia's peace-building.

---

[5] Interview with Ambassador Dina Mufiti , April 2014

[6] Regional hegemons are defined on the basis of population, size, relative GDP, and military capacity; Regions and Regional Security Complex Theory (RSC) in Africa are organized around certain states that possess key assets in terms of geographic proximity, population size, military capability, and political and diplomatic leverage at the regional and international levels (Ali, 2001).

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

- To assess the motivation for Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia's peace-building;
- To explore the nature of Ethiopia's involvement in Somalia Peace building;
- To reveal the political and legal justification for the 2006 Ethiopia's military intervention;
- To examine the challenges facing Ethiopia's involvement in Somalia peace building;
- To assess the role of Ethiopia in Somalia's peace-building;

1.4. Research Questions

The main research question is, what the role of Ethiopia in Somalia's peace building?

- Why Ethiopia actively involved in Somalia's peace-building since 1991?
- What are the nature of Ethiopia's involvement in Somalia Peace building?
- What are the cause and effect of Ethiopia's 2006 military intervention?
- What are the challenges facing Ethiopia's involvement in Somalia peace building?
- What are the roles of Ethiopia's involvement in Somalia peace building processes?

1.5. Methodology

The study seeks to explain Ethiopia's prospect for peace-building in Somalia since 1991. In this respect, there has been a necessity to consider the frequent military intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia since 1991. In order to assess Ethiopia's role in Somalia's peace-building, the study clearly has seen the aspects and nature of Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia. This study is a qualitative study which attempts to describe Ethiopia's role for peace building in Somalia since 1991 and try to make an understanding about the research questions that are better handled in a qualitative approach rather than in quantitative methods and statistical data (Lewis, 2003: 3).

Because of this, the issue of intervention and peace-building involves a lot of underlying and complex issues that cannot be measured quantitatively. The issue of intervention is heavily interrelated with the social world and the nature of human beings who use different meanings to different phenomena (contextual meaning) (Lewis, 2003: 3, Mason, 2002: 4). For complex term like intervention, terrorism and so on, it is very important to

use qualitative methodology. There are different debates or perspectives towards Ethiopia's military intervention that may difficult for effective conclusion of this study. However, the researcher has tried to evaluate its activity in various ways by depending on certain academic literature.

1.5.1. Methods of Data Collection

The study draws on both secondary and primary sources. Secondary sources, including books, journal articles and reports of various institutions were used. Since, interviews are one of the most commonly recognized forms of qualitative research method (Mason, 2002:63), this study used interviews as primary data. The primary data was collected through semi-structured interviews with key informants from Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, African Union (AU), and Institute of Security Studies (ISS), as well as with different researchers and experts. A total number of four interviews were conducted lasting from 15 to 25 minutes.

1.5.2. Methods of Data Analysis

In present time, qualitative research methods are a most diverse set which included several approaches like "empirical phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, protocol analysis and discourse analysis" (Elliott & Timulak, 2005: 147). Qualitative research is a form of social inquiry that emphasizes on the way people interpret their experience and the world in which they live (Mason, 2002: 4). This type of research has an important contribution to understanding the social reality of individuals, groups and cultures. Qualitative research seeks to make the most of a myriad of specific information which can be derived from the context, by purposely selecting settings and informants that differ from one another (Mason, 2002: 5). Consequently, this study relied on the use of the qualitative approach. All data collected from both secondary and primary sources were carefully analyzed and interpreted by using qualitative methods.

1.6. Scope of the Study

This study is focused on Ethiopia's role in Somalia's peace-building since 1991. To explore the role of Ethiopia in Somalia's peace building, an examination of Ethiopia's intervention is the most critical. A general understanding of Ethiopia's intervention is required in order to understand its positive and negative role for Somalia's peace-building. Among varied types of intervention special attention is given to the military

intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia. Since 1991, there are many events that needs to be examine in details. But this thesis tried to examine merely the military aspects of events which had determinant effects on Somalia's peace building.

1.7. Significance of the Study

In this preliminary study, the researcher found that very little research exploring on Ethiopia's role in building peace in Somalia. Furthermore, there was also little focus on the actual positive outcomes of Ethiopia's interventions in Somalia. Therefore, this study particularly aspired to explore whether Ethiopia had contribution for Somalia's peace-building or only worked to promote its national self-interests. Therefore, this study clearly shows how much Ethiopia contributed to facilitate Somalia's peace-building or how it is considered as obstacle for Somalia's peace-building.

1.8. Limitation of the Study

The goal of this study is to investigate Ethiopia's role for peace-building in Somalia since 1991. Gathering primary data from both Somalia's and Ethiopia's government officials is mostly important. However, this study faced challenges such as time constraint, shortage of finance to go Somalia. Consequently, all interviews were conducted in Ethiopia. Moreover, interviewing the experts, presented many challenges. These ranged from explaining the purpose of the study, obtaining their trust, and interviewing them within a specific time frame. The experts talked as they want. Therefore, presenting a balanced view of these interviews was quite a challenge. However, the study tried to balance the information in order to carefully analyze and interpret the data as much as possible.

Furthermore, this study faced a problem of secondary sources. The secondary sources predominantly focuses on the criticism of Ethiopia's involvement in Somalia, while the primary source greatly appreciated it. In other words, to gain a much more balanced picture, it would have been important to critically evaluate these different sides.

1.9. Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter focuses on introducing the thesis. In doing so, it briefly introduces the overall framework of the study. Particularly, this chapter provides an overview of the research topic, the research problem, the research objectives and the research questions. The second chapter deals with conceptual framework of military intervention. The third chapter explained the history of Ethiopia and Somalia relations for the purpose of creating clear understanding about the history of hostile

relations between the two countries. The fourth chapter deals with the aspects and nature of Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia since 1991. The 2006 military intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia is importantly discussed. And finally, chapter five provided a conclusion from the understanding of the whole study.

CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUAL FRAME WORK OF PEACE-BUILDING AND MILITARY INTERVENTIONS

2.1. Introduction

The post-cold war period has witnessed an increase in intra-state conflicts in Africa. In view of this situation, African leaders under the Cairo Declaration agreed to make the restoration and building of peace in war-ravaged countries a priority. Peace-building encompasses measures in the context of emerging, current or post-conflict situations for the explicit purpose of preventing violent conflict and promoting lasting and sustainable peace. Yet an understanding of the routine technocracy of the international community may still leave us short of providing suggestions of how peace-building interventions can indeed be context-sensitive and inclusive processes. International law prohibits intervention by any state within the internal affairs without the consent of targeted state. And also international law prohibited unilateral intervention[7] in internal wars neither for agreed of targeted state, nor for urgent humanitarian purposes (Henkin, 2013: 824).

In 1945 the UN Charter also "reaffirmed those prohibitions as part of a general prohibition on the use of force" (Ibid). After World War II, however, there has been a huge number of interventions (Khalid, 2011: 78). After the end of the Cold War, intervention did seem possible that there might be a new unity of purpose that would allow the Security Council gradually to develop a new and more active role (Dorr, 2008: 200). "Politics of intervention, thereafter, in style achieved the global targets set by the powerful states. This practice is normally done under the umbrella of international law" (Khalid, 2011: 78). "The doctrine of legitimate limited armed intervention" and its vigorous fight with nation's sovereignty is going to change the traditional landscape of international law (Ibid: 73). Since early 1990s, events have frustrated for a new world order and about what constituted legitimate use of force in international relations (Howard, 2005: 23). As a consequence, the Security Council adopted a "creative reading of the phrase threat to international peace and security, which allowed it to invoked its Chapter VII enforcement powers" (Dorr, 2008: 200). Therefore, the legal justifications to use force by any state against other state can be found in chapter VII of the UN Charter,

[7] Intervention by several states is unilateral, i.e., on their own authority, if the intervention not authorized by the Security Council. The Security Council was not in fact available to authorize intervention because of the Veto. Faced with a grave threat to international peace and security within its region, and with rampant crimes reeking of genocide.

in the case of intervention for humanitarian purpose, right of self-defense under Art.51 of UN Charter and against terrorist act (Khalid, 2011: 73, Howard, 2005: 22).

After the collapse of its government in 1991, Somalia experienced numerous international and regional interventions. Since 1991, Ethiopia also intervened at several times in Somalia. Ethiopia justified its 2006 military intervention as the right to self-defense, however, the intervention has been subjected to different interpretations. Was Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia a justifiable exception? The purpose of this chapter is to show the legal bases of intervention under UN Charter in order to understand the political and legal justification of Ethiopia's intervention. The 2006 Ethiopia's intervention was legally justified or not? Was it violation of international law or not? There are several views about the justification and controversies of 2006 Ethiopia's intervention. Therefore, this chapter is importantly articulated the logic of 2006 Ethiopia's intervention. It helps to know whether the 2006 intervention of Ethiopia had a legal bases under UN Charter or was contrary to the UN Charter especially Article 2(3), Article 2 (4) and Article 51.

2.1.1. The Concept of Peace

Peace is something everybody wants to have and which not many people actually achieve, it is easily lost and always has to be worked for. For that reason it is understandable that there are different definitions of peace. Basic concepts of peace involve the absence of violence, and the maintenance of stability and a relatively safe social and political order. The word Peace is usually associated with profit and advantage, suitability and fitness. This leads on to ideas such as: kindness and well mannered, talent and capability, self-mending and amending, charity and benevolence, tranquility and affluence, multiplicity and exuberance of something, reconciliation, unity, cease-fire and avoiding war (Grewal, 2003). Peace is constructive and a precondition for any meaningful socio-economic development. There are two definitions of peace. These included negative peace and positive peace.

2.1.1.1. Negative Peace

Negative peace focuses on reducing war and physical violence or the absence of violent conflict or recurrence of conflict. A negative peace program develops a well-informed citizenry or community that takes action through eradicating direct violence and working for disarmament, such as at the emergence of violence and conflict, human rights oppression, riots (Grewal, 2003). War is a form of contention, which creates new forms of

contention. It might be said the post-conflict situation might contain, as much violence as the actual conflict in itself, thus arguing that structural violence, lies under the surface in any new social process. That is to say that when the violence is over, continued efforts at peace building will be needed to reduce risks of new conflicts (Dahre, 2012: 10).

2.1.1.2. Positive Peace

The concept of positive peace focuses on the amelioration of all structural and systematic obstacles to peace and thus the creation of true and sustainable peace. Positive peace addresses the need for justice equity, democracy, and an end to structural violence, being concerned beyond the end of war and physical violence. Positive peace requires justice since changes in global society and economic systems are seen as the necessary preconditions for authentic world peace (Grewal, 2003). Positive peace (as opposed to negative peace where a conflict is stopped but the reasons for war remain) can only be achieved if underlying structures as, for example, inequality is changed.

2.1.2. Definition and Concepts of Peace-building

Peace building have not a single definition. Many organizations have presented their own definition and concept of peace-building, but these definitions have not yet been unified to make a universal definition in the international community. Based on the Report of the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Armed Conflict, peace-building was defined as the activities implemented despite the conflict, with aims to establish the foundation for peace and to provide the means to rebuild the foundation that extends beyond absence of war (DAC, 2005). With the changing nature of conflicts in the post-Cold War era, development assistance has an increasingly important role to play in peace-building assistance, alongside the conventional political framework, such as military activities, preventive diplomacy, and peacemaking. The definition of peace-building shall refer to assistance with the purpose to prevent the occurrence and recurrence of conflicts, alleviate the various difficulties that people face during and immediately after conflicts, and subsequently achieve long-term stable development (Ibid).

Former UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali defined peace-building as the "action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict". He argues that processes of building peace require addressing the root causes of conflict. The roots of the contemporary concept of peace-building date back to efforts by the United Nations in the late Cold War period to

help end collective violence within as well as across states. Peace-building evolved to a full-fledged concept of international engagement during the 1990s. In the face of civil wars and inter-ethnic violent conflict that could no longer be attributed to superpower rivalry. Major development policy documents representing the donor consensus of the time were produced at the DAC level in 1997 and 20012.

Peace-building covers a broad range of measures implemented in the context of emerging, current or post-conflict situations and which are explicitly guided and motivated by a primary commitment to the prevention of violent conflict and the promotion of lasting and sustainable peace. It has three mutually reinforcing dimensions: security, governance and political, social, economic and environmental. In all peace-building interventions, particular emphasis should be given to promoting and fostering national ownership/alignment, co-ordination of the international community's efforts, and harmonization of procedures. Strategic frameworks for the international community's peace-building efforts should be based on joint conflict analyses and needs assessments (DAC, 2005).

2.1.3. The Meaning of Peace-building

In 1992, the UN report An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping introduced the term peace-building. The concept of peace-building was further developed and clarified in a series of subsequent documents, among those the Brahimi Report on UN peace operations and Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security. The latest policy statement on peace-building from the Security Council is the Presidential Statement of 20 February 2001. It recognizes that peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace-building are closely interrelated and that peace-building is aimed at preventing the outbreak, recurrence or continuation of violent conflict and therefore encompasses a wide range of political, developmental, humanitarian and human rights programmes and mechanisms (David, 1999: 55).

Peace-building strives to stabilize post-conflict situations by creating or strengthening national institutions. Peace-building can be understood as a supplement to preventive diplomacy, peacemaking processes, conflict resolution and peacekeeping operations. It encompasses measures in the context of emerging, current or post-conflict situations for the explicit purpose of preventing violent conflict and promoting lasting and sustainable peace (Dugolli, 2008). Lasting and sustainable peace depends not only on the

commitment of political leaders, but also on social acceptance of peace by the population. Peace-building requires reconciliation and the promotion of non-violent conflict resolution at all levels of society: in the military, among political, religious and business leaders, in middle management and at grass-roots levels. The UN High Level Panel (2004) suggests that peace-building should focus on state-building – usually, but not exclusively, in a post-conflict situation (Steven, 1996: 10).

In contrast with peacekeeping, "post-conflict peace-building" is a new concept of which the UN first took note in 1992 (Ghali, 1996: 469). It is now a widely accepted part of most UN missions. There are two basic types of peace-building which aims either to reinforce preventative diplomacy before a conflict or to buttress diplomatic peacemaking after a conflict (David, 1999: 26). Peace-building consists of activities that, during the Cold War, were considered the exclusive purview of states. It can involve democratic institution building, the design and monitoring of elections, training of security institutions, and reconciliation and human rights initiatives. Peace-building is linked to peacekeeping and must observe the same principles in order to be successful. As a leading panel on UN peacekeeping reform noted in August 2000, "History has taught us that peacekeepers and peace-builders are inseparable partners in complex operations (Brahimi, 2000: 5).

2.1.3.1. How Peace-building is Maintained?

Peace building directed by external interveners is no longer a politically and practically viable approach. Peace building is a field that constantly adapts to change and strives for creative solutions for best result. There is considerable potential for regional organizations to engage in peace building (White paper, 2015: 4-5). "The 1992 "Agenda for Peace" defined 'post-conflict peace building' as "action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict. However, 20 years later, the post-conflict framing of peace building has been overtaken by the evolution of violent conflict and the ensuing adaptation of the response" (Ibid: 6). According to Colombo (2010-2011), there are conditions for success of intervention to pursued, "which refer to a set of attributes (credibility, economic sustainability, homogeneity, legitimacy, resoluteness)".

The international community's peace-building efforts in specific countries should be based on joint analyses, common needs assessments and common strategic frameworks

for action. The country's poverty-reduction strategies or other planning documents should be the basis for intervention. Where such strategies do not exist, donors must provide space, time and support for them to be developed. The capacity to peace building is dependent on understanding and affecting the root causes of the conflict (Smith, 2003). The achievement of peace, democratic governance and social justice cannot be done exclusively at any one track for peace building. Rather, it needs to be seen as a collective outcome of many partners and achieved by many agencies at the same time. Peace is a constant struggle. It is a progressive move to transfer conflict to the political, rather than the military theatre, almost under the same international instruments of engagement (Dahre, 2012: 28).

In any multi-track peace building effort we should focus on searching for badly needed flexible dynamic strategic procedures in order to deal with the current conflicts and anticipate the coming ones. Successful multi-track peace building approach can only be sustained when the government of the day, and the head of the ruling elite in particular, and the negotiators from the parties to the conflict are viewed as legitimate by each other (Ibid).

2.1.4. Difference between Peace-building and State-building

State-building and peace-building are not intrinsically synonymous and have often been contradictory in Somalia: the former prioritizes the consolidation of government authority, and the latter compromise and consensus-building. State building defined as purposeful action to develop the capacity, institutions and legitimacy of the state in relation to an effective political process for negotiating the mutual demands between state and societal groups (DAC, 2008). The establishment of government institutions cannot be the sole measure of successful reconciliation. Reconciliation cannot be simply reduced to power-sharing arrangements (Bradbury & Healy, 2010).

The most relevant difference between peace-building and state-building is the overarching perspective they adopt. While the building of states is a task of enormous instrumental value for such end goals as peace, (human) security, and a rule-based framework for socio-economic development, it should not be considered a goal in itself. Peace-building, conversely, is concerned with bringing about an element of favorable development itself, both for individuals and for a social entity; thus, peace can justifiably be regarded as an end goal (alongside other goals, such as poverty reduction, that are not

in the focus of peace-building) rather than an instrument. In short, while peace-building is a multi-faceted "single-purpose" task, state building can be rather characterized as a multi-purpose, instrumental task.

2.1.5. The Meaning of Peacekeeping

Peacekeeping, like the other conflict resolution instruments, is hard to define and may be intended by different users to mean different things. Due to the diversity of operations being described, and the familiarity and favorable resonance of the word itself, "peacekeeping" is used to encompass a wide range of missions that often include peace building and diplomatic peacemaking components. Peacekeeping is the middle ground: ambiguous place between diplomacy and democracy (Steven, 1996: 21). The main function of peacekeeping is to facilitate the transition from a state of conflict to a state of peace; this has earned it the appellation "a halfway house between peace and war." Peacekeeping rests on three principles that are political through and through. It requires that peacekeepers: maintain the consent of the host state(s) and immediate parties to the dispute; act impartially; and behave in a non-violent and non-threatening manner (James, 1990: 7).

2.1.6. The Meaning of Peace-making

Peacemaking involves diplomatic efforts to manage or resolve a conflict. Because of this diplomatic peacemaking often precedes or occurs in parallel with peacekeeping, and, like peacekeeping, requires the consent of disputants. It involves negotiations that aim to avoid conflict or to bring combatants to the peace discussion (Kittani, 1998: 95). Generally, according to Galtung's conceptualization, peace-building is somehow at the interface between peacekeeping and peacemaking, between a robust third-party response to on-going violent conflict, and the establishment of conditions to be able to tackle the causes of the dispute. But this bridge-building function also throws up a whole host of questions related to which actors and institutions should be involved in the undertaking, what kind of mandate and resources ought to be involved, and what the timeframe for such an operation might be.

2.1.7. Intervention, Peacekeeping, Peace-building and Peace-making

The end of the Cold War changed the nature of both international politics and peacekeeping operations. In a renewed spirit of cooperation, as explained above, a series of multidimensional UN operations that performed a broad range of tasks, including non-

military ones, was established. In contrast to the traditional operations, these new peacekeeping operations were also given peace-building tasks. The new type of operation often infringes national sovereignty to a greater extent. Many of these operations were initially viewed as successful and the success of Operation Desert Storm, a war mandated by the UN and waged in response to Iraq's invasion and annexation of Kuwait, boosted the international community's confidence. Facing humanitarian crises and driven by the idea that 'something must be done', operations with humanitarian tasks were established under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

The best-known examples in this regard are the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Yugoslavia and the United Nations Operation in Somalia II (UNOSOM II) (:39). However, these operations failed, because they lacked the resources to keep the peace, let alone enforce it. These interventions did not work mainly because they relied on top down approach. The peacekeeping or peace-making missions used foreign forces and well equipped armies to enforce peace and order. Peace-building interventions targeting civil society are justified as acts of empowerment and capacity-building, while actually 'reinforcing and reinstitutionalising international hierarchies of power and evading responsibility for policy outcomes (Chetail & Jutersonke, 2015: 7). But questions remain as to the compatibility of such an ambitious agenda with some of the UN's guiding principles of sovereignty and neutrality and as has been argued in the case of Somalia, the very act of labelling a particular context as post-conflict and the required intervention as peace-building may be pernicious (Ibid). From the inventory of 69 UN missions since the end of the Cold War, the range and variability of interventions is brought starkly to light. And if the notion of peace-building is indeed leading to a transformation of peace operations.

2.2. The Traditional Perceptions of Non-intervention

The United Nations Charter set up on permanent basis as a universal legal doctrine of non-intervention. Article 2(1) states that the United Nations is based on the "principle of the sovereign equality of all its members" (Massingham 2009: 812). Article 2(3) states that "all Member states shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, is not endangered" (Khalid, 2011: 76). Article 2(4) "prohibits the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state" (Massingham 2009: 812). This article of the

UN Charter's interpretation is strict that even seems to prohibit humanitarian interventions. However, "it has been claimed that Article 2(4) permits humanitarian interventions to the extent that they are not against the territorial integrity or political independence of a state; nor against the UN purposes" (Tsagouria, 2011: 23). Article 2(7) notes that "nothing contained in the Charter authorized the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a state" (Massingham 2009: 812). Since 1945 at least, sovereignty had been commonly understood as entailing a right to non-interference that reflected in Article 2(7) of the UN Charter.

"The Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty (GA Resolution 2131 (XX), 1965) and Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation Among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (GA Resolution 2625 (XXV), 1970) state the prohibition in an unambiguous way" (Julie, 2000: 471):

> *No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal affairs of any other state. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the state or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are in violation of international law.*

2.2.1. The Drawback of the Principle of Non-intervention

Indeed, the purpose of the above mentioned UN Charter's article is, to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of any state. Any disputes between states must be resolved by peaceful means rather than by means of use of force, because use of force is not preferable which is contrary with international law. However, practically this raised the difficult question of how the international community should respond to difficult situations in which the state failed to prevent its own population from mass violation of human rights and war crimes or when the state itself was among the principal perpetrators of such crimes. According to Benjamin (1992) and Henkin (2013), article 2 (4) of the United Nation Charter prohibited all uses of military force, except actions taken in self-defense and actions authorized by the Security Council. The United Nations recognized state sovereignty, and the Security Council preserves peace, and security, and

human rights through collective security. Therefore, it is subject only to the right of self-defense, Article 51 (Henkin, 2013: 824). Thus, this article in the UN Charter contains traditional concepts that may only possible in theory (Bellamy, 2013: 7).

The UN Charter does not contain an explicit and specific rule of non-intervention. What it does contained is an article that prohibited the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state (Julie, 2000: 471). The principle of non-intervention, as traditionally understood, has in practice provided a shelter from external efforts at terminating gross and systematic violations of universal human right (Ibid). As a consequence, Julie (2000), argued that "the resolutions reaffirm the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention in what amounts to an unqualified general principle of non-intervention."

2.2.2. The Causes for the Reaffirmation of the Principle of Non-intervention

Since 1991, however the UN's involvement in Somalia suggested that it may no longer be the case that "quasi-states" enjoy protection under the principle of non-intervention (Julie, 2000: 474). In September 1991, a power struggle for control of Somalia erupted in Mogadishu between the followers of the USC-appointed President Ali Mahdi Mohammed and those of General Muhammad Farah Aideed. The situation deteriorated through 1992 as famine and starvation affected a growing number of the population, and armed bands acting independently controlled their own areas and held people and food relief supplies for ransom (Arnold, 2008: 332).

The Security Council took several steps, the most important of which was the launch of a traditional peace-keeping operation in Somalia (UNOSOM), which had humanitarian aid as its main concern. And also the US-led United Task Force (UNITAF) began "Operation Restore Hope" (Fisas, 2013: 34). This intervention may be seen as a response to the immense humanitarian crisis that was generated by the breakdown of state power in Somalia (Julie, 2000: 474). On 3 December 1992, the Security Council decided to invoke the chapter VII clause of the UN charter in resolution 794, authorizing peace-keeping troops to use force to restore peace and security in Somalia. The United States took the lead in this expanded UN-sanctioned mission, taking command of the multilateral unified task force (UNITAF) operation in Somalia (Aisha, 2012: 21). Unfortunately, the UNOSOM failed in its main objectives of reviving a functional central government and restoring peace and security in Somalia (Fisas, 2013: 34, Menkhaus, 2011: 6).

States often use their sovereignty as a justification to demand non-intervention of other states in matters that they considered to be in their exclusive jurisdiction (Fisas, 2013: 29). In this respect, several politicians and intellectuals criticized the post 1991 interference, particularly the 2006 military intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia as abuse of Somalia's Sovereignty. However, in a growing interdependent world where national boundaries are increasingly permeable, traditional notions of territoriality, independence and non-intervention are losing some of their meaning (Snyman, 2010:140). Today, state sovereignty cannot guarantee complete independence or absolute power over internal matters of any states. "Some commentator's question" are important that whether the domestic jurisdiction clause still fulfills its original purpose to protect the sovereignty of the member states or not (Snyman, 2010: 151). Therefore, the principle of sovereignty and the norms that derive from it must be adapted in accordance with changing realities.

> *'It is now increasingly felt that the principle of non-interference within the essential domestic jurisdiction of states cannot be regarded as a protective barrier behind which human rights could be massively or systematically violated with impunity. . . . The case for not impinging on sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of states is by itself undoubted. It would only weaken if it were to carry the implication that sovereignty… includes the right to mask slaughter or the launching of systematic campaigns of decimation or forced exodus, civil strife or insurrection'* (Arnold, 2008: 1).

2.2.3. The Concept of Intervention

In general terms, intervention refers to the involvement of one states into the domestic affairs of any other state (Evans and Sahnoun, 2001: 8). Intervention had several aspects such as humanitarian, economic and military intervention. Humanitarian and economic intervention always overlap each other that economic intervention shared a characteristic of all non-military forms of assistance which included finance, food, and humanitarian aid (Evans and Sahnoun 2001: 8, Waal & Omar, 1994: 5). Humanitarian intervention has always been controversial (Howard, 2005: 23), in international law that had been defined by the Danish Institute of Foreign Affairs as "coercive action by States involving the use of armed forces in another State without the consent of its government, with or without authorization from the UN Security Council, for the purpose of preventing massive violations of human rights" (Kioko, 2003: 808). Even if the three aspects of intervention are the most important which

needs further investigation, this thesis is focused on the military aspects of intervention. However, to some extent, it touched humanitarian aspects of intervention for the purpose of evaluating the legality and proportionality of Ethiopia's 2006 military intervention in the context of the UN charter.

Like humanitarian intervention, military intervention also the most controversial form that related to the direct or indirect action of external military forces inside a foreign civil war (Evans & Sahnoun 2001: 61).Within the direct and indirect military and humanitarian intervention, the foreign states might had their own national interest or they might had other mission beyond peace-building, peace-keeping, peace-making and humanitarian purpose (Kioko 2003: 808, Evans and Sahnoun 2001: 61). Some writers see intervention as an instrument of foreign policy. For instance, intervention is an ancient and well-established tool which enables states to achieve their own political interest. In this respect, several politicians and intellectuals analyzed the post 1991 intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia as seeking of political interest (to fight her enemy of ONLF, OLF and its rival Eritrea) whether on the pretense of pacifying Somalia or against threat of terrorism. The defining characteristic of intervention versus other instruments of foreign policy is that intervention is both convention breaking and authority oriented (Evans and Sahnoun 2001: 61).

Therefore, states intervene in other states to bring a change of domestic political order of another state. Viewed in this light, intervention is a tool that states use to pursue their own foreign policy goals. According to Ted (2010), the post 1991 aspects of Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia is different from the previous successive regime in its aspect and content that tried to focus on Ethiopia's foreign policy, security policy and strategy, which covers a wide range of Ethiopia's assessment of its relations with Somalia rather focus on the threat of Greater Somalia agenda (Ted, 2010: 27). All these are not for mutual benefits, rather to use her policy as instrument to gain whatever advantage at the expense of Somalia. Indeed, the main objective of foreign policy is to achieve national interest, however, intervention in this sense is not in line with the purpose of UN charter.

2.2.3.1. Justification of Intervention

There are several motivations and interests that push the actor to actively involve within the internal affairs of any state. Intervention of external state in the internal affairs of any state need enough justification for the purpose of effective accomplishment and to benefit

victimized groups. Intervention might be acceptable when there is no government, no order, and the existence of extensive death of human being (when the state fail and collapse). In such case, the military forces are significant to support a political process of peace and nation re-building (Massingham 2009: 818, Colombo 2010: 126).

According to Waal & Omaar (1994):

> *Nonetheless, the theoretical and legal debate was sophisticated. In a formulation that has rarely been bettered W.V. Harcourt, writing in the mid-19th century, described intervention as 'a high and summary procedure which may sometimes snatch a remedy beyond the reach of law (…), the case of intervention as that of revolution, its essence is illegality, and its justification is its success.'*

From the above quotation, intervention in the beginning may not legally justified, but rather the success justified as legal or illegal. Intervention has both positive and negative connotation. However, the criteria to evaluate the indication of intervention as positive and negative connotation are based on the way of using preconditions to intervene and what would be the final result (Massingham 2009: 820). The UN Security Council practice of authorizing interventions suggested that states could lose their claim to protection under the principle of non-intervention, if the state engages in systematic human rights violations; incapable of protecting human rights due to breakdown of state authority; and/or the government in power is unlawfully constituted. When these conditions have been present, the Security Council has considered the situation a "threat to the peace" and thus, has the legal powers to authorized enforcement measures under Chapter VII (Julie, 2000: 470).

2.3. Non-use of Force against Others

Conflict prevention and resolution based on non-use of force are surrounded by preventive diplomacy and the mediation of "good office" of United Nation Charter that open the way for finding normative change in the system. There must be no human right violation and armed conflict (Massingham 2009: 820). In the case of non-use of force, "in accordance with the principles of Chapter VII, the Security Council has normally started out with imposing an arms embargo, sometimes expanded in to more comprehensive economic sanctions, before turning to the authorization of military enforcement" (Christiansen, 1999: 70). The UN Charter envisages a specific procedure before imposing collective

measures as a response to a threat or breach to the peace. According to Article 39 of the UN Charter, the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression (Julie, 200: 471). And make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 40, 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security (Snyman, 2010: 141, Davidsson, 2002: 21).

The UN Charter, in article 40 decides that the "Security Council may, before taking enforcement action, call upon the parties to comply with provisional measures such as a cease-fire or withdrawal of force" (Snyman, 2010: 141).

The UN Charter, in article 41:

> *The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations* (Davidsson, 2002: 21).

The measures under Article 41 can only be imposed, if at all, after the Security Council had concerned the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, listed in Article 39 (Jacoiste, 2010: 279). After determining of such situation based on article 39, the council "call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable (article 40), decide to impose measures not involving the use of armed force...to give effect to its decisions" (article 41) (Davidsson, 2002: 21). Consequently, the council first determined that a particular situation constitutes a threat to, a breach of, the peace, or an act of aggression, and only then decided what measures to adopted to maintain or restore the peace if Article 41 is ineffective decided to take action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security in article 42 (Snyman, 2010: 142, Jacoiste, 2010: 279).

However, the measures of the Security Council limited to the boundaries of fundamental human rights norms, core rules of humanitarian law and core elements of state sovereignty. The purposes and principles of the United Nations serve as limitations on

any Security Council action under Chapter VII, it emphasized that these limitations should not be construed so wide that it renders the United Nations unable to fulfill its main purpose (Snyman, 2010: 145). In a nutshell, the assumption is in conformity with the increasing belief of the international community that sovereignty implies a responsibility to protect against gross and systematic violations of human rights and that the Security Council may therefore, allow states to intervene under these circumstances (Ibid).

2.3.1. Economic Sanction

Following Article 41 of the UN Charter, the UN sanction is the common denomination to designate non-military measures decide by the UN Security Council. Sanctions are an important instrument of UNs in order to maintain international peace and security without use of force (Jacoiste, 2010: 285). Sanctions covered several issues like, prohibition of export and import, movement of funds and freezing of funds and assets, prohibition of air and land communication, severance or reduction of diplomatic and other official relations, and restriction on movement of person as a means to enforce the effectiveness of its other measures (Jacoiste, 2010: 287). He expressed that the sanction's resolution contained exception cases like humanitarian and other exception even if the resolutions have shown great inconsistency in other types of exceptions.

> *UN-imposed economic sanctions may be regarded as a countermeasure by the collectivity of States, acting in lieu of a particular injured State. Even when a State resorts to countermeasures, the scope of such measures would, according to the third and fourth reports by the Special Rapporteur on State responsibility, be limited, inter alia, to respect for human rights and humanitarian values, as well as deriving from jus cogens and erga omnes obligation (…)* (Davidsson, 2002: 24).

2.4. Institutional uses of Force (article 42, UN Charter)

Article 42 states that "collective security authorized by the United Nations Security Council" (Massingham, 2009: 812). According to UN Charter in article 42, if two conditions are fulfilled, the institutional force can be possible. These two critical conditions are: if the non-forcible measures of Article 41 UN Charter become inadequate to settle the problems and the problem is so danger for international peace and security (Tams, 2009: 366). Therefore, "the use of force is deemed to be necessary in order to

maintain or restore international peace and security" (Tsagourias, 2011: 16). The restore of international peace and security is based on the significant goal of UN which is institutional force. Before any use of institutional force, seeing the necessity as well as institutional determination of the necessity are an important method to maintain international peace and security.

2.5. Military Intervention and Use of force

After the end of the Cold War, military intervention has become an even more prominent tool of foreign policy, since territorial sovereignty and non-intervention as binding norms of global politics have declined (Chojnacki & Herchenbach, 2009: 242). Coercive measures may include political, economic, or judicial steps. In extreme cases, military action must be required (Evans and Sahnoun, 2002: 103). Military intervention can be justified only when every nonmilitary option for the prevention or peaceful resolution of the crisis has been explored, with reasonable grounds for believing lesser measures would not have succeeded. The responsibility to react with military coercion can be justified only when the responsibility to prevent has been fully discharged (Ibid: 105). If the Security Council does decided to exercise an international responsibility to protect in a particular case, it has a range of coercive options, short of military force, which it might considered at first. The procedure just outlined may well be inadequate. In such a case it may be necessary for the Council to considered authorizing the use of military force (Dorr, 2008: 206). In reaching its decision, the Council should follow the very sensible guidelines proposed by the secretary-general, Kofi Annan;

> *...we must embrace the responsibility to protect, and, when necessary, we must act on it. This responsibility lies, first and foremost, with each individual State, whose primary raison d'être and duty is to protect its population. But if national authorities are unable or unwilling to protect their citizens, then the responsibility shifts to the international community to use diplomatic, humanitarian and other methods to help protect the human rights and well-being of civilian populations. When such methods appear insufficient, the Security Council may, out of necessity, decide to take action under the Charter of the United Nations, including enforcement action, if so required* (Dorr, 2008:199).

Therefore, the rationale behind military intervention is to protect the whole civilians and not

to defeated or destroyed by the enemy of another military force. However, military intervention, if acceptable at all, should be a last resort (Waal & Omaar, 1994: 6). In order to legally justify, military intervention must be based on principles like, right intention, last resort, proportional means, and reasonable prospects. There must be a reasonable chance of success in halting or averting the suffering that has justified the intervention. The consequences of action should not be worse than the consequences of inaction (Evans and Sahnoun, 2002: 105). Military intervention has its own logic. The troops may go in because relief agencies call for them, but once there they follow commands from military structures, not relief agencies. Their operations are dictated by military strategy, which puts the security of military personnel as the first priority. This means that the troops will move slowly, with their own massive logistical backup. Military action must not risk triggering a greater conflagration (Chojnacki & Herchenbach et al, 2009: 242).

Intervening military forces should strive for neutrality, and should be accountable. The case for military intervention is always made on the basis of the failure of diplomatic interventions (Evans and Sahnoun 2001: 57). The governments that send troops invariably have apologize records on relief and diplomacy (Evans and Sahnoun, 2002: 8). Intervening forces should respect the "Geneva Conventions" and other laws of war. In Somalia, the UN justified violations of the Geneva Conventions by claiming that its authority stemmed solely from the "Security Council resolution authorizing them to take 'all necessary measures' to captured or punished General Muhammad Farah Aideed." [8]

Because of, the Geneva Conventions is an extremely dangerous precedent that must be challenged (Ibid). When military intervention does took place, for whatever reason, there are certain standards of independent verification of facts, accountability and human rights that must be respected. In practical ground, Dorr (2008), argued that the action of the US and the UK, along with some other countries, in going to war against Iraq in 2003 was wrong and unjustified. So too, were most of the reasons the leaders of both countries offered for doing so. The international community must recognized that "military intervention could not solve humanitarian or conflict resolution problems; it can only alter

[8] Muhammad Farah Aideed became an interim president of Somalia on 27 January 1991, and his candidacy was approved by 130 elders. However, there was anger at his elevation amongst other freedom fighter groups outside Mogadishu who had not been consulted. Mohammed was sworn in as president of Somalia on 18 August 1991, for a two-year period. His presidency was at once contested by Aideed and the country was plunged into the chaos of renewed civil war (Arnold, 2008: 237).

them" (Evans and Sahnoun, 2001: 57).

According to Gleditsch et al (2008), states sometimes interfere in internal conflicts of other country militarily to counteract other external states as a proxy. Different writers has seen the Ethiopian interference in the issue of Somalia especially between 1998 and 2000, and 2006 military intervention as proxy war with Eritrea.

2.6. Use of force against others

The use of force by the United Nation Peace Operation is governed under the Mandate of the Security Council. "The UN Charter established an institutional framework regulating the use of force by substituting unilateral uses of force with collective ones, when certain situations of necessity, as defined by the system, arise. These situations are described in Article 39 UN Charter and included a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace, or an act of aggression" (Tsagourias, 2011: 16). The notion of use of force has dynamic interpretation which includes inter-state and intra-state conflicts, mass violations of human right, threat of terrorism, massive destruction of weapons and so on (Tsagourias, 2011: 16, Tams, 2009: 366).

The use of military force by the UN for enforcement purposes is seen as deriving its legality from Chapter VII of the UN Charter (Snyman, 2010: 141, Findlay, 2002: 8, Dorr, 2008: 190), action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression and also a Chapter VII operation, in contrast to a Chapter VI operation, may therefore be authorized to use force beyond self-defense for enforcement purposes (Ibid). Hammarskjöld recognized that such operations could equally be mandated under Article 40 of UN Chapter VII regarding provisional measures that could be taken prior to the Security Council taking more drastic enforcement measures under Article 39 (Ballamy, 2008: 136). Hence, "the widespread idea that somehow peace-keeping might be viewed as a 'Chapter VI and-a-half' activity, somewhere between voluntarism and compulsion" (Findlay, 2002: 17).

2.6.1. Use of force for Humanitarian Purposes

Customary international law has always recognized a principle of military intervention on humanitarian grounds (Wall & Omaar, 1994: 4). The UN Charter was drawn up in the context of extreme skepticism about humanitarian justifications for intervention. The Charter expressly prohibited the use of force, or threats of the use of force, by states

except in self-defense. However, the UN Charter provides no specific provision for forceful intervention for the purpose of protecting people's human rights (Howard, 2005: 23). It has done this through resorting to a broad interpretation of its powers under Chapter VII of the Charter - determining in all cases that the humanitarian disasters gave rise to the interventions constituted a threat to the peace (Ibid). In order to maintain humanitarian assistance and the protection of civilians, the Security Council of UN strictly uses military force (Christiansen, 1999: 71). Humanitarian intervention is not only to protect threatened peoples but also to restore the international order ruptured by outrages. Humanitarian intervention is not consider as unambiguously illegal (Tsagourias, 2011: 24).

In the post-cold war period, the views towards humanitarian interventions seem to be changing that "reflected in the official positions of governments and, as far as the UN is concerned, by the introduction of the 'Responsibility to Protect' doctrine" (Ibid). Nonetheless, the UN is increasingly seen as a tool of the US, even if the endorsement be seen as the outcome of a genuine international consensus, and not the outcome of manipulation by one or more powerful countries. "In Somalia, the international forces routinely referred to as 'the Americans' by both Somalis and foreigners". According to Waal and Omaar (1994), such confusion is dangerous. If UN resolutions, are no longer seen to represent the collective will of the community of nations, sovereignty will again become a more plausible defense by abusive governments. Because of, a number of governments have justified unilateral military action with reference to the customary law of military humanitarian intervention in one form or another. Without exception, therefore, the international community has refused to recognize these actions as legitimate (Waal & Omaar, 1994: 5).

2.6.1.1. Political and Legal aspects of Humanitarian Intervention

Thus, the legal status of military humanitarian intervention is problematic. Because of, there is an ideal form of such intervention. According to Waal and Omaar (1994), few would object to "when a governing power is so tyrannous that its crimes can be remedied only by external intervention, and the world community is united in demanding such action. The problem is that few if any cases of military intervention which cite this doctrine come close to the ideal" (Waal & Omaar: 5). Although, the sovereignty of the state is still considered as a cornerstone of the international legal and political order, the

norm that the legitimacy of the "exercise of the rights of sovereignty is dependent on respect for human rights and for the principle of representation" (Christiansen, 1999: 17). The Security Council authorized military intervention for humanitarian purposes in Somalia, in 1991 and 1992.

In principle, those interventions were not justified as humanitarian. In other words, intervention, does not appear in the UN Charter. Because of this, humanitarian interventions may support some internal wars during accompanied by war crimes, and massive human rights violations and other crimes against humanity (Henkin, 2013: 825). Under Article 27(3) of the Charter, a Security Council resolution to authorized "intervention, like other 'nonprocedural' matters, was subject to veto by any permanent member" (Ibid). Therefore, by the sum of law and politics, humanitarian intervention by any state was prohibited. But in truly consideration of justice, in case of serious violations of human rights or international humanitarian law are a necessary condition for humanitarian intervention. Even if, the political and legal questions dealt with in relative isolation, later on, in Chapters VI and VII of UN Charter, "political, moral and legal-political perspectives be brought together for a comprehensive assessment" (Christiansen, 1999: 23).

> *Humanitarian intervention is the question of how to reconcile in the most constructive way that the strained relationship between the non-intervention norm and the non-use of force and the international prevention of gross and systematic human rights violations. The question of the legality of humanitarian intervention on the part of states or international organizations is determined by the norms of international law– treaty law as well as customary law. The notion of legitimacy is the intervention justifiable? Is a multidisciplinary concept referring to moral-philosophical, political as well as general legal principles* (Ibid)?

2.6.2. Use of force for the Purpose of Self-Defense (article 51, UN Charter)

From the understanding of the traditional perceptions of the rights of states that difficult to practice during war crime and mass violence, the UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, declared in 1999 that "'state sovereignty, in its most basic sense, is being redefined … States are now widely understood to be the servants of their people, not vice versa'" (Bellamy, 2013: 8). The inherent right of state to self-defense or group of state for

collective self-defense was mandated under international law and enshrined in Article 51 of the United Nation Charter and the UN's definition of Aggression Resolution of 1974 (Evans and Sahnoun, 2001: 32, Schmitt, 2013).

United Nation's Charter stated about the exceptional case of intervention. Article (51) states that "the inherent right of self-defense articulated the two sole exceptions to article 2(4)'s prohibition on the use of force" (Massingham 2009: 812). "The self-defense character of rescue operations is also confirmed by the guidelines for Non-Combatant Evacuation Operations adopted by certain states" (Tsagourias, 2011: 23). The rescue mission, therefore, an aspect of self-defense in its customary and UN Charter formulation because of the term 'inherent' in Article 51 UN Charter incorporates the full content of the customary law on self-defense (Tsagourias, 2011: 23). Such incorporation of customary law on self-defense is important to protection of nationals from external dangers or threat.

From the statement of the United Nation Charter, there are two clearly known universal principles and one exceptional declaration. Firstly, any country cannot intimidate or threaten against over the sovereignty and independence of another countries. Secondly, no countries intervene in the internal affairs of another states. Under United Nation Charter, there is no specification of the right to intervention in the internal affairs of another states. Third, the United Nation Charter provided an important exceptional case that help to the silent countries to protect themselves from the threat of belligerent countries.

Therefore, the UN Charter recognized the right of states to use force by way of self-defense during armed attack and if there is breach of peace and security. A state can exercise its right of self-defense until the Security Council takes measures necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security (Tsagourias, 2011: 18). However, states have not unrestricted rights of self-defense under the law of the UN charter rather their right is limited by the rationale behind the UN regime which is that of institutional control of the use of force triggered by necessity (Tsagourias, 2011: 18).

The decision of the Security Council, under the United Nation Charter VI on the "pacific settlement of disputes" is not enforceable, if the conflict and or whatever problems resolves through cooperation with the consent of the parties involved in the conflict (Findlay, 2002: 7). He has explained that the authorization of the Security Council for the purpose of using force, Chapter VI operation allows to use force is confined to only self-defense. According to Findlay (2002), even in self-defense, force may only be used as a last resort

and it must be used proportionately which "only sufficient force may be employed to achieve the objective of ending the immediate threat and prevent, as far as possible, loss of life or serious injury" (Findlay, 2002: 14). He also said that otherwise use of force beyond self-defense is only with the consent of the involved parties.

The UN Security Council "often adopts a two-pronged policy when emergency situations arise that justify self-defense. It affirms the right of states to use force in self-defense but at the same time it takes institutional action under Chapter VII" irrespective of the effectiveness of UN measures (Tsagourias, 2011: 18). In another case, the mandate of Security Council also has important component in "defense of the mission" which means self-defense rule openly transferred from its narrow origin to encompass a large number of possibilities (Findlay, 2002: 87).

2.6.2.1. Pre-emptive Self-defense

Based on against actual and imminent attacks, customary international law recognized a broader right of self-defense (Howard, 2005: 24). In the event of an imminent threat to its security, usually a visible mobilization of armies, navies and air forces preparing to attack, a state can legitimately strike first. Pre-emption is recognized as legitimate in international law (Ibid). It is unreasonable that states should have to demonstrate imminence before acting pre-emptively. Different views forwarded as whether pre-emptive self-defense is permitted by the UN Charter or it have been divided: "whereas parts of the jurisprudence claim that Article 51 of the Charter has suppressed this aspect of self-defense by requiring a prior armed attack, others claim that the Charter preserves the customary right of self-defense in the word inherent" (Tsagourias, 2011: 19). As a classic example, states began to support the practice that states can use force against imminent threats of an attack with the "Six-Day War" since 1945. However, after the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the "US National Security Strategy (US NSS)" in 2002, the views about the status of pre-emptive self-defense within the UN scheme dramatically changed (Tsagourias, 2011: 19).

Therefore, now a day, pre-emptive self-defense is part of the customary and the UN law on self-defense which is not as such controversial rather the critical question is how 'imminence' is assessed. Since the nature of modern threats are so complex, in contemporary time factual and temporal factors can be taken in to consideration to assess 'imminence' (Tsagourias, 2011: 20).

In this respect, the justification of Ethiopia to fight the UIC with the Somali government was its inherent right to self-defense. All States have an inherent right to defend themselves when they face an armed attack from another State, or by State-sponsored armed groups, in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter. As a consequence, the legal bases of Ethiopian's 2006 military intervention in Somalia is seen from the angle of self-defense by the state which aims the protection of its citizen from Jihad that has been declared by UIC. In Resolution 1516 of 2003, the Council avowed the need to combat by all means threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. Ethiopia took UIC as the former members of AIAI which attacked Addis Ababa in 1990's. This condition obliged the state to defend itself from those members. Ethiopia considered her response as self-defense (Allo, 2010). However, Allo (2010), argued that the response of Ethiopia was not proportional. There are arguments that articles 51 of UN is interpreted according to the interest of America in a way it needs. Because of, there is sometimes misleading in the concept of Self-defense which mostly those western states interpreted the concept according to their interest by gave political meaning for it. In this respect, the intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia challenged by different political and legal analysis, though Ethiopia justified her intervention as self-defense.

According to Menkhaus (2011), the ICU emerged victorious and consolidated control over most of south-central Somalia in 2006. For a brief period, it appeared that the ICU would emerge as a government and a victor's peace would be imposed in Somalia. But the ascent of radical elements in the Islamist umbrella movement helped to propel the ICU into a war with neighboring Ethiopia, which routed the ICU forces in December 2006 and militarily occupied Mogadishu. The two year Ethiopian military occupation provoked a predictable insurgency, led by a "radical jihadist militia known as the shabaab" (Menkhaus, 2011: 8).

UIC calls for jihad against Ethiopia, accelerated a confrontation with Ethiopia, which the Islamists mistakenly believed they would win. Ethiopian counter-insurgency responses were heavy, and had the effect of emptying whole neighborhoods. The TFG, which assumed a presence in Mogadishu under the protection of the Ethiopian forces, also engaged in military operations against the insurgents. But TFG security forces were poorly controlled and engaged in widespread and serious abused against civilian populations (Ibid). Menkhaus (2010), argued that Ethiopia has a vested interest in

perpetuating Somalia's state of war and collapse. Because of, Ethiopia, which, it is claimed, fears a revived Somali state due to Somalia's history of irredentism and war with Ethiopia (Menkhaus, 2010: 139).

2.6.3. Use of force against Terrorist act

The other important requirement of intervention was the issue of terrorism. In the particular period of 1989 -2009, the serious challenge was the issue of terrorism under argument that "in the course of two decades the legal rules governing the use of force have been re-adjusted so as to permit forcible responses against terrorism under more lenient conditions" (Tams, 2009: 361). In the period of late 1980s, the prohibition against use of force was comprehensive in its scope that "every use of force in the international relations of a state to be prima facie illegal" (Tams, 2009: 364). And Tams expressed that as a result, use of force by certain states within other states against terrorists considered as violating the rules. Because of, uses of force against another state's territorial integrity or political independence is not in line with Article 2(4) of UN Charter.

> *However, later on the "narrow readings of the prohibition had been convincingly dismissed by the ICJ in its Corfu Channel judgment, and had lost support ever since. The Court's Nicaragua judgment applied this robust interpretation of the Charter-based prohibition to the sphere of customary international law, which according to the Court was very similar in scope. It followed that states seeking to use force extraterritorially, as part of an anti-terrorist campaign, required some legal justification"* (Tams, 2009: 365).

Presently, many states considered terrorist activities to a threat which has to be addressed through multilateral or unilateral action by means of force. However, until now there is no comprehensive anti-terrorism convention rather "special sectorial treaties have mushroomed. This special sectorial treaties have been complemented by far reaching anti-terrorism rules enacted as part of secondary United Nations law" based on contextual approach to avoid the root cause of terrorism (Tams, 2009: 374). Tams expressed that free from terrorism is increasingly regarded as universal community values. The fight against terrorism is considered as "a legitimate cause which might warrant a military approach and allow readjustments to the *jus ad bellum"* (Ibid).

In order to create a clear understanding of this development, focusing on the three aspects of the traditional regime are important. These include: the ban on force, the exception and the collective security option (Ibid). In the case of ban on force, until now like the 20 years ago, does not prohibit the use of force against terrorists as such. But it prohibit in international relations between states. Therefore, the ban on force covers the extraterritorial use against terrorists based in another country indirect way only. Where as in case of exception, allowing for unilateral force is essential (Ibid). However, the collective security system has confronted the problem of terrorism. Because of this,

> *today a real possibility that states using force against terrorists should be in a position to do so with the blessing of the Security Council. This is a result of the Security Council's renaissance since 1989, its active role in the fight against terrorism as far as the use of force against terrorists is concerned. Unlike with respect to the multilateral option, there has been a considerable body of practice states exercising force against terrorists have, expressly or by implication, moved beyond the traditional regime (…)* (Tams, 2009: 377-8).

Following the attacks on the United States on September 11/2001, the idea of use of force against terrorist act found their way into US declaratory policy. In its 2002 National Security Strategy, the US administration claimed a new right of preemptive self-defense. "The administration argued that the concept of 'imminent threat' should be expanded to permit military action even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemy's attack. This basic proposition was repeated in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review" (Ballamy, 2008: 147). However, the Strategy was criticized for being deliberately misleading in using the term preemption to refer to what is in essence a strategy of prevention. In Somalia the threat posed by the collapse of the state and its institutions to the region and wider international community. The issues of terrorism and piracy as well as the devastating humanitarian consequences for Somalia's citizens have prompted neighboring countries to implement strategies to rebuild and bring peace and security in Somalia.

In light of this, Ethiopia justified her military intervention of 2006 as against the threat of terrorist act which came from UIC. Therefore, was Ethiopia's 2006 military intervention legally justified? The justification of military intervention needs legal bases, unless and

otherwise it will became contrary with the aim of UN Charter (VII). As a consequence, it will be lacked the principle of article 2(4) of UN Charter. "The United Nations Security Council passed resolution 1373 on 12 September 2001 and which freeze financial and economic assets of all suspects who commit or attempt to commit the terrorist acts" (Khalid, 2011: 75). According to the Charter of the United Nations under Chapter VII, prevent and suppress the financial support of terrorist acts and take the necessary steps to prevent the commission of terrorist acts, including by provision of early warning to other states by exchange of information (Khalid, 2011: 75).

In this respect, UIC considered as a supporter of terrorists group and it would be difficult for Ethiopia's territorial integrity. So, Ethiopia has an inherent right to defend herself. US for instance stated that there was a link between UIC and Al-Qaeda. As a result, according to United Nations Development Program (UNDP) (2010), the use of Somalia for the expansion of global terrorism was the source of international concern. Somali Islamists were able to captured control of the Council of Islamic Courts (CIC) in 2006 and drive that umbrella movement into increasingly radical and ultimately self-destructive policies. These Islamists also forged links to foreign al-Qaida affiliates in the 1990s and later provided several terror suspects safe haven in Somalia. They solidified public support by tapping into strong anti-Ethiopian sentiments. By declaring jihad on Ethiopia, they successfully conflated Somali nationalism, anti-Ethiopians and Islamism, mobilizing support from a broad range of Somali society (NSSCT, 2006: 33). When certain state like Somalia collapses, it may be exposed breeding ground for terrorists. In other words, the failure of state might directly related with the threat of terrorist group for the whole state in general and the neighboring state in particular which had "dangerous connection with terrorists proliferation" (Colombo, 201:150).

Different writers suggested, that the 2006 military intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia seemed contradict with the UN Charter of article 2(3) and 2(4), though her justification was against the terrorist act of UIC that connected with Al Shebab. Indeed, the UN Charter of article 2 (3) and 2(4) have narrow definition, which difficult to applied force during war crime against other states. The 2006 Ethiopia's military intervention in Somalia, however, under UN Charter Article 51: the right of Self-defense. Nonetheless, different writers did not accept those official discourse.

CHAPTER THREE: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF ETHIO-SOMALIA RELATIONS

3.1. Introduction

Ethiopia gained her modern shape during Menelik II (1889-1913) (Dahre, 2007: 39). Unlike Somalia, Ethiopia, widely known as the oldest state and the only country in the African continent that did not fall under the yoke of colonialism (except short period of Italian occupation, in 1936-41). During the reign of Menelik II (1889- 1913), Ethiopia began to assert itself vigorously over Ogaden[9] region with which it had loose contacts in the past (Tibebe, 1994: 69). Emperor Menelik, basing his action an old claims of Ethiopian sovereignty, it entered the Ogaden region in the late 1890s (Ibid). The Ogaden was occupied by Somali nomads extending southeast from Ethiopia's Southern highlands (Bamfo, 2010: 56). Following, the occupation of Harar in 1887, Ogaden was incorporated in Ethiopia's region (Tibebe, 1994: 69).

Over the period 1860-1900, the Somali nation was divided into different groups. From north to south, which were French Somaliland (containing the Afar pastoral people), the British Somaliland Protectorate (with no colonial settlers), the Italian colony of Somalia, the Ethiopian Ogaden (named after that local clan), and British northern Kenya (Lewis, 2004: 494). The Somali people were completely divided between colonial powers starting from 1884. The Italians developed interest along the Ogaden from the very moment they established their influence in the Benadir coast. One thing that made Italian interest in the Ogaden clearly evident is the fact that the Anglo-Italian Protocol of 1894 recognized the Ogaden as part of the Italian sphere of influence. The Italians and the Ethiopians bitterly contested over Lugh. In December 1896, an Ethiopian force commanded by Dejazmach Wolde Gabriel removed the Italians from Lugh.[10] Following the victory of Adawa, in 1897 Menelik signed treaties with Britain and France in which the "boundaries of Ethiopia with their respective spheres were defined" (Tibebe, 1991: 79).

Later on, the region of the Ogaden was incorporated in to the Italian East African Empire in the 1936 again. In August 1940 the Italians also annexed British Somaliland and added

[9] The ogaden is an Ethiopian territory bordering on Somalia and Somaliland.

[10] Lugh was a major emporium situated on the left bank of Juba, through which passed the trade from the regions of Sidamo, Bale, Arsi and Shoa into the Benadir coast. The Italians under Ferrendi had erected a fort at Lugh to secure their commercial interest in the southern part of Ethiopia (Tibebe, 1994: 78-79).

it to their East African empire (Ibid). As a consequence, both Ethiopia and Britain began to struggle the Italian force. Following the defeat of the Italians, the British military administration began in 1942 in the Ogaden. For the most part, Ogaden had been under the British rule between 1942 and 1955 (Tibebe, 1991: 9). The British left the Ogaden in 1948 and Ethiopia officially took over the largest city in the Ogaden. British in return were to have a rich grazing land in the Ogaden (Haud) (Ibid).

Somalia gained her independence in the 1960. Post-independence politics in Somalia, centered on pan-Somalism, that translated to unifying all areas populated by Somalis into one country which already proposed by Britain administration. The national flag, which displayed five stars (Arnold, 2008), had points representing those areas claimed as part of the Somali nation. However, in February 1964, a serious war erupted along the entire Somali-Ethiopian border. As well as followed the war of 1977 (Ibid).

3.2. Historical Background of Ethio-Somalia relations

The relation of Ethiopia and Somalia is not a recent phenomenon (Rediker, 2003-2004: 204, Hagmann, 2004: 3). The history of Somalia and Ethiopia is marred by distrust, animosity and war (Woodwell, 2007: 16). Suspicion of neighbouring expansionism and political extremism is deeply rooted in both states. Hostility between the two countries is deep, rooted in centuries of conflict (Menkhaus, 2009: 225). But the focus of this chapter started from the reign of Emperor Menilik. Because of this, the reign of Emperor Menilik has contributed the most significant impact in the incorporation of Ogaden region. The origin of the Somali-Ethiopian dispute over Ogaden dates back to 1897, when the frontier between Italian Somaliland and the Ethiopian empire was traced on two different maps by Major Nerazzini and King Menelik (Tripodi, 1999: 372). Because of "John Drysdale reported that 'Neither map could subsequently be found nor no living person can testify to the exact nature of the agreement'" (Ibid).

The disharmony relations of Ethiopia and Somalia started during the reign of Emperor Menilik. Hagmann (2004), in his writing on: "*The rationality of political instability in the Somali region of Ethiopia, 1991-2003",* argued that "ever since, the British Empire ceded the Ogaden to Ethiopia's Emperor Menilik in 1897, respectively, 1948 and 1954, the region has been 'one of the most problematic example of partition'". While Tibebe (1994), in his writing on: "*Towards a history of the incorporation of the Ogaden: 1887-1935",* argued that "the desert region of the Ogaden, which occupies the peripheral parts of Ethiopia,

seems to have long been a source of difficulty for Ethiopian rulers because of their inability to establish effective control" over the Ogaden region. According to Wasara (2002), in his writing on: *"Conflict and State Security in the Horn of Africa: Militarization of Civilian Groups"*, argued that definitely, the Somali ethnic groups living in the Ogaden were the cause of the Ethiopian-Somali war in 1970s. This ethnic group is the constant source of tension between Ethiopia and Somalia. Conflicts in these countries involving one ethnic group generate sympathy in the other (Wasara, 2002: 46). The Ogaden was annexed to Ethiopia in the late 19th century. In the late 1970s there were military clashes between Ethiopia and Somalia for control the Ogaden region. As a consequence, the Somali regime seriously debilitated in 1978 (Fisas, 2013: 32).

3.2.1. Ethio-Somalis Relations under the Reign of Emperor Menelik

"The incorporation of the Ogaden followed the defeat of Emir Abdulahi of Harar at the battle of Chelenqo on January 6, 1887. The army of Menilik entered Harar on January 8/9, 1887" (Tibebe, 1994: 71). The occupation of Harar opened the door to the Ogaden. Although, the incorporation of the Ogaden was a painfully slow process exacting huge sacrifices, "ending its role as a buffer zone." The slow and incomplete incorporation of Ogaden in to the Ethiopian nation- state was an ongoing narrative of the central government's repetitive yet futile attempts to establish a monopoly of violence by forceful and political means. It is also a narrative of the highlands' continuous marginalization of the Somali lowlands (Tobias, 2005: 512).

According to Tibebe (1994), Menelik was attracted by the Ogaden region, particularly for three reasons. The first two are seen from the economic point of view, while the second one is seen from political point of view. Firstly, Emperor Menelik well realized, the importance of the trade routes passing through it which connected to "Harar coastal ports of Zeila and Berbera." Secondly, the livestock potential of the region was of considerable significance. Thirdly, securing the Ogaden would help Menelik's position and his image building, from the angle of his neighbouring colonial powers.

The region of Ogaden, "which occupied the peripheral parts of Ethiopia, seems to have long been a source of difficulty for Ethiopian rulers, because of their inability to established effective control" The desert nature of the Ogaden presented a problem for soldiers to control the region consistently. Because of this, the Ethiopians could not find a viable option to exercise control apart from the traditional method of waging campaigns

(Tibebe, 1994: 71-72). However, "the year 1891 constituted a significant turning point in the history of the Ogaden", that Menelik gave command for campaigns to be intensified in to the Ogaden. The town of Jijjiga founded in 1891, which served as a meeting ground and resting station for campaigners either heading for the Ogaden or returning from it. However, Menelik faced challenges. The Italians developed interest along the Ogaden from the very moment they established their influence in the Benadir. By 1893, occupation of the coast and the hinterland was almost complete (Tibebe, 1994: 78). One thing that made Italian interest in the Ogaden clearly evident is the fact that the Anglo-Italian Protocol of 1894 recognized Ogaden as part of the Italian sphere of influence. British in return were to have the Haud, a rich grazing land in the Ogaden (Ibid).

As a consequence, in 1897, Menelik signed treaties with Britain and France in order to define the boundaries of Ethiopia with their "respective spheres" (Tibebe, 1994: 73). In this agreement, however, the Italian sphere was not distinctly defined. Rather it lying within the area running up to 180 miles parallel to the coast. That started from the point of intersection of the frontier with the British Somaliland in the north and extending to the southern reaches of the Juba River near to Bardera in the south. "This definitely left the Ogaden, including Lugh, within Ethiopia. This is a matter of crucial importance which in the long run affected the lives of the nomadic population and future political developments" (Tibebe, 1994: 73). The 1897 Treaty dealt with the demarcation of the Ethiopia-Somali border land (Arnold, 2008: 278), which allowed Ethiopia for grazing grounds that precluded to British "protectorate." However, both Ethiopians and Somalis never satisfied with the arrangement of the 1897 treaty. Because, the agreement was not made by the Somalis or Ethiopia and not organized between Ethiopians and Somalis (Bahru, 1991:77). The border treaty that established between Ethiopia and British Somaliland cut across traditional Somali grazing lands in the Haud, although it was agreed that Somalis could move their cattle into this Ethiopian territory to graze during the wet seasons (Arnold, 2008: 277).

Italians continued to make "encroachments" in to Lugh and further beyond. After 1905, the Italians made advances into the Ogaden along the same line of penetration that is the Juba and Wabi Shebele rivers. The Ethiopian government also countered Italian "encroachments" by sending expeditions in the same direction to stop Italian activities. As a consequence, border frictions at times leading to major clashes throughout the years

with their own "ebbs and flows." As a result, the two governments had to reach another agreement in 1908 (Tibebe, 1994: 79).

> *In the Convention of May 16, 1908, the two sides agreed to accept the terms outlined in 1897, as far as their border in the Ogaden went. The Convention of 1908 stipulated that, following the line accepted in 1897, all the territories belonging to the tribes towards the coast would remain dependent on Italy; all the territory of the Ogaden and all of the tribes of the Ogaden would remain dependent on Ethiopia. Following the May 16, 1908 Convention, Lugh was ceded to them through a combination of skilful military action and diplomatic man oeuvres* (Ibid).

This became a source of trouble parties, because of the boundaries were never demarcated on the ground, rather it defined on paper (Ibid). A new convention between Italy and Ethiopia in 1908 attempted to fix the border between the two territories, but "it was never implemented because it incorporated the 1897 agreement which had vanished" (Tripodi, 1999:372).

3.2.2. Ethio-Somalis Relations under the Reign of Emperor Haileselassie

During the 1930s, the colonial powers (Italian, Britain) also fought among themselves over borders (Bamfo, 2010: 56). The Ogaden being taken by the Ethiopian government to make its control effective, alarmed Italian to speed up their activities. Nonetheless, continued Italian pressure along the Ogaden border created considerable concern on the Ethiopian side. As a result, a campaign on an unprecedented scale was launched in 1931 to counter the challenge. "The campaign brought the Italian and the Ethiopian army face to face, though armed clashes were avoided" (Tibebe, 1994: 77). By 1934, the Ethiopian state had established considerable control over the Ogaden (Ibid). However, years of tension culminated in the Italian invasion of Ethiopia in 1935. Under the fascist government of Benito Mussolini, these new lands formed an expansive Italian Somali "protectorate" (Rediker, 2003-2004: 208). Generally, following the Italian fascist invasion of Ethiopia in 1935, the Ogaden became part of Italian East Africa in 1936 (Lewis, 2002: 51, Tripodi, 1999: 372). Both Britain and Ethiopia had separate objective, but as a common purpose, both countries stood in one side against the Italians to recapture British Somaliland and Ethiopian Ogaden region.

With a tremendous sacrifice made by both the Ethiopian patriots and the British soldiers,

the war of liberation in Ethiopia came to a close in 1941 (Tibebe, 1991: 9). Along with Ethiopia, British forces also recovered Somalis from Italian occupation in 1941 (Woodwell, 2007:102). After the defeat of Italian troops, Great Britain annexed Italian Somaliland, including Ogaden and Haud (Ibid). As a consequence, all Somali's territories united under a single British military administration (Lewis, 2002: 51, Tripodi, 1999: 372). Following the defeat of the Italians, the British military administration in the Ogaden, began in 1942. As a result, between 1942 and 1955, the most part of Ogaden had been under British rule (Tibebe, 1991: 9, Lewis, 2004: 496). For Ethiopian, the relative isolation of (for almost fourteen years) the Ogaden from its government, created political alienation with Britain (Tibebe, 1991: 9).

> *The immediate months of the post-liberation period were marred by confusion. The British established the so-called Occupied Enemy Territory Administration (OETA) in Ethiopia which lasted from April 1941 to the end of January 1942. The setting up of OETA presented a serious infringement upon Ethiopia's sovereignty. The behavior of the British military official's charge of the new administration even raised doubts as to whether Ethiopia was liberated or reconquered* (Tibebe, 1991: 10).

OETA was signed in the spirit of temporarily regulating relations between the "signatories and rendering mutual aid as allies in the struggle against a common enemy, that is, the Axis" (World War II fascist powers: the military and political alliance of Germany, Italy, and, later, Japan that fought the Allies in World War II). Nonetheless, it terminated by the Anglo-Ethiopian Agreement of January 31, 1942 (Ibid). "The peril of invasion of the Middle East by the Axis persisted and the danger of Japanese attack was imminent. Moreover, threat from Djibouti, then under Vichy rule, had to be countered. Thus British were given extraordinary rights in Ethiopia, especially in the eastern parts of Ethiopia, particularly the Ogaden and Haud" (The Haud is situated partly in Somaliland but mainly in the Ogaden) (Ibid). The British established the so-called "Reserved Area" (The Reserved Area is partly in the Ogaden and partly in another part of Ethiopia) in the northeastern parts of Hararghe, touching districts of Harar, Jijjiga and Dire Dawa and including the vital line of Franco-Ethiopian railway. Therefore, the period of British Military administration started over the Ogaden and the "Reserved Area" (Ibid). Furthermore, the British, who then had control over the larger portion of the Ogaden,

were beginning to envisage creating a united Somali (Ibid: 11).

On December 19, 1944, the second Anglo-Ethiopian agreement was signed. Ethiopia allowed to occupy the Ogaden and the Reserved Area to Britain, in article VII of the agreement. The legacy of the British occupation of the Ogaden and the Reserved Area was the political destabilization of the Ogaden region as a whole (Tibebe, 1991: 13). The right to exercise military administration over the areas was granted to them by the Ethiopian government. As a consequence, the British had unconditionally recognized the Ogaden and the Reserved Area as an integral part of Ethiopia in the agreement of 1944 (Tibebe, 1991: 13). The duration of the agreement was two years, which subject to termination on three months' notice. In essence, this agreement had no difference, rather only a renewal of the agreement of 1942 as far as the Ogaden was concerned. In this second agreement, no provisions were made rather conditions in the Ogaden remained the same, which substantially affecting its position. As a consequence, the Ogaden was kept under British Military rule until 1948. Without justification for extended retention, the British waited long enough to cause serious alarm (Tibebe, 1991: 12-13).

As events later confirmed, the British behaved in ways that to harm Ethiopia's position. United Somalis, proposed by Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Minister, was to be formed by the establishment of a single Somali nation comprising Djibouti, northern Kenya, the Ogaden, and Somaliland (Rediker, 2003-2004: 208). Somalis, united for the first time since colonization, began to discuss their own ideals of "Somali Pan-nationalism" (Ibid). The modern Somali nationalist movement began in 1943 with the establishment of the Somali Youth Club (SYC), which later renamed the Somali Youth League (SYL) (Tibebe, 1991: 17, Woodwell, 2007: 102). British administrators, who saw the emergence of Somali lobbying groups as a powerful hedge against Italian- national groups opposed to the presence of the British, supported the emergence of the SYC/SYL (Woodwell, 2007:102).

The legal agreement states that the Ogaden people should not be ruled by Ethiopia. Because of, Ethiopia's religion is incompatible with that of the Moslem Somali, if that is something they do not want. By assuming, allowing this would ultimately bring the British into conflict with the "Moslem world of the Middle East" (Tibebe. 1991: 13). This was worry for Ethiopia. As far as Ethiopia was concerned, the idea of united Somalis meant losing of a large portion of its territory. Even if everything else was excluded, from

a security point of view Ogaden was a serious concern for Ethiopia. As a consequence, "a memorandum released from Ethiopian side in 1944, declared that the idea of 'Greater Somalia' was a thinly veiled threat by the British to rob Ethiopia of territories which it had recognized as part of Ethiopia by an international agreement" (Tibebe, 1991: 14).

However, the British did not seem to accept Ethiopia's concern, rather she continued to be preoccupied with the idea of "Greater Somalia." Aware of the danger, the Ethiopian government began to take new diplomatic initiatives to counter the situation. To secure the restoration of the Ogaden and the "Reserved Area", the Emperor wanted the United States of America to support him in his effort (Ibid). With the decision of the UN to place Italian Somaliland under Italian trusteeship in 1948, the British desire for "Greater Somalia" was weaken (Tibebe, 1991: 14). When the UN Trusteeship Council decided to give administration of Somalis to Italy (in 1950), Haud and Ogaden remained annexed to British Somaliland (Tripodi, 1999: 373). By 1948, when the "Four Power Commission" or "Allied powers" (representing Britain, France, the USA and the USSR) visited Somalia to ascertain Somali aspirations for their future status, the Club had changed its name to the Somali Youth League (SYL) (Lewis, 2004: 497).

The SYL expanded rapidly, and, by the end of the 1940s, had opened offices in all of the four main British occupied territories, which traditional British Somaliland (in the north), Italian Somalia (on the Indian Ocean), the Northern Frontier District (later part of Kenya), and the Ogaden region. The SYL's stated objectives were to unify all Somali territories; to create opportunities for universal education; to develop the Somali language by instituting a common written language; to oppose the restoration of Italian rule (Woodwell, 2007: 102).

After World War II due to the loss of common assumption among between the Allied powers, "the Four Power Commission" were founded to decide the outcome of lost Italy's colonial controlled over the area. For the commission, variety of claims were formally introduced that were contained totally different interest: the interest of Italy was to returned back its colonial controlled; whereas the interest of Ethiopia was to get controlled over the Ogaden region. And the interest of Britain was directly contradicted with the interest of Ethiopia that encouraged "united Somalis under British colonial administration"; whereas the interest of Somali was not the same within the Somali itself: large number of Somalis people publicly supported for the establishment of a " united Somali", while some

Somalis faction appealing to remained with Ethiopia (Barnes 2007: 77).

Anyhow, the British considered that the Ethiopian government's stand on the Ogaden could not be changed. By considered these factors, the British wanted to soften the issue. According to the British perception, gave up Ogaden and secured the right to retain the Haud was important. For that matter, to give wide support to Ethiopia's effort in order to regained Eritrea on the hope that its position on the Ogaden would be accepted (Tibebe, 1991:16). Following, negotiations between Ethiopia and Britain, an agreement was reached on July 24, 1948 for the return of the Ogaden to Ethiopia (Woodwell, 2007: 102). As a consequence, the Ogaden was actually transferred to Ethiopia in 1948. Thereafter, the objective of SYL agenda was frustrated. In 1949, insult was added to injury for the SYL when the UN General Assembly voted for an Italian trusteeship in Southern Somaliland. Consequently, including the French Somaliland, Somalis were again divided into five different regions (Ibid).

In the late 1940s, Britain started withdrawing from Somalia. Consequently, finally Britain brought an agreement to give Ethiopian sovereignty over the Ogaden region and left its future plan of "one united Somali state administered by Britain" (Rediker, 2003-2004: 209). Therefore, in 1948 Ethiopia owned the Ogaden region over the disagreeing of Somali nationalists (Ibid). Nonetheless, the Haud and the region bordering of the former Italian Somaliland were still to be held by the British, without Ethiopia's a headlong confrontation with the British. Because of this, "the true considering that the Eritrean issue was on the United Nation's agenda and Ethiopia was asked British backing" (Ibid).

> *On 21 November 1949, the settlement of Italian colonies was arranged by UN Resolution Number 289. This was to determine the territorial future of the colonies and gave a guideline for the trusteeship agreement. That established "Italian Somali has to be recognized as an independent state in ten years from the adoption of a trusteeship agreement by the UN General Assembly. The Italian Trusteeship administration in Somali began officially on 1 April 1950 and the Trusteeship agreement was promulgated on 7 December 1951* (Tripodi, 1999: 360).

Finally, the trusteeship arrangement, and the prospect of eventual independence, resulted the silence of the Somali nationalism to some extent in the 1950s. However, "the biggest source of nationalist anger revolved around the final abandonment of the Ogaden region

by the British in 1954" (Woodwell, 2007: 102). The situation along the Ethiopian-Somali borderline remained a concern. However, neither Resolution 289 nor the Trusteeship agreement solved the border dispute between these two countries; there was no diplomatic relationship between Ethiopia and Italy. And Ethiopia was troubled by the presence of the former colonial power on its border (Ibid: 362).

Thereafter, the British were to hand back the Haud to Ethiopia. Therefore, the additional territories of the Reserved Areas, which were largely inhabited by non-Ogaadeeni Somali clans, were handed over to Ethiopian controlled in 1948 and 1954 (Lewis, 2004: 498, Tripodi, 1999: 372, Barnes, 2007: 77). The Haud[11] was ceded back to Ethiopia after a prolonged diplomatic struggle with the support of the U.S. (Tibebe, 1991: 19). Thereafter, Ethiopian government turned down a request made by the British for the Haud to be retained either through "purchase or lease." Because of this, there was no other reasonable option for the legality to kept Ogaden and Haud in its position. After a great arguments, an agreement was reached between the two parties on the transfer of the Haud on November 29, 1954 (Tibebe, 1991: 19). In short, the 1954 Anglo-Ethiopian Agreement which stated again strongly on the place that understood for given back the Ogaden included the Haud and the "Reserved Area" to Ethiopia. Article 1 of the Agreement of 1954 provided as follows:

> *The full and exclusive sovereignty of Ethiopia over the territories which were set forth in the attached schedule . . . recognized by the Anglo-Ethiopian Treaty of 1897, was hereby reaffirmed. Article 2 provides: The right of tribes came respectively from Ethiopia and the Somaliland Protectorate to crossed the frontier for the purpose of grazing, as originally set out in the Anglo-Ethiopian Treaty of 1897 and the letters annexed thereto, was reaffirmed by the two Contracting Parties who shall took steps to ensured that as far as possible tribal grazing rights in the area shall been protected".*

[11] The "Haud, an area in the north east returned in 1954, hopes for a united Somalis were dashed. Frustrated pan-Somali nationalism continued to feed local resistance in the ogaden, fuelled by the Republic of Somalia's diplomatic efforts to reunify 'missing' Somali territories. Mogadishu intensified support for separatist groups in neighbouring countries, including formation of the Western Somali Liberation Front (WSLF) and the Somali Abo Liberation Front (SALF) in Ethiopia; numerous students from ogaden went to Somalia for military and political training", see, Africa Report on Ethiopia: prospects for peace in ogaden, no. 207, 2013, p. 3

However, all this was neatly worked out on paper, but practically, it was founded to be quite time-consuming and complicated (Tibebe, 1991: 20). Thereafter, the 1954 agreement was terminated. After the 1954 treaty, British influence on the SYL which reduced dramatically. The first point of the SYL program was the reunion of all Somali people; the extreme importance of this point for the League was emphasized by Abdullahi Issa representing the SYL program (Tripodi, 1999: 373). Political problems that unfolded in the Ogaden in the 1940's acquired a sharper edge after the return of the Haud to Ethiopia. The League was making an intense political campaign for Somali focusing particularly on the region of the Haud (Tibebe, 1991: 17). The burden of "Greater Somalia" was to weigh more heavily on Ethiopia. Since the Haud is a vital interest for the Somali in British and Italian Somalilandst, its return to Ethiopia spurred an automatic protest. Subsequently, Somali nationalists carried out an intense political campaign against Ethiopia, which snowballed with the approach of Somali independence (Tibebe, 1991: 21-22).

As a consequence, in 1954, Haile Selassie formally expressed a speech to the whole people of the Ogaden as follows (Omar, 1992: 52): "We remind you that all of you were by race, colour, and blood, and custom, members of the great Ethiopian family. Moreover, we considered that all Somali peoples were economically linked with Ethiopia, and therefore, we did not believed that a united Somalis, could be viable standing alone, to separate from Ethiopia." However, the Somali people did not appreciate the speech of Emperor Haile Selassie, rather continued their grievance (Ibid).

3.2.2.1. Ethio-Somalia Relations after Independence of Somalia (1960-1974)

British and Italian Somaliland gained their independence in 1960 (Colombo, 2010-11: 78, Clark, 1992/93: 110, Woodwell, 2007: 102). After the independence of Italian Somali land, there were immediate nationalist calls for the joining of northern and the southern Somali land. After 63 years of imperial partition on June 1, 1960, the Somali Republic was formed, headed by President Aden Abdullah Osman (Woodwell, 2007: 102-3). After independence, however, there were a number of problems: all the regions had been divided for a long time and had been treated very differently by their colonizers. The experience of these artificial divisions-involving different administrative traditions and languages had a formative impact on the growing politicization of Somali culture that ensued (Lewis, 2004: 494). As well as clan conflicts and competition intensified in the

northern and southern region. Somali army units rebelled and called for the separation of the north and south in December 1961 (Arnold & Bedford et al, 2007:7).

Clashes occurred along the Ethiopia-Somali border throughout the 1960s and in to the 1970s, with Somalia insisting that the Ogaden was part of Greater Somalia (Arnold, 2008: 279). The Ethiopian Government thought that the new state of Somaliland could not achieve their irredentist view rather, they could be obeyed by the 1954 agreement. While the Somali Republic asserted that they could not be obeyed in accordance with the colonial agreements. And the Somali government engaged in a struggled to achieve the issue of irredentism policy by including the whole Somali territories (Rediker, 2003-2004: 209). Nonetheless, "often referred to as a 'classic' case of irredentism, it is important to note that Somalia never actually laid direct territorial claims to the territory of its neighbors. Instead, Somalia always advocated the right of national diaspora to decide freely whether to remain part of the states into which they had been absorb" (Woodwell, 2007: 103).

While Somalis rebel movements advocated self-determination, which asserted that on ethnic, cultural and historical grounds they were entitled to form a nation-state, and that neighboring Somalis under Ethiopian rule had a right to self-determination. Somali people believed that their homogeneity was a quality criterion for the accomplishment of the right of self-determination. While Ethiopia dismissed the aim of Somalia's to exercise the right of self-determination. And "Ethiopia argued that the principle of self-determination should be applied only to colonial territories which had not yet attained their independence and not to parts of sovereign or independent states". However, latter on the Ethiopian government was deeply disturbed by the potential challenge posed by the unification and independence of the European Somali protectorates (Rediker, 2003-2004: 209).

"Somali nationalist aims tend to be associated with the ideal of Muslim solidarity opposed to Christian government. This aspect of Christian influence in inspiring nationalist aspirations is particularly strong in what Somali regard as the imperialist policies of the Ethiopian government" (Woodwell, 2007: 111). Emperor Haile Selassie's regime in Ethiopia referred to "their empire as a 'Christian island' and the prospect of 'Muslim encirclement' meant that fears of Somali revisionism simply reinforced a preexisting siege mentality in Ethiopia."

During this period, Somali and Ethiopian military units fought a series of battles along their border. A "major armed clash" between state militaries took place in 1961 in the

wake of an abortive coup attempt against Emperor Haile Selassie. In late 1963 the Ethiopian government alleged incursions by Somali regular troops, while, in February 1964, according to the Somali government Ethiopian military aircraft attacked Somali villages (Woodwell, 2007: 113). It led to the "brief but bitter of border dispute in 1964, a series of inconclusive skirmishes between Somali and Ethiopian troops along the border. Ethiopia retained formal control of the Ogaden" (Rediker, 2003-2004: 209). During the 1960s, insurgency in the Ogaden did not provoke a surge of nationalist sentiment at home. Because of this, the rebellion in the Ogaden, which comprised several ethnic groups, was not primarily associated with Somali rebels (Woodwell, 2007: 114). According to Mohamud (2013), because of corruption and Somalia's failure to reclaim the Ogaden region in Ethiopia in 1964, the army became dissatisfied with the Somali government in the late 1960s.

The bilateral hostility between Ethiopia and Somalia "thawed during the Egal tenure. In the OAU summit held in September 1967, Somali and Ethiopian delegates engaged in several "encouraging exchanges" leading to an eventual "modus vivendi" between Emperor Haile Selassie and Somalia's Prime Minister Egal (Woodwell, 2007: 114). By September 1968 Somalia and Ethiopia agreed on establishing commercial air and telecommunications links and the state of emergency that had existed in the Ogaden was lifted (Ibid). Later on, from both Ethiopia and Somalia side the internal political condition did not comfortable.

October 21, 1969, Major General Mahammad Said Barre took control of Mogadishu and Somalia in a bloodless coup d'état (Mohamud, 2013: 48) and assumed the presidency of the Supreme Revolutionary Council (Arnold & Bedford et al, 2007: 7). Siad Barre overthrown the government in a coup d'etat in 1969 (Rediker, 2003-2004: 2010). After overthrown of the Prime Minister Egal in 1969, Said Barre directly declared himself as the leader of Somalia, where as Mengistu Haile Mariam, declared himself as the leader of Ethiopia in 1974 (Ismail and Herbold, 1999: 116, Rediker, 2003-2004: 2010). Both Siad Barre and Mengistu Haile Mariam was coup d'etat governments that characterized by serious murder.

3.2.3. Ethio-Somalia Relations under the Regime of Dergue (1974-1991)

When Emperor Haile Selassie removed from power in 1974 (Arnold, 2008: 226), the political land scape suddenly changed. The government of Somalia was trying to take advantage of

the turmoil in Ethiopia which was caused by the overthrew of Haile Sellassie and the bloodletting the Derg was perpetrating on opponents of the revolution. By the time of the OAU summit of 1974, however, Somali leaders had clearly adopted a policy of increasing antagonism toward Ethiopian authorities (Woodwell, 2007: 114). As a consequence, the revolution in 1974 could not normalize the Somalia-Ethiopian relations. More serious than before, President Siad Barr (who seized power in 1969 in Somalia) (Poole, 1992/4: 5) and other Somali leaders, used as popular desire of declarations about the right of nations to ”self-determination”, ”right up to secession”, had increase the opacity of their pressure on Ethiopia).

3.2.3.1. The War between Ethiopia and Somalia over the Land of Ogaden

The first Somalia‘s claims to the Somali-inhabited Ogaden region of Ethiopia, started in 1961, escalated in 1964 and lingered until 1967 as low intensity conflict. In the mid-1970s, the Western Somali Liberation Front (WSLF), was formed and this movement greatly increased pressures upon Ethiopia during 1975 and 1976, when Addis Ababa was fully occupied trying to absorb the changes brought about by the revolution (Arnold, 2008: 278). By early 1977, increasing numbers of Western Somali Liberation Front (WSLF) groups were moving into the Ogaden, where they obtained control of substantial areas on the ground (Woodwell, 2007: 116). The Somali government threw its support behind the WSLF, which was a pro-Somali liberation group in the Ogaden, planning to withdraw (Arnold, 2008: 278, Bamfo, 2010: 57). “The initial support the Barre government gave the WSLF was covert and when Ethiopia accused President Barre of interference, he replied that only ‘volunteers’ had been given leave from the army to fight” (Bamfo, 2010: 57).

In July 1977, Somalia claimed sovereignty over Ogaden, an Ethiopian region inhabited by Somali people (Colombo, 2010-11: 89). Under covered of the Front for the Liberation of Western Somalia (WSLF) sent its own forces into the Ogaden (Poole, 1992-4: 5, Gebru, 2000: 639), the Somali government officially declared war on Ethiopia in 1977. The second Ethiopia- Somalia war, again fought over the Ogaden problem, took place between 1977 and 1978 (Arnold, 2008: 227). During June to November 1977, Somalia effectively took control of most of the Ogaden (Ibid), and captured strategic cities like Jijiga and put heavy pressure on Dire Dawa (Ted, 2010: 26, Rediker, 2003-4: 2012). While Siaad Barre’s regime armed and deployed Somali armed groups from the Ogaden

region of Ethiopia to fight against Addis Ababa.

The 1977 war between Ethiopia and Somalia is known as the Ogaden War precisely because the Ogaden region of Ethiopia was both the main cause and the main site of armed conflict (Gebru, 200: 636). Although the Ogaden War was not a civil war, it was a war between two states. It nonetheless contained elements of a civil war. Because of this, the nomadic people of Somalis, had traditionally moved back and forth across the whole of the Ogaden region for centuries, which relying upon its waterholes for their herds. As well as a significant Somali minority lived in the Ogaden region of Ethiopia (Arnold, 2008: 277). The Ethiopians rallied and launched a bold counter-attack (Gebru, 2000: 146). After the military operation of Harar by Somalia, Russian experts and collaboration of Cuban forces with Soviet Union (Poole, 1992-1994: 5, Rediker, 2003-4: 2013) were supported Ethiopian leader of Mengistu Hailemariam who established the communist Derg regime. He obtained massive Soviet military aid as well as the assistance of Cuban forces in the war against Somalia (Arnold, 2008: 227). By 1978/19 because of, the heavy militarization of Ethiopia, she had regained full control of the Ogaden.

The USSR and other socialist states committed to normalize the relations between Ethiopia and the Democratic Republic of Somalia (SDR). The former Soviet Union repeatedly appealed to both Somalia and Ethiopia in order to normalize their relations and proposed a constructive program which would led to good settlement and good offices (Moller 2009: 10).

The Somali leadership, in which aggressive patriotism moods came to dominate, they set about the practical realization of its expansionist plans and then they determined on achieving success in relation to the domestic political situation in Ethiopia, which challenged Ethiopian. The Arab reaction and imperialist states such as USA exerted force and gave military assistance to Somalia (Ted, 2011: 28). Disapproved with the decisive refusal of the Soviet Union (socialist commonwealth) to support the territorial claims on Ethiopia, the Somali leadership unilaterally announced the invalidity of the 1974 treaty of cooperation with Soviet Union (Herbold, 1999: 150). Thereafter, the diplomatic relations between Cuba and Somalia was totally disappeared (Bamfo, 2010: 57).

As the conflict continued, the Somali leaders repeatedly appealed to the USA and other Western powers to provide assistance regularly to Somalia. Because of for the purpose of ‘peace’ settlement to the conflict and the ‘defense’ of Somalia from aggression which

claimed was being prepared against Somalia from the direction of Ethiopia (Samatar 2004: 23). The United States did not support Somalia's aspiration to reunite 'Greater Somalia,' but was willing to compete with the USSR for the strategic military base at Berbera in the Gulf of Aden (Rediker, 2003-4: 2013).

The Ethiopian army regrouped, and with the help of "11,000 Cuban troops and Soviet aircraft and artillery, counterattacked, driving Somali forces from many of Ogaden's major towns and cities" (Rediker, 2003-4: 2013). Somali forces were seriously weakened by this counterattack. "In March, 1978, Somalia recalled the national army from the Ogaden. It had lost 'nearly 8,000 soldiers, three-fourths of its armored units, and more than half of the Somali Air Force'" (Ibid). Then the Somali troops ultimately pushed out of the Ogaden. Following the collapse of its adventure in Ogaden, Somalia had not drawn back its territorial claims against Ethiopia, and putting forth various conditions it continued to sought those same goals by other means (Samatar 2004: 22). The war ended in March 1978 with tremendous implications for national stability: the defeat created strong "rumors and on 9 April, 1978 Majeerten officials organized a military coup. Barre soon re-established the legal order, but the decay was progressive" (Colombo, 2010-11: 89).

Finally, the huge political problem of Barre regime, leading to the 1978 attempted coup and the subsequent rose of armed opposition groups, which eventually removed him from power in 1991 (Solomon 2009: 5). After overthrew of Siad Barre from power, Somalia totally collapsed since 1991. Similarly, within the complex situation of Ethiopia and Somalia, Mengistu Hailemariam also overthrown from power by the force of Ethiopian People Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) in 1991 (Eriksson, 2013: 32). According to Bradbury & Healy (2010), the collapse of the Somali state was the consequence of the legacies of European colonialism that divided the Somali people into five states[12], the impact of "Cold War politics in shoring up a predatory state", and the cumulative effect of wars with Ethiopia, which was the most damaged war of Ogaden in 1977-78, as well as the contradictions between a centralized state authority, and a fractious kinship system

[12] The colonial state-building enterprise partitioned the Somali people into five territories: British Somaliland, French Somaliland, Italian Somaliland, Kenya and Ethiopia that suited the agenda of the European imperial and their sole collaborator, Abyssinia. While the first three constituted autonomous colonial states, the Northern Frontier District was incorporated into the colonial state of Kenya and the Ogaden region was integrated in the imperial state of Ethiopia. Ulf Johansson Dahre (2007), conference report on: "*Post-Conflict Peace-Building in the Horn of Africa",* a Report of the 6th Annual Conference on the Horn of Africa, Lund,August 24-26, 2007, p. 40

and the Somali pastoral culture in which power is diffused within Somalia (Bradbury & Healy, 2010: 10).

3.3. Ethio-Somalia Conflict on the Issue of Ogaden's Self-determination

3.3.1. Somalia's Position towards Ogaden and its Self-determination

According to Daniel (2007) Somalia's leaders contended that their country lost land because of the 19th century treaties that Ethiopia signed with the various European colonial powers. Therefore, the Somalia's question, for them, was not border demarcation, rather respecting the rights of the people of the Ogaden to self-determination, "and of recovering land that already taken by Ethiopia (Daniel, 2007: 2). Throughout the 1960s and late 1970s, interstate wars between Ethiopia and Somalia were described with reference to the principle of self-determination (Mohamed, 1997: 176).

The legacy of the British occupation of the Ogaden and the Reserved Area was the political destabilization of the region as a whole. The British had unconditionally recognized the Ogaden and the Reserved Area as an integral part of Ethiopia in the agreement of 1944. The right to exercise military administration over the areas was granted to them by the Ethiopian government. "This implied a kind of care-taking responsibility" (Tibebe, 1991: 13). The British administration, which began in 1942, created a terrible gap between the Ogaden and the Ethiopian government. Their efforts to create a united Somalia, whatever their motives, resulted in a diminished sense of allegiance to the central government. The boost that the idea of 'Greater Somalia' gave to Somali nationalism cannot be discounted (Tibebe. 1991: 13).

From the understanding of the position of Barnes (2007), Somali's people considered Ethiopia as one of the colonial powers. Ethiopia's King Menelik wrote a "circular in 1891 to the European forces that were dividing Africa among themselves and demanded his share." King Menelik wrote: "Ethiopia has been for fourteen centuries a Christian island in a sea of pagans. If the powers at a distance come forward to partition Africa between them, he did not intend to remain an indifferent spectator (Barnes, 2007: 77). And in 1954 Britain gave Somalia's Hawud and Reserve Area to Ethiopia. Because of the disagreements between the two countries two major wars were fought in 1964 and 1977/78.

The Ethiopian government countered growing Somali irredentism with rhetoric

suggesting that cultural bonds and race constituted the national ties binding all Somalis, not just those in the Ogaden, to a central Ethiopian state (Woodwell, 2007: 112). According to the statement of Moller (2008), the view of Somalia towards any interference from Ethiopia is quite understandably interpreted as attempts to curb the legitimate aspirations of the Somali nation, both in Somalia itself and in the Somali-majority parts of Ethiopia.

3.3.2. Ethiopia's Position towards Ogaden and its Self-determination

Ethiopia argued that the dispute on the Ogaden issue with Somalia concerned only on the demarcation of the borders of former Italian Somaliland and Ethiopia, rather not respecting the rights of the people of the Ogaden to self-determination. Ethiopia's position was it did not take "Somalia's land (Daniel, 2007: 1). As noted by Daniel, from the position of Addis Ababa, the Ethiopia-British Somaliland border (the northern portion), has already been demarcated. Therefore, it cannot be a "subject for discussion, let alone negotiation". In a nutshell, "Ethiopia maintains that its borders with Somalia are internationally recognized" (*ibd*).

The Ethiopians have challenged Somalia's position by contending that, to begin with, a state has to have defined boundaries. Since there was no state in history called 'Somalia' before 1960, they could not have taken land from a non-existent entity (Woodwell, 2007: 112, Cooper, 2015). Daniel (2007) further argued that;

> *Ethiopia has also referred to Article 62 (a) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which provides that 'A fundamental change of circumstances which has occurred with regard to those existing at the time of the conclusion of a treaty, and which are not foreseen by the parties, may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from a treaty, if the Treaty establishes a boundary' (Ibid). By 1908, Ethiopian Emperor Menelik had settled his borders with France for French Somaliland, with Great Britain for British Somaliland, and with Italy for Italian Somaliland, and each of these agreements recognized that the Ogaden region was part of Ethiopia. However, when Somalia emerged as an independent state in 1960, it did not renounce its claims to the Ogaden, and when the Organization of African Unity (OAU) was formed in 1963, Somalia refused to adopt one of its first resolutions: that all members*

should accept their inherited colonial boundaries (Arnold, 2005: 278).

Somalia has always maintained that Ethiopia occupied a part of its territory (the Ogaden region) which ceded by British colonialists to Ethiopia. Ethiopia disagrees and the failure of the organization of African Union (now the AU) to resolve the dispute led Somalia to declare war on Ethiopia in 1964. It also sponsored an Ethiopian rebel movement against the government of Emperor Haile Selassie. Ethiopian leaders justified the existence of Somali-inhabited regions, on principles of historical continuity (Woodwell, 2007: 111). Even if, the reserved area and the Ogaden region conferred to the military administration of British by 1942 and 1944 agreement, it remained vested in Ethiopia (Lewis, 2002: 51).

Therefore, from the understanding of the above argument, there is always a divergent interest between Ethiopia and Somalia, particularly on the Ogaden region. In such cases, Ethiopia challenged to play a role in the effort of Somalia's peace-building. Because of this, the hostile relations of Ethiopia and Somalia in the pre-1991 negatively affect the occurrence of smooth relations of Ethiopia and Somalia since 1991. Therefore, whatever interference of Ethiopia in Somalia calculating in terms of gaining greatest national advantage, whether Ethiopia's involvement gave advantage or not, it is difficult to show her importance. Because of the past grievance of Somalia on Ethiopia lacked the trust between Ethiopia and Somalia.

CHAPTER FOUR: ETHIOPIA'S INTERVENTION IN SOMALIA

4.1. Introduction

This chapter focused on the case of Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia since 1991, and the 2006 direct military intervention. Was the post 1991 concern of Ethiopia in Somalia far from seeking of the contested region of Ogaden? Writers like Tatek (2008) and Civins (2009) said that there was/is no difference between the pre-1991 and the post 1991 Ethiopia's interest for its active engagement in Somalia. On the other hand, others contend that, because of Somalia's collapsed in 1991, the Greater Somalia agenda was not critical issue for Ethiopia in the post 1991 (Ted, 2010: 26).

This chapter will examine: what rationales motivated Ethiopia to intervened in Somalia at several times? The chapter tries to provide important evidences about the rationales of Ethiopian intervention in Somalia from different contending views. The purpose of this chapter is: firstly, to reveal the motivation of Ethiopia for its interference in Somalia before its 2006 military intervention and secondly, to show the aspect and nature of 2006 military intervention. Moreover, it examines the implication of Ethiopia's 2006 military intervention?

4.2. The Involvement of Ethiopia in Somalia since 1991

Somalia has been without government since 1991 (Yihdego, 2007: 666). Hence, since 1990s Somalia was seen as an international responsibility to protect her from crisis (Colombo, 2010-2011: 93). Therefore, Somalia has experienced different forms of international intervention (Colombo, 2010-2011: 149, Healy, 2009: 8) which were United Nation Assistance Mission in Somalia (UNOSOM)[13] which could be called "UN Peace Making" between 1992 and 1995 (Kidist, 2009:16) and UNITAF[14] (Healy, 2009: 8, Marangio, 2012: 7). However, according to Menkhaus (2003), by "the mid-1990s, the US, and the UN had failed to facilitated effective peace talks in Somalia, and international intervention brought disastrous consequences, with the dead of UN and US

[13] "When talks organized by the Secretary-General led to a ceasefire in Mogadishu, the capital, the Security Council in April 1992 established the UN Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM I) to monitor the ceasefire; provide protection and security for UN personnel, equipment and supplies; and escort deliveries of humanitarian supplies".

[14] The deteriorating security situation led the Council in December to authorize member states to form a Unified Task Force (UNITAF) to ensure the safe delivery of humanitarian assistance. In March 1993, the Council established UNOSOM II to complete UNITAF's efforts to restore peace, but the escalation of inter-clan fighting confirmed that there was no peace to keep. UNOSOM II was withdrawn in March 1995", for more details see, United Nations Today, New York, 2008, p. 104.

peacekeepers, as well as the dead of hundreds of Somalis" Menkhaus2003: 40). Thereafter, the UN troops withdraw from Somalia in 1995 (Healy, 2009: 8), and the essence of intervention in Somalia has been regionally concerned, that the military incursions were constantly "accompanied by regional efforts to conquer the role of peace promoter (II)" (Colombo, 2010-2011: 142).

Consequently, as regional level Ethiopia gained the legitimacy of the international community to manage the Somalia's crisis (Ibid). Even if Ethiopia had a hostile relation with Somalia, she got international recognition when she managed to bring the main Somali factions together for the first time in Addis Ababa in 1992 for peace talks (Tavolato 2004: 6). In 1993 the OAU had assigned Ethiopia to lead the effort of bringing peace and reconciliation in Somalia, but at that stage peace and security in Somalia was firmly on the UN agenda (Healy, 2009: 8). Consequently, in 1993, the UN-sponsored peace conference was convened in Addis Ababa which consisted fifteen faction leaders in the meeting. It was also agreed to establish a two-year transitional Council. Addis Ababa peace process strengthened the role and legitimacy of the faction leaders, nonetheless it "denied room for new Somali leaders" (Kidist, 2009: 26). However, the process failed because of the aggressive competition among factions that were unable to see beyond their short-term benefits (Kidist, 2009: 26, Healy, 2009: 8).

Competing Somali militia leaders were initially, willing to use Ethiopia's arrangement of peace talks. But later, they considered Ethiopia as it had links to the old military regime (Tavolato, 2004: 6). Accordingly, there was no difference between the two past successive government and the FDRE government to Somali militia leaders.

Tavolato (2004), argued that as a consequence, Ethiopian national security was/is related with the possibility of influencing the process of reconciliation in Somalia without the Somali ambition of rebuilding a Greater Somalia (Tavolato 2004: 6). Because of this, Al Itihad al Islamia embrace Islam as their political goal. They sought the reestablishment of Somalia as an Islamic state governed by Sharia law (Healy, 2009: 8-9). Hence, Ethiopia had domestic as well as regional interests in a settlement in Somalia (Ibid).

4.2.1. The Effort of Ethiopia for Somalia's Peace process

Since the Somali state collapsed, there have been around fourteen conflict resolution efforts organized by different states, as well as regional and international organizations.

Some of the major conferences supported by the regional states and the international community include: the Djibouti Conference in 1991; the Addis Ababa Conference in 1993; the Cairo Conference in 1997; the Arta Conference in 2000; the Eldorate Process in 2002, which gave birth to the first Transitional Federal Government(TFG) in 2004; and Djibouti Peace Process in 2008, which led to the establishment of the second Transitional Federal Government (TFG II) by combining the TFG I with ARS-D (Alliance for Re-liberation of Somalia-Djibouti). All those fourteen resolution efforts failed to establish a functioning government in Somalia (Solomon, 2009: 10-11).

Ethiopia during the early 1990s was perceived as a successful causing of dramatic change or innovation and a leading figure in the "new generation" of African leaders (Tavolato, 2004: 6). Consequently, under the mandate of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and Inter Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), in November 1996 Ethiopia sponsored a Somali national conference in Sodere (Colombo, 2010-2011:142, Kidist, 2009: 26, Healy, 2009: 9, Bradbury & Healy, 2010: 13). According to Colombo,

> *the meeting in Sodere encouraged the formation of regional authorities oriented to establishing a federal state. The conference also established a fixed proportional criterion for regulating clan representation, the '4.5 formula'[15], allocating an equal number of seats to each major clan and half of the total number of seats to women and minorities.*

However, the legitimacy of Ethiopian diplomatic initiatives, was not recognized by both of Somalia National Army (SNA) and Somali National Movement (SNM) (ruling Somaliland), rather the Ethiopian efforts to lead the Somali peace process was nullified by the Cairo Conference (Colombo, 2010-2011:93). In March 1998, Egypt and the Arab League jointly hosted Somali reconciliation talks with Hussien Aideed and others leading to the Cairo Agreement. This effectively undermined the Sodere peace process (Healy, 2009: 9). Ethiopia also openly and effectively destroyed the Cairo Accord in 1997. Both Sodere and Cairo led to rival peace conferences were a matter of competing regional interests (Bradbury & Healy, 2010: 13).

---

[15] "The '4.5 formula' which accords each major clan equal representation in talks has not been an ideal solution; it has only decentralized the debates over legitimate representation, and has been criticized by many Somalis for institutionalizing rather than transcending clannism. The one exception was in Somaliland in 1991, when the clan elders off the northwest held enough authority to convene a grand *shir* or assembly to reach key fundamental decisions enabling the maintenance of peace and creation of the state of Somaliland" (Menkhaus, 2011: 10).

According to Healy (2009), within IGAD, Ethiopia enjoyed unchallenged diplomatic leadership on Somalia. During 1996/7 Ethiopia followed "a twin-track policy" (Healy, 2009: 9) Firstly, it took military action to destroy Al Itihad camps in the Gedo region of Somalia, claiming that these housed Arab and Afghan mujahidin and terrorists linked to Al Qaeda (Ibid). The operations attracted no adverse comment from IGAD, the OAU or the international community at large and Ethiopian forces remained in control of Somali border towns at Luq and Dolo for much of 1997. Nonetheless, Ethiopia warned UN officials that Somalia was becoming a major source of instability, with extremists and terrorists operating from there, the scope of which transcended the region (Ibid).

Healy (2009), point out from the view of IGAD's *Council of Ministers, (2007*), IGAD lined up firmly behind Ethiopia and expressed:

> *'appreciation to the Ethiopian Government for all the sacrifices it has made to promote the common position of IGAD Member States, which is fully consistent with the commitment of the organization to the success of the TFG and to the interest of the people of the IGAD region to achieve peace and stability and to protect the region from terrorist and extremist forces'* (Healy, 2009: 15).

According to Klosowicz (2015), Ethiopia plays a crucial role in the activity of supporting the efforts towards strengthening the capacity of IGAD to ensure peace and security, as well as political and economic cooperation. But Ethiopia uses its indisputable strong position in IGAD to secure its own interests in the region. For instance, its efforts within IGAD led to the imposition of UN sanctions on Eritrea for the destabilizing the region by supporting armed militias (Klosowicz, 2015: 92). However, the legacy of the Ethiopian intervention has been violent insecurity and intensified radicalization. These factors continue to undermine prospects for lasting peace and security in the region (Healy, 2009: 15). Healy (2009), argued "operating with a zero sum approach to security in the region, the governments routinely sought to destabilize one another: Ethiopia was backing rebel groups in Somalia; Somalia were backing rebels in Ethiopia. There was no real potential for institution building" (Healy, 2009: 3).

Ethiopia has a strong voice in, and determination to make things happen through IGAD (Newbery, 2014: 12). Ethiopia uses IGAD as a diplomatic tools. However, Ethiopia feels that it did not received enough recognition in the region for her positive role and initiative

within IGAD (Ibid). In parallel with Ethiopian military hegemony, IGAD has become the internationally recognized regional guarantor for stability, security, and development (Ali, 2014: 130). Ethiopia countered an initial Djiboutian initiative and took formal system-wide control of an internationally recognized peace process by creating a network of warlords and initiating a completely new reconciliation process (Ibid). However, Ethiopian policy is mostly driven by the fear of ongoing Somali irredentism, and Ethiopia continues to use IGAD as instrument to push through and legitimize its foreign policy towards Somalia (Ibid).

Ethiopia destroyed the Arta peace process in 2000. Because of this, Ethiopia was totally unsatisfied with the results of the Arta peace process. As a consequence, she organized its own conference in March 2001 in Ethiopia (Ali, 2014: 119), "ostensibly to undermined and remodel the Djibouti initiative in its own image and interests, and to endorse and sanction the network of proxy Somali warlords that it supported" (Ibid). These Ethiopian-backed warlords then formed an alliance called the Somali Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Council (SRRC) (Ali, 2014: 119, Healy, 2009: 20), which provided a counter-structure to the nascent and systematically underfunded TNG.

Ethiopia publicly stated that the Arta process was not complete, and organized all the factions, regions and personalities that had opposed the Arta conference. "By hosting a group of Somali warlords and other dissidents who this week joined forces in calling for the new regime in Mogadishu to be replaced, Ethiopia has once again shown itself to be a key player in Somalia's political turmoil (Afyare & Abdullahi, 2006: 42). Furthermore, Afyare and Abdullahi contend that by keeping the Somali people divided and weak, Addis Ababa believed it could eliminated any threat from Somalia (ONLF, OLF and the rivalry Eritrea). (Ibid).

Ethiopia actively recruited two of the twenty-eight warlords that were meeting in Cairo. It encouraged Colonel Abdullahi Yusuf Ahmed and General Adan Abdullahi Nur to leave the meeting and reject its outcome (Ali, 2014: 139). From Cairo they went directly to Addis Ababa. Ethiopia started to openly support these two faction leaders militarily and politically. Ethiopia and these two warlords effectively undermined Egypt's efforts to end Somalia's civil war.). Somalis who are critical of Ethiopia's involvement in the effort of bringing peace and state building in Somalia argue that Ethiopia's domination of IGAD and its belief that a strong, centralized Somali state constituted a significant threat to

Ethiopia's interest's means that Ethiopia has played an ongoing "spoiler" role for conflict resolution and the development of effective governance in Somalia (Ali, 2014: 139).

According to Adem (1995), in his writing on: "*Somalia and the Ethiopian Foresight and Commitment That Needs to Be Retold"*, took a different position. He argued that back in the early 2000s, when the world gave up on Somalia, the government of Ethiopia did not relent its efforts. Despite the fact, that historically the relation between Ethiopia and Somalia has not been a healthy one (Adem, 1995: 1). At that time, several regional and international efforts to bring peace and reconciliation had failed and many nations decided to prevent spill-overs from Somalia's crisis rather than seek a solution to it. However, Ethiopia chose a proactive approach. The government clearly articulated its direction in the 2002 National Security and Foreign Relations Policy document as follows (Adem, 1995: 1):

> *Our proximity to Somalia would be beneficial to our development if there were peace and stability in Somalia. Peace can come to our region if a government committed to fighting disorder, terrorism and extremism in cooperation with its neighbours is established in Somalia. Some circles say that the establishment of such a government in Somalia would once again resuscitate the ideology of "Greater Somalia" and that peace, democracy and development in Somalia would, in that case, not benefit Ethiopia (…) (Ibid).*

Ethiopia's inward-looking foreign policy orientation and efforts to address longstanding internal political instability loom large in its external relations. Despite improvements in governmental effectiveness and minority rights, and addressing major sources of national conflicts in pre 1991, the post 1991 political space is characterized both by the fear of politics and the politics of fear (Mehari, 2014: 2). Consequently, for Adem Hussien the view of divided Somali was fundamentally wrong and dangerous. The position of Afyare & Abdullahi (2006) and Adem (1995) as well as Mehari, (2014), are contradictory. First, of all, Ethiopia did not have problems with strong Somalia. Moreover, the threat coming to Ethiopia since 1991 was/is not the aspiration of Greater Somalia but rather security threat. Ethiopia got international as well as regional recognition to solve conflict in Somalia. Ethiopia initiated peace-building efforts in Somalia.

But it should be noted that Ethiopia's active involvement in Somalia had to do with her

national interest, rather than building peace in Somalia (Makhubela 2010). Moreover, the interest of Ethiopia covered a wide range of "spectrum of issue that were not just limited to security, commercial and political issue, therefore, at times her parochial definition of national interest has become a hurdle to the resolution of Somali conflict" (Makhubela, 2010: 84).

What compounds Ethiopia's involvement in Somali conflict is the rivalry between Ethiopia and Eritrea, two countries that support opposing groups in the Somali conflict and the fight against terrorism giving the conflict further regional dimension. Accordingly, "for any peace process to be successful and lasting in Somalia, it is imperative that such a peace process addresses these regional dimensions of the war in Somalia" (Solomon, 2009: 5-6).

4.2.2. Motivation of Ethiopia's intervention in Somalia since 1991

There are several arguments towards the motivation of Ethiopia's active involvement in Somalia. Some writers argued that Ethiopia always seeks her national interest: security and geopolitical interest. . Some writers also argued that Ethiopia always feared the aspiration of irredentists which seeks the reestablishment of Greater Somalia. Since Ethiopia greatly opposed the aspiration of irredentist, she always intervened to weaken Somalia rather than building peace, because of strong Somalia is too much threat for Ethiopia than ONLF, OLF and even its archrival Eritrea.

4.2.2.1. Political and Security Motives

Somalia's instability and lack strong central government are perceived as serious threats to Ethiopia's national security and to stability in the region. Therefore, the engagement of Ethiopia in Somalia was largely driven by security concern rather than economic incentives (Newbery, 2014: 8). Indeed, Ethiopia's foreign policy based protecting and safeguarding her economic and security interest. Because of peace and security in Somalia are necessary to "enable unhindered development and economic cooperation" (Ibid). Despite cooperating and continuing a good trade and security relationship with Somaliland and Punt land where she serves her interest, Ethiopia "claims not to be interested in a balkanized Somalia". But rather Ethiopia's involvement in Somaliland and Punt land considered as a positive engagement in peace building in Somalia, with the hope that Somaliland and Punt land will "function as building blocks" for a future peaceful and united states (Newbery, 2014: 9).

According to Bradbury (2009), the Ethiopian diplomatic initiative was sustained by the necessity to legitimize its further military incursions into Somalia. According to Colombo,

> *the Ethiopian tactic of incursion had become more systematic, and strictly anchored to the military proceedings of its key allies, the Somali National Front (SNF) and the Rahanweyn Resistance Army (RRA). Addis Ababa pursued a twofold aim: on one hand that of supporting the revenge of the Rahanwein Resistance Army against the SNA in gaining the control of Bay and Bakol; on the other one that of crushing al-Itihaad from Gedo, enabling the the SNF to establish its own control of the area.*

The Ethio-Eritrea war between 1998 and 2000 on the claim of Badme contributed to worsening conflict within Somalia, as the two sides sought out proxy partners (Colombo, 2010-2011: 138, Kidist, 2009: 25, Healy, 2009: 9). The Ethiopian intervention has actively changed the equilibrium inside the conflict between the SNA and the RRA with the capture of Baidoa and Garba Harre (Colombo, 2010-2011: 140).

The report of UN Monitoring Group on Somalia assured that Eritrea had provided political, financial and logistical support to Al-Ittihad Al-Islamy and UIC (armed groups) in Somalia. And Somalia-based terrorist group held responsible for a bomb blast at the Gshion Hotel in Addis Ababa in 1996 as well as other terrorist acts in Ethiopia. These attacks triggered Ethiopia's direct military intervention in Somalia. In May 2000 the Ethiopian army launched its last offensive assaulting Torona and Zambalesa where the Eritrean army was unable to repel the assault (Ibid). As consequence, the Ethiopian strategy has been able to establish its own "security buffer zone," ultimately oriented to weaken the EPLF government in Asmara.

From the above argument of Kidist (2009), Healy (2009), Ted, (2010), and Colombo (2010-2011), we could understand that whatever interference of Ethiopia in Somalia seemed to manipulate Al-Itihaad movement and to crush the mission and vision of Eritrea towards Ethiopia. Therefore, Ethiopia did not responsible to manage Somalia's conflict on time, because of Ethiopia faced another national problem from its rivalry Eritrea, but what was wrong: the proxy war within fragile state of Somalia exacerbate Somalia's conflict and crisis more than before. Even the Ethio-Eritrea proxy war considered as the most critical factor for the failure of peace process to pacify Somalia. Whereas Ethiopia

gained more advantage that it has been able to establish its own security buffer zone by weaken the EPLF government in Asmara. This indicated that the mutual interference of Ethiopia and Eritrea in Somalia facilitated Ethiopia to gain a political advantage.

Ethiopia has played a central role in long standing Somalia's civil war. Unlike, any other state in the region, "Ethiopia's engagement in Somalia must be seen as part of a broader regional and historic conflict dynamic that transcends both the wider Horn of Africa and the Middle East and Ethiopia is pivotal to the settlement of Somalia's civil war not because of its role as a security provider, but because of its national interests" (Eriksson, 2013: 37). Eriksson expressed that the unilateral engagement of Ethiopia in Somalia seemed to only its political settlement rather than maximizing its significant role to settle Somalia's disputes. According to Klosowicz (2015), "many prominent Somali politicians are of the opinion that, under the pretense of fighting terrorism and Islamic extremism, and with the support of the U.S. Ethiopia is pursuing its own political objectives in Somalia, thus deepening the disintegration of the latter with the aim of eliminating its traditional rival in Somalia" (Klosowicz, 2015: 90).

However, according to Mehari (2014), for the establishment of a peaceful, integrated and prosperous region, Ethiopia deems it equally necessary for its neighbors to enjoy domestic peace and stability (Mehari, 2014: 3). State failure in Somalia allowed for armed groups from Ethiopia, such as the Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF), the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) and the Islamic Front for Liberation of Oromia (IFLO), to operate and launch attacks against Ethiopia (Ibid). Eritrea exploited these stateless armed groups as proxies to weaken Ethiopia's focus on the border war. Emanating from a history of victimization and repeated external threats to its independence, Ethiopia strongly supported collective security and multilateral platforms and institutions such as the UN and its predecessor in order to pursue its own interests and seek solutions to threats to its sovereignty (Ibid).

From the view of Bradbury (2009), Colombo (2010-2011), Eriksson (2013), Ted (2010), Klosowicz (2015) and as well as Mehari (2014), Ethiopia had a pivotal role in security issue, but not for Somalia herself rather for the purpose of eliminating her enemies which could get sanctuaries in Somalia.

According to Jhazbhay (2007), Al-Ittihaad involvement in Ethiopia was linked to a twenty-year history in which many Ogaden Somalis found refuge in Somalia and later

played a role in connecting Somali armed factions with Ethiopian ethnic insurgent nationalist movements such as OLF and ONLF. The Ethiopian government's vested interest in portraying Al-Ittihaad as a terrorist-driven movement inhibited an independent assessment of its influence and alleged threat level within Ethiopia (Jhazbhay, 2007: 200).

According to Wasara (2002), since 1991, Ethiopian troops frequently intervened in Somalia in support of either friendly clan militia or in pursuit of the ONLF. It would have been logical to treat Ethiopian-Somali aspects of security threats (Wasara, 2002: 49). However, according to Makhubela (2010), "Although, Ethiopia had some legitimate concerns regarding irredentists sponsored by the Siad Barre regime, consistently working against the efforts to peace-building, cannot be justified or condoned" (Makhubela, 2010: 80). Makhubela argues that keeping Somalia in a perpetuate state of anarchy and lawlessness allowed the Ethiopian government to intervene without regard to the Somalia's sovereignty and territorial integrity (Ibid). Ethiopia always feared the strong Somalia especially concerned with Somalis' claim to the Ogaden region (Makhubela, 2010: 80, Moller, 2009: 20). Therefore, the preference of Addis Ababa for a weak Somali state which completely deepened on Ethiopia is not sustainable in the long term. While a strong Somalia with the capacity to manage its internal affairs may be to Ethiopia as well as the Horn of Africa in the long term (Makhubela, 2010: 81).

4.2.2.2. Economic Motives

Ethiopia has attempted to take advantage of its landlocked position: sharing a border of 1600 km with Somalia, Addis Ababa has privileged direct military incursion via ground operations, employing the mutual "tit for tat" support of rival parties, only to reinforce the plan of direct incursions (Colombo, 2010-2011: 140). According to Arnold & Bedford et al, (2007) and Klosowicz (2015), Ethiopia's economic problems played a key role in its government's decision to intervene in Somalia. Unlike Somalia, Ethiopia is landlocked, with access only to a few ports for trading in Somaliland, a portion of Somalia seeking independence. Therefore, Ethiopia closely cooperates with Somaliland, thus gaining access to the port in Berbera. Because of, Ethiopia hoped that by installing a moderate government, obtaining access to ports would be easier, allowing perhaps for a greater role in trade (Klosowicz, 2015). An alliance with the transitional Somali government in trade would thus greatly strengthen the economic position of Ethiopia in the region.

Indeed, Ethiopia has good economic relations with Somaliland and receives a

considerable number of sea imports via the port of Berbera, north of Hargeysa. At the same time, Ethiopia militarily supported Puntland against the progressing of UIC militias in mid-2006 (Hoehne, 2009: 273-74). And strengthened Abdullahi Yusuf's fight for power in Mogadishu. For that matter, the conflict between Somaliland and Puntland does not pose a problem for Ethiopia. The overall objective of Ethiopia is to prevent a unified and reinstated Somalia. "That is why Ethiopia puts its bets on different 'horses' (Somaliland, Cabdullahi Yusuf)" simultaneously (Ibid). Consequently, "Ethiopia might be eager to maintain the status quo of contested borders in northern Somalia and, if possible, prevent politically decisive fighting between Somaliland and Puntland" (Ibid).

According to Adem (1995) Ethiopia seeks economic interest but not by installing moderate government in Somalia rather by creating strong relations between the two countries regarding the use of ports and rivers, commerce, culture and so on, and seeing to it that the two peoples are benefiting from this, one could be sure that the peoples would resist activities designed to harm the relations that are proving to be so beneficial to them. Ethiopia would also gain direct economic advantages from this situation; in addition, when Ethiopia's eastern border ceases to be a source of threat, overall economic development would be enhanced. Because of this, Ethiopia's major objective in Somalia has always been to see the establishment of peace and democracy, and based on that, the development of strong economic, cultural and political ties between the two countries (Adem, 1995: 4).

To sum up this, this section it should be noted that the real motivation of Ethiopia to intervene in Somalia was neither unilaterally seeking of political interest nor to gained economic advantage.[16] Ambassador Dina Mufti argued that Ethiopian government as the representative of nation, nationalities and people of Ethiopia always seeks peace rather than political turbulence as well as other economic and social crises. Because of Somalia is the neighbor of Ethiopia, so whatever misery situation of Somalia negatively affect the situation of Ethiopia. Therefore, whatever the enemies (Eritrea, ONLF, and OLF) of Ethiopia said what they want about the interference of Ethiopia in Somalia, but the truth was/is to maintain peace in Somalia and keep the security and integrity of Ethiopia.

[16] Ibid

4.3. The Involvement of Ethiopia in Somalia between 2004 and 2009

Between 2004 and 2009, the African Programme for Peace I provided technical and financial assistance to the peace and security activities of African Union and IGAD. In such a way, Addis Ababa-Ethiopia Managed to effectively support IGAD by the establishment of IGADs offices in Addis Ababa and Mogadishu. This was important to Capacity Development against Terrorism.[17] The organization of IGAD was established for the purpose of created a new Transitional Federal Government in Somalia. The TFG formed in October 2004 (Yihdego, 2007: 667). The rationale behind creating of TFG was in order to rebuild a centralized federal state, and bring an end to the civil war (Yihdego, 2007: 666).

4.3.1. The Legitimacy of Transitional Federal Government versus Islamic Court Union

In 2004, through an international mediation, Somali movements represented in the peace process established a Transitional Federal Government (TFG) with its institutions initially functioning from Nairobi and two years later moved to Baidoa (Adjovi, 2013: 1185). In October 2004, the former Puntland leader Abdullahi Yusuf was elected as President of the new TFG (Menkhaus, 2007: 360, Bamfo, 2010: 60). The TFG's support was limited to Southern Somalia (Hoehne, 2010: 36). Whereas the UIC was popular among the Hawiye (Menkhaus, 2007: 361), which is a dominant clan in Mogadishu. This became a major obstacle for the newly established TFG to get legitimacy and install itself in the Mogadishu (Ibid). Neither did the newly established TFG have a strong security force to move to Mogadishu nor consolidated power (Kidist, 2009: 30-31, Bamfo, 2010: 60). Both Somaliland and influential Islamist groups in Mogadishu rejected the TFG (Bamfo, 2010: 60). Because of this, selecting Abdullahi Ahmed seemed a vindication for Ethiopia's covert involvement in Somalia, hence, the Ethiopian government considered him as an ally.

Although, the outcome that would be deeply unpopular for an influential Mogadishu politician of Ali Mahdi Mohamed, there is a widely an acceptance that Ethiopia was working toward the formation of a Transitional Government led by Abdillahi Yusuf. According to Marangio (2012), the absence of a legitimate political paradigm was due to

[17] Interview with Dr. Sunday Okello, in Institute for Peace and Security Studies research coordinator, April 08/04, 2014

a rupture between traditional social patterns and the elements of a modern centralized state, introduced through the colonial experience and the Siad Barre's regime (Marangio, 2012: 4). Despite the threat of sectarianism, Islamic militants were unified by their singular goal of undermining the legitimacy of the TFG (Ibid). The new government was also fragmented along clan and other lines and was soon confronted by the Islamic Courts Union (ICU) (Hoehne, 2010: 36).

According to Hoehne (2010), in his writing on: "*Political representation in Somalia, citizenship, clanism and territoriality"*, the ICU has been the only authority that has enjoyed even a reasonable amount of local legitimacy in southern Somalia since 1991. However, it was perceived as a threat by most neighbouring countries and by the West. According to Bamfo (2010) and Yihdego (2007), backed by the African Union and the United Nations Security Council, the Transitional Federal Government was given the international recognition, whereas the Islamic Courts lacked. Its removal by Ethiopian military forces dramatically illustrated the gap between internal and external conceptions of representation and peace building in Somalia and marked the beginning of two years of violence in which clan and Islamist militias fought the TFG and its Ethiopian ally (Hoehne, 2010: 28).

In order to ensuring stability and peace in Somalia, the TFG has taken several steps. It announced a Reconciliation Conference between all clans, Islamic militants and the TFG. However, the peace accord between the Daarood and Dir clans and the Ethiopian Army, was not recognized by the government and was declared dead. Because of this, Yusuf who was a member of the Daarood clan and an Ethiopian-backed warlord was elected as President. And resulted a turbulent relations with the other major clans in Mogadishu (Hoehne, 2010). The Somali people are in desperate need of international aid and assistance. And a very significant weakness that the TFG made the decision to allow foreign aid workers and organizations into Somalia (Ibid). The TFG was faced crucial problem. Its governmental institutions had only recognition of international community (de jure legitimacy), but not supported from the Somali people. The TFG is often described as a "rubber stamp state," as it is regarded as fulfilling only one function,

namely providing the Combined Task Force 150[18], with permission to enter Somali waters to protect the freighters passing by (Marangio, 2012: 3).

According to Lyons (2009), Ethiopia acted preventively by providing the military might to drive the UIC out of Mogadishu, to end the breeding ground offered Ethiopia's enemies (ONLF, OLF, and Eritrea), and to bring the TFG to power in the Somali capital". This links between Eritrea, ONLF, OLF and the Somalia conflicts have been acknowledged by the UN Monitoring Group as well (Lyons, 2009). Therefore, The TFG needs to be all-inclusive, consisting of clan leaders and elders, militia leaders, current government officials and Islamists. The TFG needs to take and hold onto a non-expansionist position. Somalia cannot afford to be pressed into a situation where it could be invaded and disorder returned to the country (Arnold & Bedford et al, 2007: 15). It then made quick progress, establishing control over much of southern and central Somalia and challenging the TFG sitting in the town of Baidoa.[19] In 2006 opposition to the TFG in the form of the Islamic Courts Union (ICU) took control of Mogadishu. The success of the Islamist forces reflected the lack of legitimacy and political power of the TFG, which ultimately only survived following massive Ethiopian military intervention in December 2006, on invitation by the TFG (Menkhaus, 2010: 20).

4.3.2. The 2006 Military Intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia

The Islamic Courts Union (ICU) that were mostly supported by the prominent Hawiye clans in Somalia assumed control of much of the southern part of Somalia, including in Mogadishu on June 2006, and promptly imposed Shari'a law (Adjovi, 2013: 1185, Lakey, 2008: 6). In this respect, in order attempt to oust the Union of Islamic Courts, the Transitional Federal Government sought to reaffirm its authority (Adjovi, 2013: 1185). Indeed, in late 2006, the Ethiopian parliament authorized the government to take all necessary measures against the force of UIC in Somalia in response to what it said plans for an invasion by the Islamic courts movement (Yihdego, 2007: 667, Adjovi, 2013: 1185). The parliament approved the resolution on 30 November 2006 by 311 votes to 90

[18] CTF is a multinational naval task force, which protects the ships that enter the Gulf of Aden.

[19] Baidoa is a place where severe type of war took place between TFG and UIC. It was a center of TFG in a time when UIC controlled all areas of Somalia. The region is also one of the most important markets in southern Somalia, conducting significant trade in local and imported cereals, livestock and non-food items. Main economic activities in the town include small, medium and large scale business, self-employment, and livestock and agricultural trade.

against, and 16 abstentions, stating that: “Parliament hereby authorized the government to take all necessary and legal steps to stave off a declaration of holy war and invasion by the Union of Islamic Courts against the country” (Ministry of Foreign affairs, 2006). A Resolution of Ethiopian Parliament authorized the Government to take all legal and necessary measures against any invasion by the UIC, subject to the prior exhaustion of all peaceful avenues the effort to find a peaceful route turned out to be a failure (Yihdego, 2007: 667). A Chapter VII Security Council resolution, Resolution 1725 condemned the extremist’s bombings in Baidoa, and authorized IGAD and the Africa Union (AU) to deploy a protection force to Baidoa. The UIC was not interested to accept Security Council‘s move, and on 8 December officially declared that it was fighting Ethiopian troops to the south-west of Baidoa (Ibid).

Yihdego (2007), argued that ICU declared Islamic State. Somalis were told to comply with stringent Islamic rule or faced harsh punishment. In the meantime, efforts to achieve national reconciliation were ongoing under the auspices of IGAD, though without much success. It was reported that on 20 July 2006 Ethiopian troops crossed into Somalia. Ethiopia only admitted to having military trainers to help the Somali Government (estimated to 400 military personnel). On July 21, the UIC declared a “holy war” against Ethiopia. In September 2006, the Somali interim President survived an assassination attempt in Baidoa on October 25, 2006 Ethiopia said that it was “technically at war” with ICU. After few days the UIC claimed to have ambushed and killed Ethiopian troops near the Ethiopian border (Yihdego, 2007: 667).

Because of this, ICU angry with the deployment of Ethiopian troops in Somalia, it rival to react with final demand. The UIC went on to give Ethiopia a deadline of a week to leave Somalia or face a major attack. On December 20, 2006, a full-scale war broke out between the Ethiopian army and ICU militants around the TFG administrative center of Baidoa. Ethiopia, on December 24, for its part revealed that it had launched a self-defense operation against the UIC and foreign fighters in Somalia. Ethiopian warplanes bombarded Mogadishu airport shortly after the declaration (Yihdego, 2007: 667, Lakey 2008: 6). Thereafter, by using the competence of Ethiopian troops, the ICU essential rebel militia was completely defeated within a two weeks (Ibid).

4.3.2.1. Justification and legal Implication of Ethiopia's 2006 Military Intervention

According to Abdul (2007), the 2006 Ethiopian military intervention in Somalia in pursuit of what Ethiopia perceives as its legitimate national security interest by ensured the Transitional Federal Government to defeats the Union of Islamic Courts resulted too much polarized and simplistic thinking and analysis. With regards to 2006 military intervention, Ethiopia provided justification on three grounds which recognized under international law. These included: the right to self-defense in face of clear and present danger, against terrorist threat and at the invitation of a legitimate government (TFG) (Healy, 2009: 15, Yihdego, 2007: 668). Ethiopia launched an intervention in Somalia. The intervention had been requested by the Somali Transitional Federal Government (TFG), which needed Ethiopia's help to defeat the Islamic Courts Union (ICU) – a coalition of sharia courts that had united to form a rival administration to the TFG and had gained control of the majority of Somalia (Hull, 2013: 15, Miyandazi, 2012: 2).

However, the 2006 military intervention of Ethiopia still now subjected to different analysis: some analysts portray the war in Somalia as the latest in a long round of national and religious wars between highland Christian Abyssinians and lowland Somali Muslims. Others portray this as Ethiopian aggression in pursuit of territorial aggrandizement and its centuries-old search for secure access to the sea. Eriksson (2013) has explained, that the intervention of Ethiopia in 2006 and armed conflicts in 1964, and 1977 which indicate a vast security interest were led in to confrontation between Ethiopia and Somalia (Eriksson, 2013: 37). Others portray the conflict as a pre-emptive invasion to prevent the establishment of a Taleban-style state in Somalia that would provide a home base to al Qaida. Some insist that it is a proxy war between Ethiopia and its arch enemy Eritrea (Abdul, 2007). Therefore, Abdul Mohammed further argued, "the reality is more complicated and lies in the peace and security dilemmas of the Horn." Let, illustrated these different argument in this section:

Elsa González (n'd), in her writing on: "*the Security Issue behind the Ethiopian Involvement in Somalia,"* argued that the justification of 2006 military intervention in Somalia, given by the Ethiopian government, was the fight against terrorism, for the

purpose of faced the Jihad declared war by the Union of Islamic Courts (UIC)[20] towards Ethiopia (Gonzalez, n'd: 1). Since Ethiopian feared by the Jihad declaration of UIC against Ethiopia, she deployed her troops in Somalia (Gonzalez, n'd: 3). Consequently, from the Ethiopian side, the deployed of Ethiopian troops in Somalia presented as an act of self-defense under the international law on 24th of December 2006 (*ibd*). However, Elsa González confronted the Ethiopian argument by providing his own argument:

> *This is why the official discourse prefers to talk about an 'operation' rather than an 'intervention' or an 'incursion'; but as the Ethiopian officials have termed it in different occasions, the operation can even be understood as a war. It has been legitimized officially in the framework of the international law in two ways; on the one hand, as an act of self-defense, and on the other hand, as following the invitation made by the TFG to enter troops in Somalia and combat the UIC.*

How the question of intervention upon invitation is possible? In principle, international law permits third-State intervention by force into another State if there is clear consent from the government of the State where the intervention takes place (Yihdego, 2007: 668). Therefore, Ethiopian intervention was invited by TFG of Somalia which got international recognition. However, in most cases, these interventions are not acceptable unless the inviting government is a constitutionally installed government (Yihdego, 2007: 668). There must be care in inviting of government. The intervention is not contrary with Article 2 (4) of the UN Charter and the intervention does not run against peremptory norms (violations of humanitarian law). Consequently, TFG was internationally recognized government and it can invited other states in time of facing problem. It has no problem to invite other state since it has got recognition by the Security Council and western states (Allo, 2010, Yihdego, 2007: 668). As a consequence, the 2006 military intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia did not contrary with international law.

According to Ambassador Dina Mufti, even though unilateral intervention is mostly controversial, the extreme movement of ICU did not accept from Ethiopia side. Because of this, the UIC was not merely a Somalia's force, but also emerged with citizens of

[20] "The UIC was created in 2006 out of the 16 Islamic courts in Mogadishu in response to these warlord attacks and the insecurity in Mogadishu on a district base and implemented Sharia law to ensure security in an area characterized by lack of state law and institutions.

various states, like Eritrean troops and officials, Arab fighters and some Ethiopian rebels such as OLF. By taking these in to consideration, the international and regional legitimacy of the interim Government, the concern about terrorism, the fact that Ethiopia's intervention was/is not contrary to peremptory norms including the prohibition of aggression. Therefore, Ethiopia's intervention based upon the invitation of the interim Government was lawful.[21] Whereas the other writers argued that the intervention of Ethiopia was not a unilateral, we could see in other section below.

Ethiopia claimed that the rule of the Union of Islamic Courts posed a threat to both the stability of Somalia and the safety of his Christian-led government in Ethiopia. While he justified the incursion as a preventive strike aimed at keeping Somalia from becoming a politically unstable 'pariah' state" (Ibid). However, they confronted the justification given by Ethiopia's government officials by stated, the "Just War Theory"[22], from the views of just war theory, the late "Zenawi's preventive war was not only irresponsible, but also unethical" (Arnold & Bedford et al, 2007: 25).

The principle of non-intervention is being challenged today not only on the basis of human rights, but also on the basis of considerations concerning de facto statehood as well as democratic governance. This suggested that the scope of the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign states has gone through important modifications since the end of the Cold War. The scope for justified resort to force in particular circumstances has expanded accordingly (Julie, 2000: 470).

Arnold & Bedford et al, (2007) and Colombo (2010/11), also argued that the 2006 Ethiopian intervention was justified as necessary to establish the TFG in Mogadishu. Therefore, certain actions of the UIC throughout 2006 provided Ethiopia with justification for the invasion of Somalia. Even though, they strongly opposed the action of Ethiopia, they also believed that there was something mistake from the action of ICU. Therefore, a tiny mistake of ICU opened a door for Ethiopian troops to intervene in Somalia directly. As a result, the Ethiopian government declared war on UIC by categorizing it as a terrorist organization.

---

[21] Interview with Ambassador Dina Mufti, April, 2014

[22] The philosophical tradition of discussing just war has concentrated on two separate questions. First, what, if any, are the legitimate reasons for engaging in war (jus ad bellum)? Second, what is it justifiable to do, and against whom, when fighting a war (jus in bello)? (Julie, 2000: 469).

Menkhaus (2007), argued that many Somalis and foreigners alike held out hope that the rise of the Council of Islamic Courts (CIC) in 2006 would at last lead Somalia out of its prolonged crisis. It came as a huge disappointment to watch the CIC hardliners appear to go out of their way to provoke war with Ethiopia. Their calls for jihad against Ethiopia, their irredentist claims on Somali-inhabited regions of Ethiopia, the CIC's close ties to Eritrea, CIC support for the Oromo Liberation Front and Oromo National Liberation Front, and the CIC's call for Ethiopians to rise up to overthrow the Meles regime all guaranteed armed conflict. Menkhaus (2007), further argued that those declaration of war indicated that the "Somali resentment was incredibly irresponsible and again constituted a wilful disregard for the lessons of the 1977-78 ogaden War. As with many other examples of Somali and foreign leaders failing to learn from the past" (Menkhaus, 2007: 2). The Ethiopian military intervention in Somalia was motivated by the UIC's alleged link to terrorists, irredentist rhetoric, support to Ethiopian rivals (OLF and ONLF), and dependence on Eritrea. Surprisingly, the UIC forces were quickly defeated and left most of their controlled areas, which enabled the TFG to move to Mogadishu (Kidist, 2009: 31).

According to the Report of the UN Monitoring Group on Somalia (2006), Islamic Court Union (ICU)[23] declared a holy war against Ethiopia that was a dangerous situation to Ethiopia. The controlling of Mogadishu by the UIC was conscious by the Ethiopia's government as a threat to the integrity of the Ethiopian state and population (UNMGS, 2006: 22). Such beginning destabilized Ethiopian depend on different factors that the UIC "Greater Somalia" debate and their claim on the Ethiopian Ogaden region that its stability was troubled by the colonial power, the Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF) claims for independence; the Oromo Liberation front (OLF) by extremist movements in Somalia and the Eritrean connection with the UIC and rebel movements (UNMGS, 2006: 22).

[23] "In 2006 another faction rose to power and almost succeeded in controlling all of Somalia: the Union of Islamic Courts (UIC). They first appeared in 1999, and by 2000 they were receiving aid from several Arab and African states. The United States, in response to what they saw as an Islamic fundamentalist threat, formed the Alliance for Restoration for Peace and Counter-Terror in February 2006. In the heaviest fighting in Mogadishu since 1991, the UIC took control of the capital in June 2006. They restored order in Somalia to people who had lived 15 years in anarchy. However, the hard liners called for harsh Islamic law and Jihad against Ethiopia. Actions like these alienated the U.S. and prompted Ethiopia to invade Somalia on December 24, 2006" (Arnold, Bedford et al, 2007: 10).

> *Ethiopian Somalis, no matter whether the ideology of "Greater Somalia" is revived or not, would choose to live in equality and unity with their other Ethiopian brothers and sisters. As our development and democratization process gains momentum, our vulnerability to the effects of this and other similar slogans will be much reduced. Furthermore, it should be underscored that, since it has been the cause of much suffering first and foremost to the people of Somalia, this slogan of "Greater Somalia" has been discredited and its chances of revival are indeed very slim* (Adem, 1995: 3).

Ethiopia first entered Somalia in 2006 to remove the now-defunct Union of Islamic Courts (UIC) (Adjovi, 2013: 1185). UIC had ruled most of southern Somalia for six months. That year Islamic Court Union, a cluster of diverse extremist and terrorist groups was becoming strong enough to threaten the government. And literally hundreds of moderates were assassinated and murdered in Mogadishu, including many professionals, civilians, former soldiers and police. "The world was watching silently and almost no one was willing to risk its resources to contain the looming regional danger. In fact, the government of Ethiopia took the decision to intervene in Somalia in 2006 solely in light of national interests and depending on its own finance from the national treasury" (Ibid).

It is very natural for the threatened state to get involved in the conflict in pursuit of defending its national security. External actors are often threatened by internal conflict that spread over international borders affecting regional and international security. Hence, external actors find it imperative to act against the posed threats using diverse national and international instruments (Ethiopian Herald, 2015). And since Ethiopia shares the most volatile border with Somalia, its "intervention is borne out of insecurity of cross border infiltrations of refugee, terrorist elements who bombed many places in Ethiopia and other military problems". Therefore, Ethiopia's involvement in the Somali conflict should be seen from the context of defensive intervention. Ethiopia as the most populous country in the region cannot afford ignoring the troubling situation in the neighboring states; it should play its role to safeguard its peace and that of the region. "Therefore, Ethiopia's involvement in Somalia is a necessary evil" (Ibid). Zemedkun Tekle, a spokesman for Ethiopia's Information Ministry asked: "what did you expect us to do? Wait for them to attack our cities? The reaction of the international community to

Ethiopia's intervention may help find some answers to this major question" (Yihdego, 2007: 671).

From the explanation of Menkhaus (2007), Yihdego (2007) and Ethiopian Herald (2015), the 2006 intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia seemed legally justified as an act of self-defense under the international law. Even though interference in the internal affairs of sovereign state is not allowed, instability that can be used as threat for the neighbor provided legitimacy for intervention of other state. However, Awol K. Allo (2009), confronted the Ethiopian arguments with the UN Charter and especially its article 51. According to Allo, although Ethiopia could be seen to be under an imminent threat of attack triggering the right of recourse to a proportionate response, it certainly went beyond what is necessary to remove the threat and used a disproportionate force" (Allo, 2009: 35).

According to Moller (2009), "the year 2006 was to become quite dramatic for Somalia, featuring the creation of a counter-terrorism alliances of warlord dubious repute, the establishment of control over most of the country by the Islamic Courts with a somewhat opaque agenda, and an Ethiopian armed intervention had dubious legality" (Moller, 2009: 15). He argued that because of a rationale behind confrontation of ICU and Ethiopia was, ICU's rejected of TFG and secrete military intervention of Ethiopia in Somalia. Moller (2009), further argued ICU declared defensive Jihad against clandestine Ethiopia's military intervention. Moreover, ICU began to lend support from the enemy of Ethiopia (ONLF and OLF) which has a strong connection with Eritrea. And then the ICU become mixed group with radical individuals such as Sheikh Aweys who is "more militant protégé, Aden Hash Farah known as Ayro" (Moller, 2009: 16).

Moller further expressed, ICU then become in charges of Al-Shaabab militia and responsible for different terrorist attacks. Consequently, Ethiopia launched a major attack on the ICU in the form of full-fledged invasion of Somalia. Whether the 2006 Ethiopia's invasion of Somalia seeming legal or illegal, according to Moller (2009) explanation, the response of Ethiopia's force was so indiscriminate which results hundreds of civilian death and thousands of people displacement. Moreover, Ethiopia's opponents also 'fought dirty,' e.g. attacking humanitarian and UN agencies, and using roadside bombs" (Moller, 2008:144).

A great confrontation with regards to 2006 Ethiopia's military intervention strictly connected with a long-standing history of political and territorial disputes, which has led

to several direct military confrontations in the past history (Tatek, 2008). The uprising of the SCIC in 2006 aggravated the tensions between the two countries, while undermining the already tiny legitimacy of the TFG, perceived as too close to the Ethiopians (Moller, 2008:144). As the researcher have understood, still now there is debating issue whether first, of all why really ICU declared a wholly war against with Ethiopia, or first, of all why Ethiopia's troops really deployed in Somalia which considered as a cause of declared war from ICU. Different writers argued that in 2006 Ethiopia invaded Somalia, while from side of Ethiopia and her advocator, ICU declared war with Ethiopia. But until now, the fact is under controversies.

From the argument of Moller (2009), the act of self-defense from Ethiopia side seems doubt, even Ethiopia's response seems disproportional. Disproportionate use of force is totally contradict with the international law. While the measurement of ICU to escaped Ethiopia's military from Somalia was also wrong action. In this respect, the relationship between Ethiopia and Somalia will be in endangered. Because of this, Tatek (2008), point out that the involvement of Ethiopia in Somalia has reversed the recovering wounds between the peoples of Ethiopia and Somalia because of the former governments and regimes of both Somalia and Ethiopia has created an artificial enmity between Ethiopia's and Somalia's people for their own self-interest particularly by the issue of Ogaden. He argued that even if the good and brotherly relation that was seemed gradually being built up between Ethiopia and Somalia since 1991, it eroded since the invasion of Somalia in 2006. Because of the invasion of Ethiopia results indiscriminate killing of civilians.

According to Martin Hill (2008), in his writing on: "*Human Rights, Conflict and Peace-Building in the Horn of Africa – What Can Governments and Civil Society do?"*

> *The Ethiopian military intervention and its defeat of the Islamic Courts forces in December 2006 led to the TFG beginning to establish itself in Mogadishu in the face of continued clandestine armed opposition and assassinations. Human Rights Watch has published its findings of investigations in Mogadishu into violations of international humanitarian law by Ethiopian forces and TFG militias in operations against TFG opponents*.

Martin (2008), also argued that the Ethiopian Foreign Ministry's response failed to convincingly deny the main charge which needs full independent investigation, which

Ethiopian troops arbitrarily and disproportionately fired on civilian areas, causing large-scale casualties of civilians. Human Rights Watch also criticized Islamist opponents for war crimes such as firing from civilian areas and placing civilians at risk (Martin, 2008: 57). Therefore, Martin further argued, Ethiopian troops who were reportedly called in by the TFG President have been the principle force protecting the TFG and fighting armed clan-based and Islamist opponents in Mogadishu. According to Reisman (2000), the issue international legal bases of unilateral military action is plausible based on humanitarian concerns that still strongly criticized by elites of smaller states. However, the reason for the criticism was/is not a lack of feeling for human rights, rather so much as the fear that any erosion of the principle of sovereignty can only increases the vulnerability of weaker states to more powerful states (Reisman, 2000: 6).

From the above extreme arguments, the study concluded that there was a huge gap about the real justification of 2006 Ethiopia's military intervention in Somalia. Because from the two side's arguments, different writers did not recognize the Ethiopia's threat by ICU. While from the side of Ethiopia, it considered its intervention as necessary and indisputable. The UIC blamed Ethiopia's interfering in Somalia's internal affairs, while Ethiopia in turn accused the UIC of promoting a hidden agenda aimed at destabilizing the unity of the Ethiopian State. Ethiopia contended that the leadership of the UIC was controlled by forces that are still actively pursuing the vision of a Greater Somalia. It affect Ethiopia's political independence and territorial integrity. Although, Ethiopia faced challenge for her territorial integrity from ICU, the 2006 military intervention of Ethiopia did not followed a necessarily step to attacked a target group, rather all inclusive attacked. Those situation exposed Ethiopian for further criticism and blaming even Ethiopia as responsible state did not took a right action, rather it could ill-afford to open for criticism by invading fragile state of Somalia. In such a fragile situation and in a crisis mainly of an internal nature, military intervention by invitation may be very controversial indeed, in particular as a justification for the deployment troops in to the territory of sovereign Somalia (Yihdego, 2007: 668).

4.4. Impacts of Ethiopia's 2006 Military Intervention

4.4.1. The Weakening of UIC

Even there are arguments about the consequence of Ethiopia's military intervention, whether ICU was totally dismissed or changed its own nature. In one side, by using the competence of Ethiopian troops, the ICU essential rebel militia was completely defeated within a two

weeks (Lakey 2008: 6). Ethiopian ousting the Islamic Courts Union in December 2006 and the resulting insurgency and war. "The Ethiopian troops quickly decimated the UIC's militant wing. For unknown reasons, the UIC opted to fight the Ethiopian army, one of the largest and best-trained in Africa, on open territory where the conventional Ethiopian troop shad huge advantages" (Arnold & Bedford et al, 2007: 6). "Ethiopian army invaded and the small, Ethiopian-backed TFG army was able to oust the UIC and seize control of Mogadishu." In another side, the Somalia's country report (2015), indicated the Ethiopian intervention was unsuccessful in eliminating the power of the ICU in Somalia and instead resulted in a more radical and dangerous opposition. The dispersed ICU splintered into several factions, triggering the emergence of the Islamic group Al-Shabaab.[24] A terrorist organization striving to build an Islamic state in Somalia through the use of violence against the Somali government, diaspora, and western countries and organizations. Al-Shabaab fought back against the Interim Administrative Government and Ethiopian troops regained control of most of southern Somalia by late 2008 (Somalia: country report, 2015: 30). Following the Islamic Courts Union defeat, it splintered into several different factions. Some of the more radical elements, including Al-Shabaab, regrouped to continue their insurgency against the TFG and oppose the Ethiopian military's presence in Somalia.

Nonetheless, whether ICU was totally dismissed or not the consequence was misery for Somalia. The 2006 military intervention of Ethiopia resulted the distrust and even anger from most of Somali people, because of it took place severe. They further argued by providing the work of "Joyce Mularma", who has written article about Somalia's conflict, the Ethiopian government reliance on forces which resulted animosity with many Somalis, who have already a deep distrust of the Ethiopian state (by the war of 1964 and 1977). The Ethiopian military moved in and pushed the ICU out. But further destabilization ensued. Attempts at national reconciliation failed to draw in any opponents of the TFG and little progress was made (Menkhaus, 2010: 20).

[24] Extremists who use Islamic religion as a cover to agitate in its modern form first appeared in Somalia. It became notable when it governed the Somali town Luuq from 1991 to 1996 and conducting several terrorist attacks within Ethiopia in the mid-1990s (Menkhaus, 2005). After it had been attacked by Ethiopia in Luuq in 1996, it had changed its strategy of abandoning to hold territories and started spreading its ideology via military means and most of whom were not politically active (Menkhaus ,2005).

4.4.2. The Deployment of African Mission in Somalia (AMISOM)

During the Ethiopian intervention, the African Union sent its own peacekeeping forces, the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) with the full and consistent support of the UN Security Council. (Adjovi, 2013: 1185). In order to defeat the Islamic courts which had taken over large parts of the Somalia, AMISOM is the third most important peacekeeping operation that has been launched by the AU which was established in 2007 to replace the Ethiopian troops (Hull, 2013: 12, Kidist, 2009: 46, Bradbury & Healy, 2010: 14). The TFG was supported by the United States and Ethiopia which was "established as the outcome of a three year attempted to negotiate a solution to the conflict by the regional organization of the Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD) (Ibid).

The TFG was established with an interim five-year mandate to prepare Somalia for elections to be held in 2009". However, TFG would not renew Somalia's claim on the disputed of Ogaden issue rather than the TFG president become as an ally. Therefore, AMISOM was launched in Somalia for the purpose of protecting the TFG and its institutions, which first fore considered as it play a pivotal role. But the opportunity is infant for a new government for the whole of Somalia because of different challenges such as stakeholders including Somaliland, Puntland or organizations like al-Shabaab by understanding TFG[25] as just another foreign invasion (Ibid).

By January 2009, the militias had managed to force the Ethiopian troops to retreat. Between 31 May and 9 June 2008, representatives of Somalia's TFG and the Alliance for the Re-liberation of Somalia (ARS) group of Islamist rebels participated in peace talks in Djibouti brokered by the UN. The Djibouti peace agreement was rejected by the major opposition groups, hence by implication they are against the deployment of foreign troops in Somalia (Kidist, 2009: 46). The conference ended with a signed agreement calling for the withdrawal of Ethiopian troops in exchange for the cessation of armed confrontation. Parliament was subsequently expanded to 550 seats to accommodate ARS members, which then elected its leader to office.

4.5. Why Ethiopia's troop remained in Somalia until 2009

The TFG and the Ethiopian forces soon achieved their goal of defeating the ICU, but

[25] The TFG was not considered a legitimate government by all stakeholders and its enemies rather came to see AMISOM as an invading force.

agreed that Ethiopian troops would remain in the country until they could be relieved by a multinational peace support operation in order to prevent a renewed security vacuum (Hull, 2013: 15). As AMISOM was unable to provide sufficient security, Ethiopia remained in the country until 2009 when it, at least formally, withdrew its troops in 2009 (Adjovi, 2013: 1185). Even Ethiopia never really withdrew completely from western Somalia after its last intervention, between 2006 and 2009, and has continued to run reconnaissance missions across the border, continue to operate separately from AMISOM (Hull, 2013: 37).

As such, acknowledging the Ethiopian presence may have been more controversial. A withdrawal of Ethiopia would likely entail a significant worsening of the security situation and AMISOM and the Somali government remains dependent on the Ethiopian presence (Ibid). After the total withdrawal of Ethiopia's troops in 2009, Al Shabaab and the Hizbul Islaami, a rival Islamic party, control most of South and Central Somalia, with the exception of parts of Mogadishu where the TFG receives protection from AMISOM. Members of al-Shabaab are interested in advancing their commitment to regional jihadist, while promoting Somali nationalism (Miyandazi, 2012: 1, Bradbury & Healy, 2010: 14).

In January 2010, Al-Shabaab confirmed officially that it had joined Al Qaida's "international jihad" (UNDP, 2010: 10). In October 2011, a coordinated multinational operation began against Al-Shabaab in southern Somalia, with the Ethiopian military. As Schulman, Williams and Marangio (2012) have explained, Ethiopia was consistently determined not to integrate its forces into AMISOM, because Ethiopia's usually has secretive stance on all defense related issues. Even if, the Ethiopian intervention differentiate from AMISOM, the new strategic concept for AMISOM, authorized by the Security Council, was dependent on Ethiopia maintaining a presence in western Somalia. The Ethiopian soldiers were a significant external factor in the security improvements made in Somalia (Ibid).

The Federal Government of Somalia was later establish on August 20, 2012, representing the first permanent central government in the country since the start of the civil war. On September 2012, Hassan Sheikh Mohamud was elect as the new Somali government's President, with the Ethiopian authorities welcoming his selection and newly appointed Prime Minister of Ethiopia Hailemariam Desalegn attending Mohamud's inauguration ceremony (Mohamed, 2012).

4.6. The Joining and Contribution of Ethiopia's troops in AMSOM group

Ethiopia's troops have been directly involved in Somalia since their military intervention in 2006 enabled to remove ICU (Newbery, 2014: 8). Ethiopia joined AMISOM in January 2014 (Mohamed, 2015: 4, Newbery, 2014: 8). On January 2014, 4000 Ethiopian troops were deployed in Somalia as part of the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) having a UN mandate for the purpose of combating terrorism and extremism. "All in all 22 thousand of Ethiopian troops serve within African Union peacekeeping and stability missions" (Klosowicz, 2015: 92). The joined of Ethiopia in AMISOM followed by the invitation of Somalia's government who expressed the wish that the 6000 additional troops to join AMISOM should be Ethiopian (Newbery, 2014: 9). He argued that because of their experience in peace operation, military training and also their ability to build relationship with local authorities. The preference expressed by Somali authorities resonate with Ethiopia's troops as they are professional and effective who had positive experience in Sudan and UNISFA. As a consequence, "Ethiopia's troop strengthened her position as regional power, which invest in peace and security in the Horn of Africa. Consequently, this gives Ethiopia influence and leverage in region and in future development in Somalia (Ibid).

According to Marangio (2012), AMISOM has made some progress in accomplishing its mandate, "thanks to the direct military intervention of Ethiopia, concerned by the potential spillover of Islamic fundamentalism". A withdrawal of Ethiopia would likely an indicative of exposing of the security threat to both AMISOM group and the Somali government which remains dependent on the Ethiopian presence. The 2014 was a crucial year for AMISOM, which projected the image of what one international adviser to the mission in Mogadishu described as a "grinding relentless machine." AMISOM projected levels of cohesion and direction that momentarily blurred the strong sense of national interest that defines the very core of the mission (Mohamed, 2015: 3).

In early 2015, AMISOM's strategic direction shifted from actively fighting and putting pressure on Al-Shabaab to focusing on stabilization, and allowing the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) to begin institution-building. However, it quickly became apparent that despite AMISOM's notable successes in 2014, al-Shabaab was able to block supply and access routes in and out of many of the towns from which it had been

expelled. One of the reasons for this is the sheer scale of the operation in Somalia, which according to informal estimates would require twice as many troops as were available to AMISOM (Ibid). As Rosen (2012), Mr. Rondney and Dr. Sunday Okello (2014) have explained, African multilateralism attributing the turning point in the fight against Al-Shabaab when fighting forces in Somalia was established (when Kenya, Ethiopia, AMISOM, the TFG and proxy militias began cooperating and developing a coherent vision to fight against al- Shabaab successfully).

Beyond the role of other East African states, the contribution of Ethiopia was the most significant one. However, in the first half of 2015, AMISOM lost momentum, which led to a resurgence of Al-Shabaab and a number of spectacular attacks in Mogadishu, Kismayo and Garowe. Hence, the disconnection between AMISOM headquarters in Mogadishu and the sectors across southern and central Somalia where the troop-contributing countries operate due to the limited political will of the contributing countries to find replacements (Ibid).

4.6.1. Ethiopia's Position within AMISOM

Before Ethiopia joined in AMISOM group in 2014, unwilling to give up the "command and control" over her troops for reasons of concerns over possible Somalia reactions to the inclusion of Ethiopian troops in the mission (Newbery, 2014: 9). Ethiopia was consistently determined not to integrate its forces into AMISOM. Hence, Ethiopia was better equipped for sustained unilateral operations. In addition, Ethiopia's involvement in AMISOM had always been considered controversial given Ethiopia's role in the Somali conflict (Hull, 2013: 35). Even though, the Ethiopian intervention remained separate from AMISOM, the new strategic concept for AMISOM, authorized by the Security Council, was dependent on Ethiopia maintaining a presence in western Somalia. The Ethiopian soldiers were thus not re-hatted into AMISOM, but continued to be a significant external factor in the security improvements made in Somalia. "Despite not contributing troops to AMISOM, Ethiopia does hold positions at AMISOM headquarters; a highly unusual arrangement which indicates the importance of Ethiopia in Somalia. Despite this, coordination between the Ethiopian operation and AMISOM is reportedly often lacking" (Hull, 2013: 36).

Ethiopia stands out as a state that can play a critical role in the Horn of Africa (Berouk, 2012: 88). It is clearly the dominant state in the region, as seen both in the narrower and

broader perspective. Especially, Ethiopia has always been a hegemon within the East African region; its strong military tradition is rooted in a strong sense of national pride (Arnold & Bedford et al, 2007: 19). Most meaningfully, Ethiopia has a significant influence in African international affairs as it is the seat of the African Union. It also has the region's most potent and best-equipped military. Understandably, Ethiopia's current military set-up, dispositions and operations are held in great secrecy with few official or independent figures available, hence the difficulty in establishing reliable military strength (Berouk, 2012: 89).

Ethiopia did not viewed AMISOM as lasting as well as long term solution to the security crisis in Somalia rather it argued that any external involvement should be directed at supporting a Somali- lead peace process (Ibid). Indeed, Ethiopian troops in AMISOM will externally funded is recognized as benefit, however, Ethiopia insists that economic interest were not an important motive for Ethiopia's involvement in Somalia.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Since the beginning of the 1990s, the crisis in Somalia has received several international and regional interventions. However, all international interventions have failed to pacify Somalia. As regional level Ethiopia gained the legitimacy of the international community to manage Somalia's crisis. The relationship between Ethiopia and Somalia has been very problematic. These two countries have a longstanding history of conflict, particularly over the Ogaden territory of Ethiopia. The Ogaden region has been a scene of protracted conflict ever since its incorporation into the Ethiopian State at the end of the 19th century. These two countries fought a bitter war in 1977 in which Somalia was defeated. Since 1991, Ethiopia is widely perceived as one of the most stable African countries. The fact that Addis Ababa is home to the African Union (AU) give the country some leverage. Due to its history, strategic geographic location, and military strength, Ethiopia has a strong position in the IGAD and the AU.

Since the collapse of Somalia in 1991, Ethiopia got involved in the Somali conflict early on. Until the mid-1990s, Ethiopia has made significant contributions to mediation efforts in Somalia. Nonetheless, later on the Ethiopian intervention has actively changed the equilibrium inside Somalia. Hence, on the one hand, Somalia's instability and lack a strong central government are perceived as a serious threat to Ethiopia's national security and stability. In this respect, throughout the 1990s, Ethiopia militarily intervened several times against AIAI, which was accused of undertaking bombing attacks in Ethiopia in 1996 and 1997. Internal conflicts often have regional impacts in several aspects. They posed serious threats against Ethiopia. These threats include security threats, refugee problems, socio-economic and military problems. All these actual problems (for instance piracy and Ethiopian separatist groups, such as OLF and ONLF) with a potential threat provoking Ethiopia to be involved in internal conflicts of Somalia.

On the other hand, Ethiopia shares with all the states of the Horn of Africa porous borders which are very difficult to fully monitor. Its geopolitical location also means that Ethiopia is more affected by regional issues than any other state in the Horn of Africa. In light of Ethiopia's historical experience, this position has its own demerit. Ethiopia has often divergent interests with its neighboring states. For instance, Ethiopia and Eritrea fought a two year border war in 1998-2000 which critically disturbed Somalia's peace process.

The rivalry and conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia extended into Somalia and aggravated the situation.

The period between 2004 when the Transitional Government was established and 2006 when the Ethiopian government military intervened, and 2009 when Ethiopian troops were formally withdrew have been a subject of intense academic and political debate. In early 2006, the Islamic Courts Union arose as an armed group. In December 2006, the Ethiopians launched a counteroffensive and drove the ICU out of Mogadishu and other major centers. Clearly there is a gap on between the continuum of state collapse in Somalia and the issue of national security interest in Ethiopia.

Therefore, Ethiopia‘s involvement in the Somali conflict should be seen from the context of defensive intervention. Ethiopia has desired to see the reestablishment of government in Somalia. Because of this, Ethiopia always fears a radical Islamist group that had surfaced in various parts of the country after the downfall of Siad Barre. In a nutshell, both in historical perspective and in the contemporary time, Ethiopia through all old regimes until the current administration of FDRE government, the external threats to Ethiopia have generally been quite similar. Hence, Ethiopia managed to neutralize, and crush it shortly. Hence, Ethiopia, a powerful and well-positioned state, is a hostile neighbor to Somalia. For this evidence, the war of 1964, 1977, and as well as the military intervention of 2006, in the reign of Emperor Haile Selassie, military regime of Derg, and the FDRE government respectively. As a consequence, such neighboring relations are misfortune for both Ethiopia and Somalia.

As a result, the study found that in such undesirable and difficult situations, for Ethiopia, it is difficult to play a pivotal role in Somalia’s peace-building effort. Many Scholars, intellectuals and politicians were/are pessimistic towards the effectiveness of Ethiopia in the effort of Somalia’s peace-building. Due to its internal problems and the huge economic underdevelopment and vulnerability, Ethiopia’s position is limited by its security interest.

The findings of this thesis do not support the argument that Ethiopia has participated in many activities that have blocked peace-building efforts in Somalia in order to maintain a weak and divided Somalia. Ethiopia’s involvement in Somalia’s peace-building may not always have a positive impact on the efforts for achieving peace in Somalia. Because of this, the challenge is that how to strike the right balance between the need for building peace in Somalia and how addressing Ethiopia’s security concerns.

The study found that Ethiopia is an important international actor, especially with regard to combating international terrorism and extremism. Ethiopia greatly fought with different terrorist groups to maintain its territorial integrity unilaterally and multilaterally. Ethiopia collaborated with the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) and Transitional Federal Government of Somalia's troops. These have made important gains in Somalia that renovated peace and security. Therefore, Ethiopia supported Somalia's government in fighting Al-Shabaab. The central driver for its active involvement was/is to have a stable and peaceful neighbor. Since, Ethiopia is situated in the center of the Horn, it is trying to improve regional integration and encouraging other states to have coordination in the fight against terrorism.

However, the study found that two great problems from Ethiopia side. The first problem is, Ethiopia's policy speculation (which is an abstract thought). For instance, from the whole assessment of this study, the sources from Ethiopia side predominantly focused on policy explanation than what Ethiopia has actually did/do for Somalia's peace-building effort. Because of this, different, intellectuals and politicians considered Ethiopian as an aggressor. As well, they considered the 2006 military intervention of Ethiopia, like the previous experience. The second problem is relates to the way Ethiopia managed its public relations through the media. On the one hand, the Ethiopian media repeatedly talks about the positive aspects of Ethiopian intervention. On the other hand, the foreign media has generally a more negative attitude.

In sum, Ethiopia has been affected by the prolonged Somalia's crisis. Hence, it tried contradictory solutions to resolve these crisis. Due to its contradictory solutions and its divergent interests with other actors, Ethiopia's activities for peace-building in Somalia have been affected by different interpretations. Therefore, this study has offered solutions. Firstly, Ethiopia should avoid a militaristic approach to the problem of state and peace building in Somalia. Secondly, Ethiopia's peace building efforts in Somalia should be based on objective facts. Thirdly, Ethiopia should deal with its internal weaknesses, and its rivalries. Fourthly, advancing a common peace and security agenda enhances not merely for Somalia but also mutual benefits for all the neighboring states. But Ethiopia predominantly focused on unilateral actions. Therefore, Ethiopia should reconsider having a common policy than unilateral activities, to build peace in Somalia effectively. Greater inclusion of regional and international organization (intergovernmental

organizations and NGOs) is important for efforts to build peace in Somalia. Ethiopia's Efforts should be made to hold consultations with several neighboring countries.

Bibliography

Abbink, J. (2003). Ethiopia-Eritrea: proxy wars and prospects of peace in the horn of Africa. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, *21*(3), 407-426.

Abbink, J. (2009). The Islamic Courts Union: The Ebb and Flow of a Somali Islamist Movement. *Movers and Shakers: Social Movements in Africa*, *8* (87).

Abdulkadir, S. (2012). Al Shabab's Impact on Peace in Somalia and the Horn of Africa. *Backgrounder*, (23)

Adam, Hussien. (1995). "Somalia: A Terrible Beauty Being Born?" In *Collapsed States: the Disintegration and Restoration of Legitimate Authority*,

Adjovi, R. (2013). Introductory Note to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2093 on the Situation in Somalia. *International Legal Materials*, 52 (5), 1185-1195.

Ahmed, I. I. (1999). The heritage of war and state collapse in Somalia and Somaliland: local level effects, external interventions and reconstruction. *Third World Quarterly*, 20(1), 113-127.

Aimé, E. G. (2013). The security issues behind the Ethiopian intervention in Somalia (2006-2009). *State and societal challenges in the Horn of Africa: Conflict and processes of state formation, reconfiguration and disintegration*, 32-47. Instituite of Lisbon.

Aisha Ahmad. (2012). Agenda for peace or budget for war? Evaluating the economic impact of international intervention in Somalia. *International Journal*, 67(2), 313-331.

Ali, K.O. (2014). The Role of Hegemonies within African Regional Organizations' Interventions: A Comparative Study of Nigeria in ECOWAS' Intervention in Liberia and Ethiopia in IGAD's Intervention in Somalia

Allo, A. K. (2009). Counter-intervention, Invitation, Both or Neither: An Appraisal of the

2006 Ethiopian Intervention in Somalia. Mizan Law Review, 3(2), 201-239.

Allo, A. K. (2010). Ethiopia's Armed Intervention in Somalia: The Legality of Self-Defense in Response to the Threat of Terrorism. Denv. J. Int'l L. & Pol'y, 39, 139.

Arend, A. C. (2003). International law and the preemptive use of military force. *The Washington Quarterly*, *26*(2), 89-103.

Arnold, G. (2008). *Historical Dictionary of Civil Wars in Africa: Revolution, and Civil Unrest,* No. 34, United States of America by Scarecrow Press, Inc. ISBN-13: 978-0-8108-5766-7/ISBN-10: 0-8108-5766-9

Baheru Zewde (1991). *A History of Modern Ethiopia*.1855-1974. Athens: Ohio University press.

Baheru, Zewde (1998). *A short History Ethiopia and the* Horn. Addis Ababa. Ethiopia.

Bakircioglu, O. (2009). Right to Self-Defence in National and International Law: The Role of the Imminence Requirement, The. *Ind. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev.*, *19*, 1.

Barnes, C. (2000). The Ethiopian State and its Somali Periphery, Circa. University of Cambridge, PhD Thesis.

Barnes, C. (2007). The Somali Youth League, Ethiopian Somalis and the Greater Somalia Idea, c.1946-48. *Journal of East African Studies*, 1(2), 79

Barnes, C., & Hassan, H. (2007). The rise and fall of Mogadishu's Islamic Courts. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, *1*(2), 151-160.http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17531050701452382

BBC News (2006) "Somalia's Islamic Courts", BBC NEWS, June 6, 2006, available at http://news.bbc.co.uk /2/hi/5051588.stm. Accessed, on 19 January, 2016.

Bellamy, A. J. (2008). Conflict Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect. *Global Governance*, 14 (2), 135-156

Bellamy, A. J. (2008). The Responsibility to Protect and the Problem of Military Intervention. *International Affairs*, 84 (4), 615-639

Bellamy, A. J. (2010). The responsibility to protect-five years on. *Ethics & International Affairs*, *24*(2), 143-169.

Bellamy, A. J. (2013). *The Responsibility to Protect: Towards a "Living Reality"*, *Report* written for the United Nations Association-UK

Berouk Mesfin, (2010). The Horn of Africa as a Security Complex: Towards a Theoretical Framework. *African conflict prevention program institute for security studies*.

Berouk Mesfin, (2010). The Architecture and Conduct of Intelligence in Ethiopia (1974 1991). *International Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 5 (1), 39-70

Berouk Mesfin, (2012). Ethiopia's Role and Foreign Policy in the Horn of Africa. *International Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 6 (1/2), 87-113

Bradbury, M. (2003). Overcoming State Failure: Somaliland and Puntland. A Report for DFID.

Bradbury, M. and Healy, S. (2009). *Endless War: A brief History of the Somali Conflict.*

Bradbury, M and Healy, S. (2010). Whose peace is it anyway? Connecting Somali and International Peacemaking, an International Review of Peace Initiatives, ISSN 1365-0742/ISBN 978-1-905805-14-3

Brown, M. E. (1996). *The International Dimensions of Internal Conflict*. Center for Science and International Affairs. John F. Canady School of Government, Havard University, Cambridge. Massachusetts *Conflict Trends 21. 2009.* (http://www.imuna.org/endless-war-brief-history-somali-conflict) Accessed: May.20-2014.

Civins, B. (2009). Ethiopia's Intervention in Somalia. *Journal of International Studies,*

2(2), 137-154

Civins, B. (2010). Ethiopia‘s intervention in Somalia 2006-2009. *Journal of International Studies*, 2(2), 137-54.

Clapham, C. (1998). *African Guerrillas*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Clark, J. (1992). “Debacle in Somalia.” *Foreign Affairs* 72. 1 109–123. doi:10.2307/20045500.

Christiansen, G.M. (1999). Humanitarian Intervention: Legal and Political Aspects, Danish Institute of International Affairs, ISBN 87-90681-21-5

Colombo, A. (2010). The Persistence of State Disintegration in Somalia between Regional and global Intervention.

Crocker, C. (1995). The Lessons of Somalia: Not Everything Went Wrong. *Foreign Affairs*, 74 (3), 2-8

Dagne Ted. (2010). Somalia: Current conditions and prospects for a lasting peace. Library of Congress Washington dc congressional research service. *Decolonization*, London: I.B. Taurus.

Daniel Kendie (2003). Toward Northeast African Cooperation: Resolving the Ethiopia Somalia Disputes, Special Issue: Challenges of Building Democratic Institutions for Governance and Development in Ethiopia and the Horn of Africa, *Northeast African Studies*, New Series, Michigan State University Press, (10 2), 67-109

Davidsson, E. (2002). Legal Boundaries to UN Sanctions. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 7 (4), 1-50, (http://www.juscogens.org)

Dorr, N. (2008). The Responsibility to Protect: An Emerging Norm? *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, 19, 189-207

Fisas, V. (2013). *Peace Processes*, ISBN: 978-84-9888-511-8

Fordham, B. (1998). The Politics of Threat Perception and the Use of Force: A Political

Economy Model of U.S. Uses of Force, 1949-1994, *International Studies Quarterly*, 42 (3), 567-590

EBC News (2013). "Somalia seeks Ethiopia's continued support in peace efforts", Tuesday 17 September 2013

Eriksson, M. (2013). External intervention in Somalia's civil war: security promotion *and* national Interests? Swedish Defense Research Agency FOI-R--3718—SE. ISSN 1650-1942. Mainstay of defense

Elmi, Afyare Abdi and Barise Abdullahi. (2006). The Somalia Conflict, Root Causes Obstacles and Peace-building Strategies. *African Security Studies*, 15 (1), 32-54.

Emmanuel, F. (2010). Analysis: Ethiopian Intervention in Somalia, Ethiopia's Invasion of Somalia in 2006: Motives and Lessons Learned in African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 4 (2), 80

Ethiopian Herald: "Meles Holds Talks with Somali TNG President", 15-01-2006" Ethio-Somalia Bilateral Ties Growing", 09-05-2006.

Evans, G. and Sahnoun, M. (2001). The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. International Development Research Centre, Canada.

Evans, G. and Sahnoun, M. (2002). The Responsibility to Protect, *Foreign Affairs*, 81 (6), 99 110

Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, The Foreign Affairs and National Security Policy and Strategy, Ministry of Information, Press and Audiovisual Department, November 2002, Addis Ababa, available from http://www.mfa.gov.et/resdoc.php?cpg=2 (accessed 2 November 2012), Pp. 107.

Findlay, T. (2002). The Use of Force in UN Peace Operations, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Oxford University Press, Inc., New York, ISBN 0-19-829282-1, SE-169 70 Solna, Sweden

Gebru Tareke. (2000). The Ethiopia-Somalia war of 1977 revisited. *International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 635-667. Boston University African Studies Center. Retrieved http://www.jstor.org/stable/3097438.

González, E., & de Estudios Africanos, G. The Security Issue behind the Ethiopian Involvement in Somalia.

Hagmann, T. (2005). Beyond clannishness and colonialism: understanding political disorder in Ethiopia's Somali Region, 1991–2004. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, *43*(04), 509-536. Cambridge university press.

Hagmann, T. (2007). The political roots of the current crisis in region 5. *SSRC, September 21st, [available at: http://hornofafrica. ssrc. org/Hagmann/printable. html]*.

Hagmann, T. & Khalif, M. H. (2008). State and Politics in Ethiopia's Somali Region since 1991. *Bildhaan: An International Journal of Somali Studies*, *6*(1), 6.

Healy, S. (2008). 'Lost Opportunities in the Horn of Africa: How Conflicts Connect and Peace Agreements Unravel', *Chatham House Report*. London: RIIA.

Healy, S. (2009). "Peacemaking in the Midst of War: An Assessment of IGAD"s Contribution to Regional Security", *Working Paper*, Royal Institute of International Affairs, ISSN 1749-1797, ISSN 1749-1800.

Hoehne, V. M. (2009). Mimesis and Mimicry in Dynamics of State and Identity Formation in Northern Somalia, Africa, *Journal of the International African Institute*, Cambridge University, 79 (2), 252-281

Howard, B. (2005). Intervention and Prevention: How Dangerous? *AQ: Australian Quarterly*, 77 (4), 22-26, 40

Jackson, R. (2000). Managing Africa's Violent Conflicts. Peace & Change, 25(2), 208-224

Jacoiste, E.L. (2010). *The United Nation Collective Security System and its Relationship*

with Economic Sanction and Human Rights, Max Plank year book of United Nations Law, 14, 273-335

Julie, A. S. (2000). The New Practice of UN-Authorized Interventions: A Slippery Slope of Forcible Interference? Special Issue on Ethics of War and Peace. *Journal of Peace Research,* 37 (4), 469-488

Khalid, I. (2011). Politics of Intervention: A Case of Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq, *International Journal of Business and Social Science,* 2 (11).

Kidist Mulugeta (2009). The Role of Regional and International Organizations in Resolving the Somali Conflict: The Case of IGAD.

Kioko, B. 2003. 'The Right of Intervention under the African Union's Constitutive Act: from non-interference to non-intervention', *International Review of the Red Cross* 85(852): 807-25.

Kłosowicz , R. (2015). The role of Ethiopia in the regional security complex of the Horn of Africa. *Ethiop.j.soc.lang.stud. 2*(2), 83-97. eISSN: 2408-9532; pISSN: 2412-5180

Krain, M. (2005). International intervention and the severity of genocides and politicizes. *International Studies Quarterly*, *49*(3), 363-388.

Lake, D. A., & Morgan, P. M. (1997). *Regional orders: Building security in a new world*. Penn State Press.

Lefebvre, A.J. (1996). "Middle East Conflicts and Middle Level Intervention in the Horn of Africa", *Middle East Journal,* 50 (3), 387-404.

Levine, N.D (1992). 'Greater Ethiopia Reconsidered' in Ethiopian Review.

Levine, N.D (1992). 'Meles Zenawi and the politics of Ethnicity' in Ethiopia Review.

Levine, D. N. (2000). *Greater Ethiopia: The Evolution of a Multiethnic Society*. University of Chicago Press.

Lewis, I. M. (2002): *A Modern History of the Somali: Nation and State in the Horn of Africa*, 4th edition, Oxford, UK: James Currey.

Lewis, I. M. (2004). *A Modern History of the Somali: Revised, Updated and Expanded*. London: Woolnough.

Luck, E. C. (2008). The United Nations and the Responsibility to Protect

Lyons, T. (2009). The Ethiopia-Eritrea Conflict and the Search for Peace in the Horn of Africa‖, *Review of African Political Economy*, 36 (120), 167-180.

Marangio, R. (2012). *The Somali Crisis: Failed State and International Interventions*. *Institute of International affair*.

Marangio, R. (2012). The Somali Crisis: Failed State and International Interventions. Institute of International affair. Working Papers, 12 (15).

Massingham, E. (2009). Military intervention for humanitarian purposes: Does the Responsibility to Protect Doctrine Advance the Legality of the Use of Force for Humanitarian ends. International Humanitarian Law Officer with the Australian, Red Cross, 91 (876).

Menkhaus, K. (2007). 'The Crisis in Somalia: a Tragedy in Five Acts', *African Affairs*, 106 (424), 357-90.

Menkhaus, K. (2009). Somalia after the Ethiopian Occupation. Enough Project Strategy Paper (Washington: Center for American Progress, 89.

Menkhaus, K. (2009). Somalia: 'They Created a Desert and Called It Peace (Building)': Conflict and Peace in the Horn of Africa, Review of African Political Economy, 36 (120), 223-233

Menkhaus, K. *et al* (2009). *A History of Mediation in Somalia since 1988.* The Search for Peace Somali Program Inter peace and the Center for Research and Dialogue

Menkhaus, K. (2010). Stabilisation and humanitarian access in a collapsed state: the

Somali case. Disasters, 34(3), 320-S341.

Menkhaus, K. (2011). Somalia and the Horn of Africa, World Development Report, Davidson University.

Menkhaus, K. (2012). Somalia at the Tipping Point? *Current History*, *111*(745), 169-174.

Miti, K. (2010). The Endless Search for Peace. Policy briefing no.25. Africa Institute of South Africa.

Mitchell, Mc. S. and Prins, C. B. (2004). Rivalry and Diversionary Uses of Force, *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 48 (6), 937-961.

Moller, B. (2009). The Somali Conflict: The role of external actors (No.2009:03). DIIS Reports/Danish Institute for International Studies. http://www.diiper.ihis.aau.dk/research/3397011

Moussa, J. (2008). Can jus ad bellum override jus in bello? Reaffirming the separation of the two bodies of law. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *90*(872), 963-990.

Muhamed M. (2007). Somlaia Reconciliation Conference- The Unbeaten Track: Somalia at the Cross roads – Challenges and perspectives in Reconstructing a Failed State. London, Adonis and Abbey Publishers.

Mohamud H. Khalif. (2006). State and Politics in Ethiopia's Somali Region since 1991, Bildhaan: an International Journal of Somali Studies, 6.

Newbery, K. (2014). Mapping National Security Interests in the Horn of Africa Summary Report.

Poole, W. (2005). *The Effort to Save Somalia: August 1992-March 1994*. Washington, DC: Joint History Office.

Powell, B., Ford, R., & Nowrasteh, A. (2008). Somalia after state collapse: Chaos or improvement? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *67*(3), 657-670.

Rediker, E. (2004). The Ogaden: a microcosm of global conflict. *The Concord Review*.

Regan, P. M. (2002). Third-party interventions and the duration of intrastate conflicts. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *46*(1), 55-73.

Reinold, T. (2011). State weakness, irregular warfare, and the right to self-defense post-9/11. *American Journal of International Law*, *105*(2), 244-286. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5305/amerjintelaw.105.2.0244

Rice, S. E. (2003). The new national security strategy: focus on failed states. Brooking Institution.

Saleh, A. (2010). Broadening the concept of security: identity and societal security. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, *6*(04).

Samatar, Abdi Ismail, and Ahmed I. Samatar (2003). "Somali Reconciliation." *Bildhaan: An International Journal of Somali Studies* 3. http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/bildhaan/vol3/iss1/.

Samatar, Abdi Ismail (2004): Ethiopian Federalism: Autonomy versus Control in the Somali Region, *Third World Quarterly*, 25 (6), 1131-1154.

Samatar, Abdi Ismail. (2007). "Ethiopian Invasion of Somalia, US Warlordism and AU Shame." *Review of African Political Economy* 34. 111 155–165. doi: 10.2307/20406369.

Samatar, S. S. (2007). The Islamic Courts and Ethiopia's Intervention in Somali: Redemption or Adventurism?. *Horn of Africa*, 222.

Seybolt, T. B. (2007). *Humanitarian military intervention: the conditions for success and failure*. Oxford University Press.

Simons, K. W. (2008). Self-Defense: Reasonable Beliefs or Reasonable Self-Control?

Snyman, A. F. (2010). Intervention with specific reference to the relationship between the

United Nations Security Council and the African Union. *The Comparative and International Law Journal of Southern Africa*, 43 (2), 139-172

Tams, C. J. (2009). The Use of Force against Terrorists, *The European Journal of International Law*. 20 .2 359 -397. doi: 10.1093/ejil/chp031

Tams, C. J. (2010). The Necessity and Proportionality of Anti-Terrorist Self-Defence. *AvailableatSSRN1653895*.http://www.gla.ac.uk/schools/law/staff/christiantams/

Tatek (2008). Ethiopia Democratic Unity Front: Condemns the Brutal Actions of the EPRDF Regime in the Ogaden.10. London WC1N 3XX

Tebebe Eshete, (1991). The root causes of political problems in the Ogaden, 1942-1960. *Northeast African Studies,* 13(1), 9. Asmara University.

Tibebe Eshete, (1994). Towards a History of the Incorporation of the Ogaden: 1887-1935. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 27(2), 69.

Terrence, P. (2007). Avoiding Conflict in the Horn of Africa: US Policy toward Ethiopia and Eritrea (Council Special Report).*The Cost of a Failing Somalia*. Washington: The Center for American Progress and the One Earth Future Foundation.

Tsagourias, N. (2011). *Necessity and the Use of Force: A Special Regime*. Netherlands Yearbook of International Law, 41 2010. doi: 10.1007/978-90-6704-737-1-2

Waal, A. and Omaar, R. (1994). Can Military Intervention Be "Humanitarian"? Intervention and North-South Politics in the 90's, Middle East Report, 187/188, 2-8

Wasara, S. (2002). Conflict and State Security in the Horn of Africa: Militarization of Civilian Groups. *African Journal of Political Science*, 7 (2), 39-60

Woodwell, D. (2007). *Nationalism in International Relations: Norms, Foreign Policy, and Enmity,* Advances in Foreign Policy Analysis, ISBN-13: 978–1–4039–8449–4/10: 1–4039–8449–2

Yussuf Muhammed, H. (2014). The Role of External Actors in the Somali Conflict: A Post 2000 Study of Kenya and Ethiopia‘s Involvement In the Conflict of Somalia.

Yihdego Z. W. (2007). ‘Ethopia’s Military Action against the Union of Islamic Courts and others in Somalia: some Legal Implications’, *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 56: 666-76.

Appendices

Annex 1. Interview Guide

1. How do you see the post 1991 Ethiopia‘s intervention in Somalia?
2. In your view, what was Ethiopia’s motivation, to be actively involved in Somalia’s politics since 1991?
3. There is an argument that the intension and interest of Ethiopia was not clearly settled.
    - Would you think that the objectives and interests of Ethiopia was not clearly settled about its intervention?
4. Ethiopia strictly concerned about the turmoil situation of Somalia. However, as some writers argued the post 1991 intervention of Ethiopia was a mistake that exacerbate conflict and terrorist act in Somalia and even not necessary in the future for peaceful settlement of Somalia.
    - How do you see this argument?
5. Several writers related the post 1991’s involvement of Ethiopia with the past historical relation of Ethiopia and Somalia that concerned on only expansion of territory and maximizing their own national interest?
    - How do you see this argument?
6. How do you see the Union of Islamic Courts (UIC) and Transitional Federal Government (TFG)?
7. How do you see Ethiopia‘s 2006 intervention in Somalia?
8. How do you see the political and legal justification of 2006 Ethiopia’s military intervention in Somalia?
9. How do you see self-defence and its component in relation to Ethiopia‘s intervention in Somalia?
10. In your view, what Ethiopia has contributed for Somalia’s peace building effort?

Annex 2. List of key informants

No	Name of key informants	Institution	Position	Place and date of interview
1.	Ambassador Dina Mufti	Ministry of Foreign affairs	Ethiopia's Spokesman	April 04, 2014 at Ethiopian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Addis Ababa
2.	Mr. Rondney	Africa Union	Coordinator in Peace and Security Department	April 08, 2014 at African Union
3.	Dr. Sunday Okello	Addis Ababa University	Research Coordinator of Institute for Peace and Security Studies	April 11, 2014 at Addis Ababa University
4.	Dr. Demeke Achiso	Addis Ababa University	Lecturer in Department of Political Science and International Relations	April 15, 2014 at Addis Ababa University

Annex 3.



Map of Great Republic of Somalia

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declared that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

_____

Meaza T/aregay Beyene

April, 2017

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as advisor of the candidate. _____

Asnake Kefale (PhD)

April, 2017