



Patterns of Violence in Somalia

Notes from the Seminar

26-28 September, 2013

The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
Medford, Massachusetts

The World Peace Foundation Seminar Series

The World Peace Foundation, an operating foundation affiliated solely with The Fletcher School, aims to provide intellectual leadership on issues of peace, justice and security. It believes that innovative research and teaching are critical to the challenges of making peace around the world, and should go hand-in-hand with advocacy and practical engagement with the toughest topics. It regularly convenes expert seminars to address today's most pressing issues.

Contents

Preface	i
Contributors	ii
Clan Cleansing in Somalia: The Ruinous Turn of 1991 (2013) <i>Lidwien Kapteijns</i>	1
State-Sponsored Violence and Conflict under Mahamed Siyad Barre: The Emergence of Path Dependent Patterns of Violence <i>Daniel Compagnon</i>	10
Somalia: The Logic of a Rentier Political Marketplace? <i>Alex de Waal</i>	17
The Wars in the North and the Creation of Somaliland <i>Dominik Balthasar</i>	22
Conflict over Resources and the Victimization of the Minorities in the South of Somalia <i>Catherine Besteman</i>	33
Clan Cleansing in Somalia: The Ruinous Legacy of 1991: A Book Review <i>Faisal Roble</i>	39
Some Reflections on Lidwien Kapteijns' Clan Cleansing in Somalia: The Ruinous Legacy of 1991 (2013) <i>David D. Laitin</i>	43
Response to David Laitin's Reflections on Clan Cleansing in Somalia <i>Lidwien Kapteijns</i>	47

Preface

This book is a product of the World Peace Foundation's "Patterns of Violence in Somalia" seminar, which was held September 26-28, 2014 at The Fletcher School at Tufts University.

The seminar approached the crisis in Somalia not through the lens of immediate problems and policy prescriptions, but from a starting point concerned with political economy and historic patterns of violence, the societal impacts and accounts of violence, and comparative analysis of changing frameworks of governance and conflict associated with the end of the Cold War and the growth of global governance. By taking history, literature and political theory seriously, and seeing Somalia as an exemplar of wider patterns in the contestation over governmental power and resources, the seminar generated important insights into the country's current predicament.

Events in Nairobi the week beforehand—the terrorist attack on the Westgate Mall by gunmen affiliated with al Shabaab—made the seminar uniquely timely. One of our participants was caught in the attack and narrowly escaped death; this brought home the immediacy of the issues under discussion.

Two principal inter-twined themes recurred throughout the discussions: the instrumental politics of violence and the societal, cultural and personal impacts of violence, including the denial of violence.

Other key themes that emerged during the seminar were the continuities in patterns of political violence from the late 1970s onwards, particularly its instrumental rationale for political entrepreneurship, but also the "key shift" in clan-based violence that occurred at the time of the collapse of the state; the paradox of the persistence of simplistic and primordialist clan-hate narratives, even while politicians routinely reconfigure their alliances across clan lines; the central role of resources, including both land and externally-derived rents, to power struggles; the societal repressed memory of the heinous acts committed in the past, notably during 1991 and the years immediately prior and subsequent, and the need for recognition, recounting and reconciliation; the tendency of international actors to address their own problems in Somalia, rather than Somalia's problems, and the associated fallacy that defeating al Shabaab or establishing a recognized government would represent the most important contribution to resolving the Somali crises of continuing violence, political rentierism and instability; and a narrow and uncertain roadmap for the future, charted by international actors and their Somali counterparts, which is founded on simplistic understandings of the past.

- Alex de Waal, January 2014

Contributors

Dominik Balthasar is a Transatlantic Post-doctoral Fellow for International Relations and Security (TAPIR, 2012-14), currently based at the United States Institute of Peace. Having conducted research on aspects of state fragility, conflict, and development with a particular focus on Somalia/Somaliland, Balthasar aims to shift his focus from analyzing national processes of state-making to understanding the role that diverse international actors can play in supporting projects of state-reconstruction. Prior to his post-doc, Balthasar was a teaching fellow at the London School of Economics and Political Science and held affiliations with the Crisis States Research Centre (London, UK), the Sciences Po (Paris, FR), the Graduate Institute (Geneva, CH), and the Academy for Peace and Development (Hargeysa, SO). Moreover, Balthasar has consulted with the World Bank, the United Nations, and other agencies on issues of conflict and governance in Somalia/Somaliland, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Timor-Leste, and Nepal. He studied at the universities of Freiburg (DE) and Bordeaux (FR), and holds an MSc and PhD in international development from the London School of Economics and Political Science.

Catherine Besteman is a professor of anthropology at Colby University. Her teaching and research interests focus on the roots of violent conflict and the forces that sustain inequality and produce poverty in Africa and the US. Her first major research project was in southern Somalia in the late 1980s, immediately prior to the civil war. The research she produced on Somali Bantu communities along the Jubba River Valley sought to explain why this population was so victimized during the war. Many of the surviving refugees from the villages in which she worked now live in Lewiston Maine, and Professor Besteman continues to work with them to document their experiences since the outbreak of civil war in 1991. She is completing a book project on this subject, supported by ACLS, the Guggenheim Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. She also studies post-Apartheid transformation in Cape Town, South Africa, with a particular focus on local activists working to overcome Cape Town's enduring patterns of racism and poverty. She is the author of *Unraveling Somalia: Race, Violence and the Legacy of Slavery*, *The Struggle for Land in Southern Somalia: The War Behind the War*, *Violence: A Reader*, and *Transforming Cape Town*. She also co-edited two volumes on the contemporary US with Hugh Gusterson: *Why America's Top Pundits Are Wrong: Anthropologists Talk Back* and *The Insecure American*.

Daniel Compagnon is Professor of Political Science at Sciences Po Bordeaux and Researcher at the Centre Emile Durkheim. He lived in Somalia from 1983 to 1985 and wrote his PhD on the regime of Mahamed Siyad Barre. He lived in Zimbabwe from 1994-1997 and published two books on the country's political crisis (the last one in 2011 with Penn Press). Since the mid-2000s he has specialized on international environmental policies and global governance with a focus on Southern countries, with publications also on biodiversity, climate change, NGOs and corporate actors.

Alex de Waal is Executive Director of the World Peace Foundation. Before joining the Foundation, De Waal worked as Senior Advisor to the African Union High Level Panel on Sudan. He also worked at the Social Science Research Council, where he directed a program on HIV/AIDS and Social Transformation and on a group of projects on Conflict And Humanitarian Crisis in the Southern Cone of Africa. De Waal received his doctorate in social anthropology from Oxford University in 1988.

Lidwien Kapteijns is Kendall/Hodder Professor of History at Wellesley College, Massachusetts, where she teaches African and Middle Eastern History and currently chairs the Department of History. Before turning to Somali studies in the late 1988, she lived and worked in the Sudan and published widely about pre-colonial Sudanese history (including several source publications). Having studied Somali language and literature under Dr. B.W. Andrzejewski at SOAS, she returned to Somali studies in the late 1980s. In 1999 she published “Women’s Voices in a Man’s World: Women and the Pastoral Tradition in Northern Somali Orature, c. 1899-1980” (with Maryan Omar Ali), which deals with notions of proper womanhood in Somali folklore texts and the popular songs of the nationalist era (1955-1991). In 2010, she published a co-edited volume entitled *African Mediations of Violence: Fashioning New Futures from Contested Pasts*, with a chapter on “Making Memories of Mogadishu in Somali Poetry about the Civil War.” *Clan Cleansing in Somalia: The Ruinous Turn of 1991* is her most recent book. For a number of years she served as associate editor of *Bildhaan: An International Journal of Somali Studies* and of *Halabuur, Journal of Somali Literature and Culture*, based in Djibouti.

David D. Laitin is the James T. Watkins IV and Elise V. Watkins Professor of Political Science at Stanford University. He received his B.A. from Swarthmore College and then served as a Peace Corps volunteer in Afgoi, Somalia and Grenada. He received his Ph.D. in political science from UC Berkeley. As a student of comparative politics, he has conducted field research in Somalia, Yorubaland (Nigeria), Catalonia (Spain), and Estonia, focusing on issues of language and religion, and how these cultural phenomena link nation to state. His books include *Politics, Language, and Thought: The Somali Experience*; *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change among the Yoruba*; *Somalia: A Nation in Search of a State* (with Said Samatar); *Language Repertoires and State Construction in Africa*; *Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad*; and *Nations, States and Violence*. His publications on Somalia cover language, scientific socialism, irredentism, and state breakdown, and include "Somalia: Civil War and International Intervention" published in B. Walter and J. Snyder "Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention." In collaboration with James Fearon, he has published papers on ethnicity, ethnic cooperation, the sources of civil war, and on policies that work to settle civil wars. Laitin has also collaborated with Alan Krueger on international terrorism and with Eli Berman on suicide terrorism. In 2008–2009, with support from the National Science Foundation, and with a visiting appointment at Sciences-Po Paris, Laitin conducted survey and experimental research on Muslim integration into France. He has been a recipient of fellowships from the Howard Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation, and the Russell Sage Foundation. He is an elected member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences.

Faisal Roble is a prolific, well-known, and highly respected political analyst of, and commentator on Somali politics, history and society. He has been involved with the Horn of Africa Region, particularly Somali issues for the last three decades and in many capacities, both in the Region and from the diaspora. Until last year, he was the editor-in-chief of one of the most respected and newsworthy Somali websites (www.wardheernews.com). He also serves as a contributing editor of the academic journal entitled *The Horn of Africa Journal*, and a regular participant of a yearly Roundtable: *Reflections and Ruminations on The Horn of Africa* at the African Studies Association. Faisal received his B.A. from Somali National University in 1980; MA in Afro-American Studies (Political Science) from UCLA (1984), and a second MA in Urban and Regional Development in 1986 (UCLA). Faisal's publications include: "Looking Backward and Looking Forward: The Ogaden Region in the 21 Century, 2011," "Local and Global Norms: Challenges to Somaliland's Unilateral Secession," *Horn of Africa Journal*, Volume XXV, and "The Culture of Politics: The Somali Experience." Currently, he is the Director of Research for the Institute for Horn of African Studies and Affairs (IHASA).

Clan Cleansing in Somalia: The Ruinous Turn of 1991 (2013)

Lidwien Kapteijns

History of the Project: Stage One

This project started as research into Somali popular culture about Somali civil war violence. This study led to the insight that the most ‘prestigious’ and ‘legitimate’ mediations of civil war violence, that is to say, men’s words in genres that could be legitimately performed in simultaneously shared Somali public space, largely did and could not articulate who did what to whom in the civil war. The discovery of this aporia then led me to the more conventional historical tasks of analyzing, documenting, and contextualizing the civil war violence that marked the collapse of the Barre regime and the Somali state.

Analyzing, Documenting, and Contextualizing the Campaign of Clan Cleansing: Stage Two of the Project

My book is a study of the changing use of large-scale clan-based violence against civilians *as a political instrument* between 1978 and 1992 and argues that the clan cleansing campaign of 1991-1992 represented what I call a key shift that became the immediate cause of the collapse of the state. It acknowledges the relevance of earlier Somali history and presents the increasingly violent and divisive policies of the military regime of M.S. Barre (1969-1991) as crucial causal factors (Chapter Two). It also traces the War of the Militias, triggered in response to the clan cleansing, during which clan-based violence against ordinary people became normalized practice. However, the book’s major contribution lies in the documentation and interpretation of ‘the ruinous turn of 1991’, as well as, I hope, a conceptualization not just of why it may be necessary to speak truth about this past but also how this might be done without redrawing the very battle-lines of 1991 in a war of words and competitive memory-making today.

Why 1991 as key shift?

First, 1991 marked the first time that politico-military leaders used large-scale clan-based violence against civilians as a political instrument *outside of the institutions of the state*.

Second, 1991 was the first time that politico-military leaders did not only target civilians as victims of clan-based violence but also incited and organized *civilians to become perpetrators* of such violence. I see the

moment at which leaders outside of the framework of the state tied their civilian followers to them by making them kill civilians of other clans, i.e. *the purposeful incitement to and perpetration of communal violence*, as a second aspect of 1991 as key shift. As the testimony of civilian survivors of the clan cleansing campaign clearly shows: they were hunted down intentionally because of their group identity and even by name by people who knew them well – precisely by people who knew them well. Meanwhile the top henchmen of the Barre regime whose clan backgrounds fitted the genealogical construct with which the USC associated itself were not just spared but welcomed into the political fold as heroes.

Third, 1991 marked the moment of an unexpected and abrupt reversal of the axis along which civil war violence (including the political use of large-scale clan-based violence against civilians) had occurred until now. Until this moment, the political dividing line had been between military dictatorship and opposition fronts, and large-scale violence against civilians had been meted out by the government against civilians associated because of their clan backgrounds with the armed opposition fronts. In 1991, the front that marched on Mogadishu and drove the dictator from the capital (as well as elements within the military regime itself), drew a new line – one based on clan. This meant that the opposition front that overthrew the military government in Mogadishu included and welcomed with open arms those die-hards of the regime who happened to be of their clan, while targeting for death and expulsion not only regime stalwarts but also tens of thousands of ordinary people who had themselves been the direct victims of the regime but who were now – simply because of their clan backgrounds – targeted for terror warfare and expulsion.

1991 was the first time that politico-military leaders did not only target civilians as victims of clan-based violence but also incited and organized civilians to become perpetrators of such violence

Fourth, Recent work in the fields of new genocide studies and the anthropology of violence have shown that silences, misrepresentations, and denials have been an integral part of acts and campaigns of genocide and ethnic cleansing – so much so, I argue, that they become part of the diagnostic of such violence and become of crucial importance to documenting such episodes and providing insight into their nature and contexts. In the book, I document such silences, denials, and purposeful distortions of 1991. I refer to accounts that simply skip the campaign of clan cleansing and go straight from the expulsion of Barre from the capital (January 26, 1991) to the war between USC-Caydiid and USC-Cali Mahdi (April/November 1991). Stanley Cohen, in *States of Denial: Knowing About Atrocities and Suffering*, has a name for such denials that often accompanies genocides and speaks in this context of ‘literal,’ ‘factual,’ or ‘blatant’ denial, and even of ‘the classic cover-up’ (2001: 7, 138).

Almost equally abundant are accounts that characterize what happened in 1991 as revenge killings exacted by the clans that had allegedly been victimized by the military regime from the clans that had purportedly been its supporters and beneficiaries. By uncritically accepting clan as the relevant category of analysis and the logic of revenge, these accounts imply that the victims were punished for wrongs they had actually committed. First, they sidestep any attribution of responsibility to politico-military leaders who mobilized

and organized ordinary people to commit violence in the name of clan. Second, they conceal the fact that those targeted largely consisted of civilians who had as little benefited from the brutal regime as Somalis as a whole. Thus, like the clan cleansers, they paint whole clan groups with the brush of being supporters and beneficiaries of the regime, Third, like the inciters to clan cleansing, they paint whole clans with the brush of being killers and conceal the fact that even the groups in whose name people were incited to clan cleansing included not just inciters (the warlords) and perpetrators (clan-based militias, *mooryaan*, and some ordinary people), but also bystanders and even – as my book illustrates – rescuers and saviors. According to Cohen’s typology, denials of this kind fit the category of ‘interpretive denial,’ which ‘ranges from a genuine inability to grasp what the facts mean to others, to deeply cynical renaming to avoid moral censure or legal accountability’ for oneself or others (Cohen 2001: 9). Cohen also speaks of ‘implicatory denial’ and ‘denial of the victim,’ applicable to misrepresentations that do not deny what happened but find nothing wrong with that and imply that the victims somehow deserved what was done to them (2001: 7, 8, 61). This interpretation is at times also still going strong in the Somali context. Denials have been an integral part of the histories of genocide and ethnic cleansing everywhere. I argue that their existence and persistence in the Somali case are therefore not only a powerful diagnostic of the clan cleansing of 1991-1992 but also evidence of how *unbewältigt* this past continues to be.

Why the harsh and painful term of clan cleansing?

I use the term ‘clan cleansing’ in parallel with the usage of ‘ethnic cleansing’ in international law. In the context of international law, ‘ethnic cleansing’ has been defined by the United Nations Commission of Experts on the war in former Yugoslavia, as ‘*rendering an area ethnically homogeneous by using force or intimidation to remove from a given area persons of another ethnic or religious group.*’ The Commission described the means used in ethnic cleansing as including: ‘the mass killing of civilians, sexual assault, the bombardment of cities, the destruction of mosques and churches, the confiscation of property and similar measures to eliminate or dramatically reduce Muslim and Croat populations that lie within Serb-held territories’ (Bringa 2002: 204). This definition of ethnic cleansing applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the violence of 1991, although the appropriate phrase in the Somali case would be a campaign or policy of clan (not ethnic) cleansing. A non-legal definition would emphasize that those who incite to this kind of terror warfare against civilians, in doing so, also destroy alternatives to their own power and authority. I do not assert that some victims of Somali civil war violence deserve more attention, sympathy, and so forth than others. However, when we conceptualize civil war violence, the turn to communal violence in the context outlined above deserves our attention, as does the question of whether public acknowledgement of the different kinds of civil war violence, including the so often denied and concealed clan cleansing, is crucial to peace and justice.

The question of intent

As Jacques Semelin (2003) has pointed out, it is always difficult for those who want to document past atrocities to ‘prove’ intent. Yet the intent to kill and expel – to conduct a campaign of clan cleansing – on the part of USC-Caydiid is a central part of the argument of my book. Intent becomes undeniable, I argue, because particular actions were taken and atrocities committed in a particular order and following particular patterns of organization, and because these atrocities were instigated and justified by particular discourses of incitement, namely the mythical constructions of history to which also many scholars, accepting these as facts, have contributed. I will briefly comment on aspects of the discursive elements, order of events, and patterns of clan-based, communal violence against civilians that argue for intent.

The discursive elements that argue for intent are analyzed in Chapters Three and Four and include the following: First, Caydiid’s rhetoric – especially repeated reference to the numerical insignificance of the Daarood and to the need to whip those who might survive into subject status (that of *raaciye*). Second, the broader anti-Daarood clan hate-narratives that helped incite and justify the clan cleansing (especially references to the Daarood as foreigners in the Somali territory from which they were to be cleansed (the accusation of allochthony) and to accusations of ‘one hundred years of domination’), together with the code words that evoked them and were used by USC and SNM leaders as well as ordinary people: *faqash, haraadiga Siyaad (is raaciya; ha kala reebinina), badda ku dara; siliggaan geynaynaa, ninkii dhoof ku yimid ...*, and so forth. Third, the normalization of this discourse of hatred as evident, for example, from Radio Mogadishu but also from song, poetry, and doggerel (as cited in the book).

As for the chronological order of atrocities committed, this is the backbone of the narrative of Chapter Three, which includes events that become relevant to intent when one regards them as they succeeded each other in time. I want to isolate here just one episode of the clan cleansing campaign by USC-Caydiid at the end of February 1991. This surprise night attack on the residents of Gaalkacyo occurred three days after Radio Mogadishu had reported that an SSDF assembly, with representatives from different regions, had met with one of Cali Mahdi’s ministers and decided to accept the provisional administration’s invitation to attend a National Reconciliation Conference wherever and whenever it would be called.

There were therefore no Barre supporters from which this area needed to be ‘liberated’ by General Caydiid nor had there been for over two decades. Moreover, Gaalkacyo was not on the way to Kismaayo or to Gedo, where Barre was hiding out. Caydiid’s attack on Gaalkacyo had thus nothing to do with the war against forces loyal to Barre; it was a stage in the clan cleansing of Daarood Somalis from that large sweep of Somalia General Caydiid and his associates wanted to dominate. Oral accounts of the USC attack on Gaalkacyo in February 1991 express grief and indignation about all victims of the attack (which the group called Concerned Somalis in the diaspora estimated at 500 dead, 1000 wounded and 200 hostages), but especially dwell on the rounding up of the very elders who had promoted and were most likely to promote peace and reconciliation. Thus, clan-based violence against civilians was also, *again*, used by a warlord to eliminate any alternative to war and warlord domination.

Finally, relevant to the issue of intent are the eyewitness accounts of survivors on which I draw in the book. This is a source on which perpetrators (and those who associate themselves with perpetrators) almost always focus their denial and on which scholars, for complex reasons – from the time of the Armenian genocide under the Young Turks to the expulsion of the Palestinians in 1947-1948 and beyond – try so hard *not* to depend. The philosopher Marc Nichanian speaks in this context about ‘historiographic

Clan-based violence against civilians was also, again, used by a warlord to eliminate any alternative to war and warlord domination.

perversion,’ because survivors of the Armenian genocide have been and are forced to retell the stories of their experience of genocide time and again and again because their eyewitness accounts are never sufficient to those who demand proof. I have made limited use of such survivor accounts in the book but those accounts I included were to a large extent ‘sources-in-spite-of-themselves’ – accounts I had heard before I had even conceived of the book project. It was from hindsight that I

realized that the pivotal point of these vignettes, their *raison d’être*, was the shocking moment of realization that the individual was targeted because of his or her clan identity and that USC leaders (such as a former Manifesto member and Xasan Cismaan Caato) were actually in charge of the lower-level perpetrators. One may add that these accounts prove that there was a pattern to the ways in which the clan cleansing was conducted, that USC leaders were trying to conceal it as it was happening, and that ordinary individuals of the clan on which the USC based itself were among the saviors.

In the book I outline the broad and complex context in which the clan cleansing campaign became possible such as the political and economic abuses of the Barre regime and its large-scale clan-based violence against civilians; the regime’s active undermining of state institutions; Barre’s refusal to step down and leave Mogadishu, and so forth. Moreover, without the context of war and the outbreak of armed fighting; the break-down of law and order; the histories of underlying regional, class, rural-urban, economic, political, and personal conflicts; opportunity with impunity, and so forth, the clan cleansing campaign might never have happened.

However, it *did* happen and, while elements of the campaign of clan cleansing had featured in earlier episodes of large-scale clan-based violence against civilians before it (under the military regime) and after it (during the War of the Militias), the combined features of campaign of the clan cleansing make it analytically distinct and mark it as a key shift in the use of large-scale clan-based civil war violence against civilians. These combined features include: its scale, especially its time-span, geographical scope, and numbers of people affected; its nature, that is to say the fact that it was communal violence, incited to and committed outside of the institutions of the state by perpetrators who included many civilians, often knew those they unexpectedly targeted for terror warfare and expulsion well, and intentionally sorted them out from individuals of other clan backgrounds (allowed to go free or join in in the campaign); the intent, both that explicit in the discursive triggers for the clan cleansing (the ‘mythical hate-narratives’ and the code words that stood in for them and served as rationales and justifications for the clan cleansing) and that implicit in the patterns of organization that characterized the campaign’s implementation; the incitement of Somali civilians that mobilized them at nearly the highest possible level of the clan template or

genealogical construct, that of Daroodnimo versus Iirnimmo, which leaves relatively few Somalis outside of its scope; the lack of acknowledgement of the clan cleansing campaign in shared Somali public space by the different iterations of the Somali political leadership since 1991, many of whom played a role in, stood silently by, or benefited from the clan cleansing; and the active concealment, distortion, and denial of the clan cleansing—from 1991 until today—in many journalists’ and scholarly accounts, reports by human rights organizations, political memoirs and autobiographies, and Somali website comments and editorials.

I do not argue that the divide that opened up as a result of the clan cleansing campaign of 1991-1992 – one that lined up with the opposing genealogical constructs of Daaroodnimo and Iirnimmo and Hawiyenimo – is immutable or the most relevant to all levels of conflict in Somalia. However, I argue that this divide continues to underlie current popular mindsets and political contestations about the state in Somalia because of its nature as a key shift (explained above) and immediate cause of state collapse, and the fact that it remains publicly largely unacknowledged and has been and continues to be actively denied by the majority of those who associate themselves with the perpetrators.

How to Bring the History of the Clan Cleansing Campaign into the Present: Stage Three of the Project

How might we go about thinking and talking ‘truth to Somali history’ in a context of a total lack of public acknowledgement of what happened and with the hope of making things better rather than worse? In the book I speak about the three principles I have adopted in bringing this account of the past into the present (Chapter Four). These are: (1) reject false categories of analysis and do not attribute single agency to groups/clans; (2) reject the mythical hate-narratives that provided the rationales for large-scale violence against civilians in Somalia in this era, and (3) make clanship matter and not matter at the same time.

Most of the participants in this symposium have contributed to an analysis of the many causes of the civil war. I have tried to outline those causes but the book’s major contribution may lie in its analysis of what I (after Lieberman 2006) ‘mythical clan hate-narratives.’ I would like to make the following points about this: In my work I have tried to outline a history of the changing uses of clan as a political instrument (Kapteijns 2013 and 2010b), for I do not deny or underestimate the power of clan as a political tool and template, and as a dimension of popular mindsets, networks, and group identities. However, I try to insist on the need to never take the concept of clan for granted and to always analyze its specific workings in their diachronic and synchronic contexts. Thus, while I insist that clans did not kill but that people killed in the name of clan, I also emphasize (after Mamdani 2002) that we must explain why so many people flocked to clan banners in the Somali civil war. In this context, clan-based violence against civilians itself is a powerful motivator, but the neopatrimonial state that purposefully divided and ruled through the manipulation of clan as mindset (Compagnon 1995) represented a crucial stage.

I have come to believe that much of what we think we know about Somali history is the result of purposeful and powerful political spin. What empirical historical realities do concepts such as ‘Majeerteen

dominance' in the era of the civilian administrations, 'MOD' during the Bare regime, 'one hundred years of Daarood domination' during the clan cleansing really represent if one refuses to attribute single agency to clans? I am not arguing that they are without content; just that we have not studied them.

This brings us to neopatrimonialism and the favoritism of the state (civilian and military) towards its clients. As Compagnon wrote, Barre did not rule *for* 'the' Mareexaan but *through* them (1995). We know that many Mareexaan benefited from the Barre regime but even more did not. What do we really know about clan-based favoritism? Have we not neglected studying it in any detail because we accepted the principle of collective clan punishment and clan-based political spin, which has also remained largely unexamined? And should one and, given the available sources, *can* one hope to distinguish between the historical fact and fiction on which mythical clan hate-narratives draw?

When I think about truth and justice, I would like to see a number of research projects go forward, two of which I will mention here:

1. A historical project that examines and analyzes aspects of the mythical group hate-narratives and their precursors and tries to get a handle on fact and fiction. I consider of crucial importance, as I said before, research about what political and economic patronage as an instrument of clan-based divide-and-rule under the Barre regime actually meant. But we may also need to examine the history of the armed fronts in more detail (and is that feasible given the stakes and the secrecy?). If we do not step away from

Without an acknowledgement that not all narratives are equally valid about the past, such peace-making efforts may not constitute moral repair.

accepting discursive or interpretive 'collective clan punishment' as substitute for research and documentation, then we can never speak truth to history and disown and debunk the very stories that facilitated and accelerated large-scale clan-based violence against civilians.

2. A biographical project that documents the lives and political acts of those who played central roles in recent Somali history, whether in the Barre regime, the armed fronts, the clan cleansing campaign and War of the Militias, and large-scale violence against civilians since then. I believe that this should focus on those who are guilty of human rights violations, war crimes and crimes against humanity and are still playing (or aspiring to play) a role in national and regional politics. It should also focus on those who have written about the period of Somali history in which they were major actors but concealed their own involvement, whether sincerely or criminally, temporarily or long-term.

When I think of social reconstruction and moral repair, I do not think that a centralized formal Truth Commission or other centralized forms of retributive or restorative justice are suitable for Somalia. However, a range of projects of historical documentation and commemoration are an integral part of speaking truth to history. They are, in any case, already under way, whether academically trained researchers participate in them or not.

Somalis have, of course, publicly engaged with the violence of the civil war for a long time, and this engagement has taken many forms, from poetry and fiction to academic and journalistic analysis and website commentaries. All these renderings of civil war violence are mediations of this violence; that is to say that they represent and interpret aspects of this violence as they also attempt to intervene in it and shape it; the memory-making about the past in which such mediations engage is often also an imagining of the future (Kapteijns 2010a).

My book, which draws on these mediations, as well as many other Somali and non-Somali sources, also represents a particular mediation of the violence of 1991-1992, namely one using the conventions and interpretive tools of the academic field of history. It is based on the premise that the truth about 1991 exists and can and should be recovered, and that public acknowledgement of the large-scale, clan-based violence against civilians, war crimes, and other gross violations of human rights is necessary for social reconstruction and moral repair.

However, in line with the scholarship about truth and post-conflict reconstruction, I accept what Eltringham concludes in his study about Rwanda: 'that the past is a contested place and that different interpretations of it should be explored (rather than dismissed) *because they reveal what actors hold to be current disparities*' (2004:148, my emphasis). This means that, when it comes to making peace, the narratives of all parties may have to be represented at the table. However, without an acknowledgement that not all narratives are equally valid about the past, such peace-making efforts may not constitute moral repair.

Many Somalis are stuck in the narratives of their own victimization and thus unable to engage (let alone publicly acknowledge or accept some form of responsibility for) what was done if not by them as individuals then in the name of their clan. I believe that these truths must become part of critical memory work that engages in the present the moral freight of what happened in the past. I also believe that that work can best be done by Somalis, gradually, in many different ways, forms, and spaces.

Bibliography

- Bringa, Tone. 2002. "Averted Gaze: Genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1992-1995." In *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of genocide*, ed. Alexander Laban Hinton, 194-225. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cohen, Stanley. 2001. *States of Denial: Knowing About Atrocities and Suffering*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Compagnon, Daniel. 1995. "Ressources politiques, régulation autoritaire et domination personnelle en Somalie: Le régime de Siyaad Barre (1969-1991)." Ph.D. dissertation, Political Science, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour.
- Eltringham, Nigel. 2004. *Accounting for Horror: Post-Genocide Debates in Rwanda*. London: Pluto Press.
- Kapteijns, Lidwien. 2010a. "Making Memories of Mogadishu in Somali Poetry about the Civil War." In *Mediations of Violence in Africa: Fashioning New Futures from Contested Pasts*, ed. Lidwien Kapteijns and Annemiek Richters, 25-74. Leiden: Brill.
- Kapteijns, Lidwien. 2010b. "I. M. Lewis and Somali Clanship: A Critique." *Northeast African Studies* n.s., 1, 1: 1-25.
- Lieberman, Ben. 2006. "Nationalist Narratives, Violence Between Neighbours and Ethnic Cleansing in Bosnia-Herçegovina: A Case of Cognitive Dissonance." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, 3: 295-309.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 2002. *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Nichanian, Marc. *The Historiographic Perversion*, translated by and Gil Anidjar, New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2009).
- Semelin, Jacques. 2003. "Toward a Vocabulary of Massacre and Genocide." *Journal of Genocide Research* 5, 2: 193-10.

State-Sponsored Violence and Conflict under Mahamed Siyad Barre: The Emergence of Path Dependent Patterns of Violence

Daniel Compagnon

Before looking in more detail at the patterns of state-sponsored violence during the period in which Siyad Barre held power (October 1969 to January 1991), I would like to make some general comments about political violence and other useful concepts in the Somali context.

Some Preliminary Notes on Violence, Clan and Politics in Somalia

1. Although this seminar is concerned with political violence, we need to bear in mind that nothing political takes place in a social vacuum and that violence with ostensible political goals is embedded in a broader violent context that comes to symbolize an epoch.

As a matter of fact, the collapse of what remained of political institutions in January 1991 resulted in all kinds of violence developing alongside proper political conflict including criminal violence, sexual violence (in particular against women), personal revenge and pathological behaviors of all sorts. Therefore, not all violence was politically motivated, but it was sometimes difficult to decipher whether an incident (for example car hijacking or kidnapping of foreign workers) was political or not. The political context itself stimulated criminal activities.

Yet, given the clan structure of the Somali society, then the last effective ideological and practical frame of reference that remained for most people once the state and all modern institutions had collapsed, it was difficult to see any such violence as “private”—i.e. disconnected from clan-based factional politics. The picture was so blurred that the violence of clan conflicts has been overemphasized—thus pointing at the “exceptionality” of the Somali case.

2. We need to distance ourselves from the emotional reactions to Somalia’s civil war that prevailed in the international press and many NGO reports in the 1990s. We must put violence in a comparative perspective, both historically and culturally. There had been instances of cruel clan warfare in the past, before and during colonial time (let’s recall Sayid Mahamed Abdulle Hassan’s use of mass violence against clan segments collaborating with colonial power or perceived as hostile),^[1] as much as there were institutions such as councils of elders and diya payments to settle scores. It was increasingly popular in the 1990s to idealize in retrospect Somali society prior 1969 seen as inherently pacific, despite significant evidence to the contrary in colonial administrative reports, travelers’ accounts and anthropological works.

It is also too convenient to forget the amount of violence used by colonial powers to “pacify” different areas of the Horn, in particular by the Italians during the fascist regime. Mahamed Siyad Barre was socialized during that era, in the Italian colonial police, and he probably took part in the invasion of Ethiopia in which 40,000 Somalis troopers were involved. He knew very well what could be gained from the unrestrained use of violence by the state. The Soviet patronage the Somali enjoyed in the 1970s did nothing to modify his views.

A political entrepreneur using violence to establish his domination should be able to alter the balance of power in a meaningful and durable way, something no clan-based faction or coalition of factions was ever able to achieve in southern Somalia after January 1991

When we look at the extent of mass atrocities and ethnic cleansing that took place in Europe, in the wake of World War II,[2] or more recently in former Yugoslavia, let alone in the current Syrian crisis, the Somalis’ political violence does not look so extreme. What is more unusual is the length of the crisis in southern Somalia.

3. Although there is some causal link between state collapse and the level of violence that engulfed the country after the fall of Villa Somalia and the flight of Siyad Barre, we should not oversimplify the correlation between these two variables. Curbing political violence was certainly an important precondition for restoring a form of government in autonomous Somaliland. However, violence sometimes leads to the establishment of stable forms of state power (see the success of EPRDF that seized power also in 1991 in Ethiopia). A political entrepreneur using violence to establish his domination should be able to alter the balance of power in a meaningful and durable way, something no clan-based faction or coalition of factions was ever able to achieve in southern Somalia after January 1991. Foreign intervention interfered with this process in a counterproductive way, without providing effective alternatives. Addressing the issue of violence separately, without taking into account the political process, might bias our understanding of the situation and shift the debate towards moral issues.

4. In understanding the roots of political violence, and the vicious circle of its repetition, we should avoid naturalizing Somalis’ identity (today as war addicts), as it was done in the past when they were once portrayed as “pastoral democrats”, “fierce nationalists”, “moderate Muslims” and so on. Well-wishing observers, including foreign academics, projected their own prejudices and expectations on the Somali complex social system,[3] and these constructs were deeply misleading. The ability of Somali politicians to rise above clan politics in the 1960s and 1970s was overestimated (except by IM Lewis who, however, contradicted himself by supporting the idea of a Somali nation united by language and custom—a political project rather than a fact to this date).[4] The Somalis’ problematic relationship to the imported nation-state framework forced upon them by Western colonization was never properly weighed, although it is a trivial enough observation for many segmentary societies in social anthropology.



These constructs still inform the dominant discourse about the restoration of a “national government” in Somalia, and form the background of the doomed (and largely bloody) attempts at political engineering that pervaded the past two decades. Understanding “patterns of violence” in contemporary Somalia requires departing from teleological perspectives about state building as a prerequisite for peace.

5. Siyad Barre’s regime could not be characterized as the domination of one clan—or even the so-called MOD[5] alliance—over the rest of the society. Had it been the case, it would have disintegrated far sooner because clan alliances are usually instable. As I argued at length in my PhD thesis, it was a personal rule relying on an extended client system of patrimonial servants cemented by fear, greed and marriage. Indeed, the security apparatus became increasingly controlled by officers from these three clans, and at the end of the period, Siyad Barre’s hold of power depended on a few well-armed units commanded by Marehan officers—mainly from his Rer Koshin Dini. However, both the military and civilian state elite included individuals from most clan segments, and many Hawiye, Dir, Majerten and Isaq businessmen got very rich under Siyad Barre. These people did not “represent” their clan in government as the elected politicians did to a certain extent in the 1960s. They were used nevertheless by Siyad to isolate those targeted by state repression at a given time, and provided a channel to send messages and gifts to the clan elders. Whatever the political reality, what counted eventually was the popular misperception. It explains why USC Hawiye militias hunted down all Darod people during the fighting of January 1991,[6] prompting the latter in the South to rally behind the former dictator. Indeed, Siyad Barre did not invent the mobilization of clan affiliations in political conflict. It was already a prominent feature of Somali politics before 1969. However, the extreme politicization of clan segmentation by his regime has transformed the nature of clan warfare in Somalia, adding on the top of the existing layer of past feuding cycles—then mitigated by truces and intermarriage—a much deeper antagonism and an appetite for revenge for the crimes committed during 21 years. This is one of Siyad Barre’s lasting legacies: his politics instilled distrust and hatred even among longtime friends and family members.

Patterns of State Violence under Siyad Barre

In spite of the fairy tales about the “progressive” era of the 1970s, violence or the threat to use it was consubstantial to the regime, although it was less visible from 1969 (“the bloodless revolution”) to 1978. It is difficult to evaluate the extent of genuine support the regime then enjoyed, when a full dictatorship solidified as early as 1971 with the backing the Soviet Union, a powerful patron with its ubiquitous advisers in the state bureaucracy and the parastatals. A major exception to the lack of visible opposition was the protest movement in the mosques against the 1974 law on women’s status and the family perceived as undermining the Islamic law (e.g. banning polygamy and giving equal rights to women in inheritance). The spontaneous movement was suppressed heavy-handedly: many imams and sheikhs were detained and tortured, and ten alleged leaders were publicly executed in January 1975. In June 1975 a major purge of the civil service and the army—the second since 1969—targeted people who had disagreed publicly (or were suspected of having done so) with these murders.

Throughout the 1970s state violence took the form of harassment and arbitrary detention of thousands of people—far beyond the circle of rivals and true opponents—by the fast growing surveillance apparatus making good use of its training in the Soviet block countries. Prominent were the ubiquitous political police (the NSS) backed by the extra-judiciary National Security Court, the military police (HANGASH) created in 1978, which provided the presidential guard and played an increasing role in the civil war of the late 1980s, and the Youth militia called Gulwadayal. Uniformed police and army units could also be involved. Various observers, including academics, largely underestimated the extent of this police state at the time. It generated an atmosphere of fear and distress, and legitimized the opposition’s later use of violence.

Unlike the 1964 border war, the full-fledged invasion of Ethiopia in 1977 that led to a resounding defeat for the Somali army had a significant impact on society. The core of the regime’s legitimization was the nationalist discourse on Greater Somalia, and many perceived the Soviet alliance as a temporary nuisance necessary to achieve this objective. The shattered dream—for a foreseeable future—and the loss of Soviet patronage eroded Siyad Barre’s legitimacy. Moreover, he was widely held responsible for both political and strategic mistakes that left Somalia weakened and humiliated, saved from a shameful Ethiopian occupation by a last minute deal between Washington and Moscow. The widespread unrest in the army led to the April 9, 1978 coup attempt. Although its leader, Abdullahi Yusuf Ahmed was Umar Mahamud, the core group came from various clans including Hawiye and Isaq. However the state repression focused on the Majerten,[7] because from the onset, Siyad Barre had been wary of this clan’s potential threat. He had antagonized the Majerten while working for the Italians in the 1950s, when many radical nationalists came from that clan. The SYL candidate to succeed President Shermarke, assassinated on October 15, 1969, Haji Muse Boqor, belonged to the same sub-clan and many Majerten felt that the top job was stolen from them. Although the original military junta included two Majerten members, Siyad made sure to leave out of the SRC the most prominent colonels belonging to that clan.

Hasty recruitment of MOD and increasingly Marehan lineages into the army transformed this formerly professional corps into an aggregate of clan militias by the late 1980s, which were proficient in harassing and killing civilians only.

When Abdullahi Yusuf created the SSF in February 1979 and then the SSDF in October 1981, and launched a guerrilla force from the Ethiopian side of the border, Siyad’s security forces assaulted the Umar Mahamud living in Mudug and Nugal regions, killing people, raping women, destroying settlements, slaughtering livestock and poisoning the wells. This was the first “war against his people” launched by Siyad Barre, years before the near annihilation of the Isaq in the North, and the first time in modern Somali history when the state intervened in the bush not to quell inter-clan warfare but to fuel it. Like a self-fulfilling prophecy, targeting the Majerten seemed to give credit to the government propaganda of a coup motivated by “tribalism”, which helped dividing the growing opposition.[8] Violence against civilians was meant also to dissuade the Majerten from crossing the border in mass to join the SSDF guerilla.

Isaq officers were active in the new regime in the 1970s, and played a significant role in the Ogaden war. Isaq businessmen who had invested in Mogadishu in the late 1960s were prominent in the import/export trade. However, Siyad Barre treated the clan family as an enemy as soon as the SNM was created in April 1981 and vowed to overthrow the regime. At about the same time, some civilians, who had organized a true self-help movement in Hargeysa (the Uffo group) to protest against the state neglect of the North, were arrested. Their trial in February 1982—with confessions extracted by torture—generated popular unrest especially among the youth, with dozens killed and hundreds detained and severely beaten. The students kept organizing demonstrations in the towns in 1983 and 1984 with a more political agenda leading to more repression. Then some Isaq elders sponsored the army deserters who founded the SNM guerilla force in Ethiopia.

However, it is the disproportionate collective punishment carried out by the regime that generated the support for the liberation front: after every guerilla attack the NSS and the army retaliated with arbitrary killings, arrests and tortures, behaving as a foreign force occupying the country. Harassment including rape, beatings, racketing, and the looting of Isaq properties became the norm. When, Siyad Barre's peace agreement with Ethiopia in April 1988 forced the SNM guerrillas to cross the border into Somaliland for a desperate offensive in May, the government forces once again overreacted to break the popular uprising by bombing Hargeisa and Burao, indiscriminately killing civilians (15 to 20,000), including columns of displaced people fleeing the combat zone. Although the outgunned SNM had to evacuate Hargeysa and Burao in mid-August 1988, the civilians had fled the ghost towns and the regime never regained full control of the North.

In the early 1980s Siyad ordered the arming of some Dulbahante sub-clans and Ogadeni refugees in the northern camps [9] to fight the Habar Yunis and Idagalle, and then a Gadabursi militia to fight the Habar Awal. When the SSDF fizzled out in 1985 and Abdullahi Yusuf was detained in Ethiopia (until 1991), defectors from this front and other Majerten were drafted into the army to fight the SNM, especially after general Mahamed Said Hirsi "Morgan" was appointed head of the military region that encompassed the Isaq territory in Somaliland. Such policy of arming clan militias was extended to the southern part of the country when the Ogadeni SPM in Jubaland and the Hawiye USC in Hiran opened new guerilla battle lines.[10] Unpaid soldiers operating in the North survived through looting and ransoming the local people, sometimes selling their weapons to their opponents in the liberation fronts. In this context of anarchy, they were mass desertions of Isaq, Hawiye and Ogadeni soldiers from mid-1988 onward to join their respective guerilla organizations. The regime retaliated with massacres of civilians from the same lineages. The disintegration of the army largely explains why the SNM was able to take control of the North in late 1990 and early 1991, and why the USC guerilla force managed to fight its way to Mogadishu so fast from June 1990 to January 1991. This disintegration is a by-product of Siyad Barre's use of unrestrained, clan-targeting violence.

Hasty recruitment of MOD and increasingly Marehan lineages into the army transformed this formerly professional corps—still able by 1982 to contain the joint SSDF and Ethiopian invasion—into an aggregate of clan militias by the late 1980s, which were proficient in harassing and killing civilians only. Their lack of

professionalism and discipline, and prevailing clan loyalties led to an increasing amount of war crimes and criminal behaviors. For example, the presidential guard recruiting young Marehan from the bush became reckless and committed atrocities and murders in Mogadishu—such as the assassination of the Catholic archbishop in July 1989—with total impunity. Civil protest in Mogadishu, such as the Islamic-led demonstrations in mid-July 1989, was handled brutally with heavy fire at the demonstrators (several hundred casualties in one day), mass detention and torture. The more threatened the regime felt the harsher the forms of repression. However, the growing abuses by the presidential guard precipitated the Hawiye uprising in the capital city in December 1990.

We should not underestimate the impact on the moral fabric of the society of the dissemination of weapons, the inter-clan fighting and the repeated, often sadistic atrocities that characterized the later years of Siyad's regime. The perpetrators of violence were never held responsible of their deeds. It became legitimate to kill for a political purpose or to avenge your kin. Banditry developed in both urban and rural areas before the fall of Siyad. Human life had little value. Young adults who grew under Siyad's rule equated state power with treachery and violence. Indeed, the atrocities perpetrated by the clan militias in the 1990s mimicked the recurrent behavior of the security apparatus since the late 1970s. The collapse of the schooling system, the ruined economy and the empty state coffers led many young men to use their weapons acquired for self-protection to obtain what they needed—announcing the morians of the 1990s[11]. Looting became the most common form of salary for combatants.

Because Siyad refused to leave power when given the option or to make sincere concessions—to the Manifesto group for example—until he was forced to flee by the USC uprising, and because he destroyed the state as well as the economy through his strategy of political survival, the subsequent two decades of anarchy are as much a product of Siyad's regime as the consequence of the liberation front's irresponsible behavior. Unlike in Ethiopia, where the EPRDF was able to use the predominantly Amharic state apparatus to tighten its grip, there were no government institutions left in Somalia over which the victors could take control.

To promote an era of peace and reconciliation in Somalia, facilitate a negotiated political settlement based on justice, and to end the culture of impunity, it is important to acknowledge this history and its enduring legacy.

Notes

[1] The ‘Mad Mullah’ was defeated in 1920 only, when the colonial air force bombed his fortified stronghold. The jihad and British counterinsurgency operations caused an estimated 200,000 casualties.

[2] See Keith Lowe’s recent synthesis, *Savage Continent: Europe in the Aftermath of World War II*, Penguin Books 2013 (Viking 2012).

[3] That some brilliant, Western-educated Somali intellectuals were the strongest supporters of such myths did nothing to dispel the fantasy until well into the 1990s. Many of these intellectuals later became unashamed clan chauvinists.

[4] Even the linguistic and cultural divide between pastoral nomads from the four, Samale clan families, and semi-sedentary Sab agriculturists living in the South, let alone the peasant communities of Bantu origin, was deliberately downplayed.

[5] For Marehan, Ogaden, Dulbahante, three clans of the Darod clan family.

[6] Ali Mahdi and other Hawiye “moderates” did nothing to prevent the assassination of Darod members of the Manifesto group by Hawiye militias. The disintegration of the Manifesto along clan affiliations and USC-Aydid’s attack on the SPM triggered the subsequent clan-based factionalism.

[7] Among the hundreds of military arrested, 17 officers predominantly Majerten were selected to be executed in July 1978.

[8] A decade later many Hawiye still used it to justify their inaction and rejection of the SSDF.

[9] Siyad’s regime’s abuse of the HCR resources and the drafting of refugees into pro-government militias was documented at the time by various reports but it remains under-researched. The SNM attacked the Ogaden refugees when taking control of Somaliland, both those remaining in the camps and those “resettled” in the towns.

[10] During its advance towards Mogadiscio, the USC attacked the refugee camps around Beled Weyne and Jalalaqsi, from which a pro-government militia assaulted their columns.

[11] See Roland Marchal’s work on the *moryans* of Mogadishu.

Somalia: The Logic of a Rentier Political Marketplace?

Alex de Waal

Introduction

In this posting, I sketch an approach for understanding Somalia, based on the framework of the “rentier political marketplace,” which is a political-economic analysis structured around the dynamics of bargaining over rental resources by intermediate elites, both inside and outside the state. I outline how this may also help in understanding patterns of violence over the last thirty years.

My main argument is that the Somali state, along with a number of other countries in Africa and the greater Middle East, underwent a profound structural transformation in the 1980s, and that we have been living with the under-recognized consequences ever since. At the time, this change had two particularly striking features. One was economic crisis, which meant that—in the words of Bob Bates—meant that “things fell apart.” The levels of finance available to governments meant that they simply could not sustain the basic functions of government, let alone build institutional states. The second was the beginning of the end of the Cold War, which meant that—as David Laitin observed—that the coup maker could not count on automatic security backing from one or other superpower. Common to both of these changes was a sharp reduction in the discretionary budgets that rulers used to pay their armies and security services and to pay off intermediate elites. I suggest that this (unmeasured) collapse in the “political budget” (the term is Sudanese political vernacular) was the cause of state crisis in many African countries, of which Somalia was an extreme and illuminating case.

The cashflow to the political budget is the heartbeat of a rentier patronage state. It is this top-down flow of resources, managed by the ruler in accordance with a political-business plan, that determines regime survival or otherwise. Moreover, under a patronage-based regime, the army is not a rule-bound institution loyal only to the state, but rather a patrimonial hierarchy in which orders are not dutifully enforced, but are negotiated. In the 1980s, Somalia was a security rentier state, and because guns were more plentiful than cash, Mohamed Siyad Barre’s business plan leaned more to using violence than financial incentives.

The classic Tillyean model for European statebuilding consists of a ruler, who controls (most of) the means of violence bargaining with agrarian and commercial elites who control (most of) the resources. In Africa’s rentier systems—a characteristic accentuated as the continent began its economic recovery, initially imperceptibly, in the 1990s and 2000s—the ruler commands most of the resources. Also, as provincial elites (tribal leaders, militia and rebel commanders) often control extensive armaments, and as national

armies and security services are themselves fragmented with a high degree of command and financial autonomy at lower levels, the ruler does not possess anything close to a monopoly of control over the means of violence. This stands the Tillyean model on its head. Rather than the state as a protection racket, negotiating the terms of taxation, governance became an extortion racket, with armed intermediate elites bargaining for a share of the rents, and commonly using violence as a tool of bargaining.

The “Rentier Political Marketplace”

The rentier political marketplace is an organizing principle to describe and explain how political power functions in these orders. This is specified by four main characteristics.

First, the ruler enjoys and disposes sufficient income from rents that he is the principal economic actor. Some rents derive from facto control of resources and territory, but most accrue to him by virtue of sovereignty. The main forms of rent are from minerals, aid, security cooperation with foreign powers, sovereign privileges, and criminal activities. All the forms of rent mentioned escape, at least partially, formal regulation: they all have discretionary political budgets. Aid is the most regulated, security much less so, and criminal rents of course escape any regulation.

Second, the ruler does not have a monopoly over the machinery of war-making or coercion within the national territory. He has to bargain with rebels, with armed formations in society, and with his own army commanders and security chiefs. As a political tool, violence is cheap and therefore attractive. But in a situation without guaranteed loyalty, violence is also dangerous.

Rather than the state as a protection racket, negotiating the terms of taxation, governance became an extortion racket

Third, the country is integrated into the global financial, institutional and technological order, on generally subordinate terms, but is in a position to exploit sufficient niches in that global order to establish a viable political order. The states in question are on the margins of Europe, the Gulf and Asia, and are in some respects an outer periphery of these regions.

Lastly, this system is characterized by ongoing political bargaining over allegiances at both national and international levels. Earlier international political orders were determined by imperial orders and the Cold War, and were relatively slow-moving. In the current system, complexity, mobility and facility of communication mean that subordinate actors have the opportunity for negotiating the terms on which they engage with patrons and paymasters. While earlier inter-state systems were anarchic in the limited sense that major sovereign nation-states were ready and willing to violate supposed norms of international conduct when it suited them, the current system has a profusion of regulation but also a shadow order of unregulated bargaining within an internationalized patronage system.

The results of this bargaining are fluid and generate perpetual instability. I call this “turbulence,” in the sense (borrowed from fluid dynamics) that it is a system that changes in an unpredictable manner over short periods of time, but which remains structurally constant over long periods. Thus, the politics of these countries changes from week to week (recurrently encouraging the diplomatic ingénue) but look much the same a decade on.

Somalia in the Late 1980s and Early 1990s

During the late 1980s and early 1990s, I suggest that Somalia represented an interesting variant of this model. The element of particular relevance was the expectation among the political elites that some form of security rentier state was the norm and would be re-established in due course.

The main challenges to Mohamed Siyad Barre arose either from within the army, or from former army officers wanting to replace him as dictator. This began with the SSDF, and continued with the SNM (whose very name is revealing, mirroring so closely the SNA), the USC-Aidid and the SPM. Especially in the aftermath of the 1988 war in the north-west, both the army and the opposition came to resemble clans in arms. The militarization of politics and the growth of clan-based organization went hand in hand. The driving factor in this was, I suggest, the organizational and financial difficulties faced by those trying to fight the war, on both sides. Not only was clan-based mobilization, alongside the often-linked strategy of divide-and-rule, an easier route than the arduous tasks of sustaining a professional national army or a building politicized and disciplined people’s army, but once one faction had taken the clan route, those who did not follow would have been at immediate military disadvantage.

Although the military dynamics were more pronounced, the financial stratagems of the Siyad regime demand scrutiny. As the challenges multiplied, the rulers looted the state, both for personal enrichment anticipating future exile, and also to pay for a patronage-based war machine. The cheapest way to pay a militia is in kind, giving its leaders and foot-soldiers a license to loot.

I further suggest—and here I have a different emphasis to Lidwien Kapteijns—that these same organizational imperatives were the driving factor in General Aidid’s use of clan, pillage and violence against civilians in his dash for power in January 1991. Aidid was, I believe, a putchist and he was thwarted when the Saleban militia, allied to Ali Mahdi, seized control of Radio Mogadishu before his forces got there. He was ruthless in using clan identities as an instrument for building a power base and trying to destroy the power base of others, in doing so fuelling a Darood-Hawiye divide that had disastrous repercussions for ordinary residents of Mogadishu and beyond. He licensed his fighters to loot, pillage, rape and kill, with particularly damaging consequences in the context of mobilizing clan identities and demonizing the Darood. The key incidents in 1991-92 that led to the worst fighting in the city were all associated with the two rival USC leaders’ respective attempts to claim key symbols of sovereignty and the associated powers. Clan-based mobilization reached new heights.

However, in a political marketplace system, as was emerging in Somalia at that time, the instrumental calculations of political entrepreneurs trump any ideological or ethnic allegiances. Thus, despite the horrific episodes “clan cleansing” of the years 1988-92, reaching depths in 1991, coalitions were regularly reshuffled during and after these years. After Aidid’s failure to take power in January 1991, and his subsequent failure to dislodge Ali Mahdi in November that year, the focus of political contestation shifted from state power to control over ports, airports and riverine farmland, and political alignments were reconfigured in accordance with circumstance. Many clan militia leaders switched sides, some of them several times. The U.S. Operation Restore Hope and the subsequent UNOSOM II recentralized politics, briefly reviving the dream of a centralized state with generous international support.

Somalia since the mid-1990s

After the collapse of the U.S.-U.N. intervention in 1993-94, even without a state, the concept of a state and the mechanisms for state-based rent still cast a deep shadow over Somali politics. The same rents that have sustained other “political marketplace” states such as Chad, Sudan and Yemen, are also present in Somalia—rents for security cooperation with the U.S. and neighboring states, criminal rents, aid rents and some (reduced) sovereign rents, in this case mostly associated with participation in international negotiations.

The legitimacy of the government with its international sponsors is little more than its readiness to comply with foreign demands in these areas: it is a latter day form of indirect rule

What explains Somaliland? I suggest that its economics dictated cooperation more than competition among both the business and political elite. The key elements included the much smaller anticipated state rents and the structure of the livestock export trade, which was the main source of finance for the regime at its critical moment of establishment in 1993, and the speed and comprehensiveness with which the SNM had fragmented over the previous two years. This made for an unusually benign elite bargain in 1993. However, what has resulted is not a traditional polity or a democracy, but rather a well-regulated political

marketplace that allows for the production of limited public goods. Somaliland is prone to the same pressures as its neighbors, and is just as likely to succumb to the logic of rentierism and armed bargaining over the price of loyalty, as it is to develop a mature institutionalized democracy.

In southern Somalia, I suggest, the major change over the last twenty years has been the gradual intensification of Somalia’s integration into African and global economic, political and security orders. Somalia’s patronage networks are now thoroughly regionalized and globalized.

In the mid-2000s the Mogadishu merchants recognized the necessity of collaboration across factional lines. This was facilitated by the growth in the commercial sector, though important issues of urban and rural land ownership remained unresolved from fifteen years earlier. Another factor was the apparently-final collapse of the rentier-security order associated with the factional leaders of the Alliance for

Restoration of Peace and Counter-Terrorism, aligned with Kenya, Ethiopia and the U.S., who had so outraged ordinary citizens that it was not difficult to mobilize public opinion against them. In contrast to the Taliban in Afghanistan, with whom they were sometimes compared, the UIC's economic base was an international trading and financial system. However, rather than utilizing Somalia's societal and economic globalization as a starting point for engagement, the regional and international response was driven by security concerns—Ethiopia's paranoia over the presence of Eritrean elements and the U.S.'s militarized counter-terrorism strategy.

The African-international coalition against al Shabaab and its dependent Federal Government has led to a rentier marketplace regime in Somalia. Governance in Somalia is now thoroughly internationalized. Security is provided by troops from African nations backed by the U.S. The state is mostly funded by European and Middle Eastern donors. Services are provided by international NGOs. The legitimacy of the government with its international sponsors is little more than its readiness to comply with foreign demands in these areas: it is a latter day form of indirect rule. Among some Somalis, similarly, state legitimacy is bound up with its role in facilitating international service provision. But the patrons do not hold all the cards: Somali leaders can dupe them, obstruct them and prevaricate, or play them off against one other. The idea that a state suspended in this way, perpetually bargaining at all levels, will create public goods including institutions, development and the rule of law, is fanciful. But if such a governance regime is indeed the future for Somalia, we should study in carefully so as to understand how it can, at least, do the minimum of harm to the prospects for Somalis.

The Wars in the North and the Creation of Somaliland

Dominik Balthasar

Having enjoyed relative peace and stability since it unilaterally declared independence in 1991, Somaliland's state-making project has been accorded the status of 'Africa's best kept secret' (Jhazbhay, 2003). Past attempts to disclose its mystery referenced processes of 'traditional reconciliation' (Bryden, 1995; Jhazbhay, 2007; Walls, 2009), 'grassroots democracy' (Adam, 1995; Othieno, 2008; Forti, 2011), the combination of 'traditional' and 'modern' forms of governance into 'hybrid political orders' (Böge et al., 2008; Renders & Terlinden, 2010), and its overall peaceful nature (Othieno, 2008). These narratives of Somaliland's state-making have not only led to the assertion that the polity's state development was unique (Hoyle, 2000; Kaplan, 2008; Jhazbhay, 2009), but culminated in the erroneous contention that throughout its process of state-making "[n]o civil war occurred" (Sufi, 2003:285).

Yet, Somaliland's trajectory was not as benign as has frequently been claimed. Not only did its state-making project witness serious traits of authoritarian governance, but it was also marked by episodes of large-scale violence – both prior and subsequent to its unilateral declaration of independence in 1991. While it has been recognized that the struggle of the Somali National Movement (SNM) against dictator Mohamed Siyad Barre during the 1980s was foundational for Somaliland (Huliaras, 2002; Spears, 2003; Bakonyi, 2009), there is reason to argue that also the 'war projects' undertaken by Somaliland President Mohamed Haji Ibrahim Egal in the early to mid-1990s were constitutive of the polity's state-making endeavor.

Besides challenging the prevailing reading of Somaliland's state-making history and accounting for some of its bellicose elements, the argument presented in the subsequent paragraphs also speaks to the wider theoretical debate on war and state-making (see e.g. Mann, 1988; Tilly, 1992; Kaldor, 1999; Leander, 2004). While Tilly's dictum that "war makes states and states make war" (Tilly, 1992:67) needs to be further disaggregated, I propose that the violence in Somalia's north and the creation of Somaliland allow to argue that war may remain an important component for state-making in contemporary Africa (Herbst, 1990, 2000; Deflem, 1999; Niemann, 2007).

The Somali Civil War and Its State-Making Repercussions: Mass Violence in the 1980s

Scholars such as Prunier (1990/91), Compagnon (1990, 1998), Marchal (1992, 1997), Bakonyi (2009), and Spears (2010) have significantly contributed to our understanding of the early organization of violence and

the dynamics of war in Somalia and Somaliland. However, the connection between the decade-long civil war of the 1980s and Somaliland's state-making endeavor remains under researched to date, not least because most accounts of the polity's state-making project commence their analysis with the polity's *de facto* secession in 1991 at the very earliest.^[2] Yet, glossing over the bellicose decade preceding Somaliland's formal creation is not only problematic empirically, but also conceptually, as it silently subjects to the neo-liberal proposition that war constituted nothing but 'development in reverse' (World Bank, 2003; Collier, 2004).

After Somalia had lost to Ethiopia in the Ogadeen War of 1977/78, armed resistance against Barre's rule took root. Officially pronounced in London on April 6th, 1981, the SNM was one of the first rebel groups to form, finding its base amongst the Isaaq clan family. Seeking alliances with other clan militias, the movement waged a guerrilla struggle in the country's north-west, aiming to overthrow and replace the military government. In the wake of the dictator's defeat and particular developments unfolding in 1991, the SNM decided to abrogate the union of 1960 and declared the Republic of Somaliland an independent state.

The decade-long armed struggle contributed in several ways to the argument that Somaliland is "very much a product of war" (Spears, 2004:185). For one, the war constituted the birth certificate of Somaliland, as without the military defeat of Barre, it would have been highly unlikely that the polity of Somaliland would have been established in the first place. Thus, Bradbury (2008:5) argues that this self-styled state has "its origins in the war that led to the collapse of the Somali state." Although true, the role of war in supporting the formation of Somaliland goes beyond this passive and destructive component, as, for another, the war actively aided Somaliland's state-making project.

First, while the SNM was far from exercising a *monopoly* over the means of violence, it achieved "outstanding military success" (Adam, 1994:36; Compagnon, 1998) and emerged from war as the "most powerful military force in the north-west" (Bradbury, 2008:79), enabling the movement to make a "legitimate claim to exercise power" (Compagnon, 1998:82). In contrast to south-central Somalia, the SNM's military supremacy in north-west Somalia prevented alternative armed movements from pursuing "any viable alternative" (Terlinden & Ibrahim, 2008:2f.) to engaging in peace talks. It is in this context of military supremacy at the part of the SNM that processes of 'traditional reconciliation', generally judged as having been successful, need to be understood.

Second, the war also left important political and institutional legacies. The *guurti*, or 'council of elders', which has frequently been identified to lie at the heart of Somaliland's alleged state-making success (Renders, 2006; Höhne 2006; Glavitz, 2008; Moe, 2009; Richards, 2009), is, after all, a creation of the SNM and a direct outcome of the war (Interviews 4, 34, 36, 75, 103). It was created by the young officers who

The guurti, or 'council of elders', which has frequently been identified to lie at the heart of Somaliland's alleged state-making success, is, after all, a creation of the SNM and a direct outcome of the war

had deserted the Somali National Army for the SNM and who had little knowledge about how the clan system worked (Interviews 103, 113, 135) in order to instrumentalize the ‘traditional authorities’ to help mobilize resources and adjudicate disputes (Adam, 1995; Interviews 4, 36; Compagnon, 1993; Brons, 2001). Although having been a much more unintended and problematic product of the civil war (Interview 113) than attested by some (see Bradbury, 2008:69), it had a major impact on Somaliland’s state-making project (Interview 4).

Third, the war aided the formation of the Somaliland polity by contributing to the development of a nascent national identity, which is indispensable for state-making to succeed (Lemay-Hébert, 2009; Balthasar, 2012; see also North, 2005). Committing itself to sharia law and deciding to rename its fighters *mujahedeen* (‘holy warriors’; Bradbury, 2008:64), the SNM set itself apart from other armed movements and nurtured a particular identity. By furthermore suffering mass atrocities and reviving the narratives of colonial and cultural differences between north and south Somalia, the struggle “played a crucial role in the formation of a strong sense of identity – at least for the majority of its population” (Huliaras, 2002:174). Thus, the “[w]ar shaped the ‘imagined community’ that later proved essential in providing a government apparatus with the moral basis needed to ensure the willing participation [...] of its citizens” (ibid.:159; Omaar, 1994:234).

‘War Projects’ as Tools of State-Making: Somaliland’s Large-Scale Violence in the 1990s

Mass violence continued to shape Somaliland’s state-making endeavor once it had officially broken away from Somalia on May 18, 1991. In fact, the early to mid-1990s were marked by such levels of violence and insecurity that interim President Abdirahman Ahmed Ali Tuur and United Nations special envoy to Somalia, Mohammed Sahnoun, agreed to have 350 peacekeepers deployed to Somalia’s north-west (Renders, 2006). While the troops were, ultimately, not dispatched as Sahnoun resigned from his post and Somaliland managed to broker a peace by itself, it shows that the young republic had hit rock bottom in 1992 and came close to all-out civil war in subsequent years.

Once the interim government under the leadership of President Abdirahman Ahmed Ali Tuur was installed, contestation about the allocation of political, military and economic resources started taking root. The ensuing civil strife largely pitted the SNM’s ‘civilian’ and ‘military’ wings, which had emerged during the decade-long liberation struggle, against one another. Whereas the former was mainly comprised of intellectuals who had proclaimed the formation of the SNM in London and Jeddah in 1981, the latter largely encompassed militaries who had started the armed resistance on the ground (Interview 113). While enjoying the backing of the ‘civilian wing’, Tuur was eyed with suspicion by the more hardline military elements, referred to as *Calan Cas*, who were in charge of the most potent SNM militias.

In the absence of a binding, centralized command over the different SNM militias, security regulation was a hard nut to crack and the government’s authority was largely confined to Hargeysa, (Gilkes, 1993; Spears, 2010) resting on those armed units under command of some of the individuals belonging to the new

government (Reno, 2003). Tuur's attempts to establish state-owned security forces provoked tensions within and outside of his administration, and resulted in violent clashes in Burco in January 1992, which left 300 dead. In March 1992, this was followed by large-scale violence in Berbera, when the government attempted to secure the port and its revenues, which had come under the control of the Isaaq sub-clan of *lisa Muse* that opposed the Garhajis-dominated Tuur government, militarily. The subsequent eight months of "extensive death and destruction" (Renders, 2006:207) resulted in presumably 1,000 individuals losing their life (Bradbury, 2008).

Throughout 1992, security continued to deteriorate (Flint, 1994), as every clan established its own militia, turning Hargeysa allegedly more insecure than Mogadishu (Interview 63, 76, 108). With the government far from dominating the means of violence, competing (sub-)clan militias started clashing over control of resources throughout the country (Renders & Terlinden, 2010). During this interim period between 1991 and 1993, governance issues were largely left in the hands of other actors, such as the *Calan Cas* and 'traditional authorities', and, in terms of state-building, came to be considered "two wasted years" (Gilkes, 1993).

At the Boroma Conference in 1993, Tuur was replaced by Mohamed Haji Ibrahim Egal as President. While received wisdom has it that the *guurti* selected Egal in a smooth process on May 5, 1993 (Bradbury, 2008), it was, in fact, the *Calan Cas* who propagated him in a prolonged tug-of-war. To the military hardliners Egal appeared to be the ideal candidate, not least because the *Calan Cas* believed that they could easily manipulate and rule through him (Interviews 14, 143). Yet, during subsequent years, Egal applied shrewd, authoritarian politics and wittingly instrumentalized different factions against one another, not least to free himself from the tight grip of the *Calan Cas* and contain the powers of the 'traditional authorities'. Thereby, he did not shy away from instigating two significant civil wars in order to consolidate his power and drive the state-making project forward.

The decentralized character Somaliland had taken during the 1991-93 period constituted a key structural challenge for the young polity and its potential to establish stable state institutions, largely because it favored a situation, in which multiple political actors contested economic and political power. Thus, it was little surprising that, shortly after Egal took the reins of power, the supporters of the previous government went into an opposition as strong as the one that the *Calan Cas* had posed to Tuur. Aggrieved by Egal's choice of ministers and his increasing centralization of control over financial and military means, some of the most prominent Garhajis – made up of the Habar Yonis and Eidagalle – leaders gathered in the vicinity of Burco in July 1993. During their 'Liiban Congress I', the burgeoning opposition announced that they were not bound by the laws of Somaliland (Bradbury, 2008) – and even declared Somaliland's government illegitimate one year thereafter (Spears, 2010; Garowe Online, 2007).

Hence, Egal sought to dispense of this opposition that challenged the government's authority and constituted a political thorn in the President's flesh. Equally, however, Egal also wanted to liberate himself of the grip of the *Calan Cas*, whom he felt being hostage to. As one observer put it, "[i]n 1993, Egal was not

a leader, he was a guest” (Interview 142). Being well aware of the historical tensions between the *Calan Cas* and the Garhajis, who had been side-lined by the former during the 1993 Boroma conference, Egal had politically accommodated the SNM hardliners at the expense of the Garhajis, thus fuelling the friction, leading some to argue that “Egal intentionally ignited the conflict – it was really obvious” (Interview 142). Ultimately, two Eidagalle militias, into whose territory the Hargeysa airport falls, took control of it in the summer of 1994.

Although political issues lay at the heart of the dispute, it also carried economic connotations (Interviews 19, 36), as by taxing and harassing commercial and aid flights, the Garhajis militia interfered in the business of the Habar Awal entrepreneurs living in Hargeysa, who were crucial to Egal’s ability to establish and maintain government capacity (Bradbury, 2008). Thus, in many ways, the challenges Egal faced resembled the conflict Tuur had fought in Berbera two years earlier. Rejecting calls for another national conference to resolve outstanding issues, Egal unleashed his eager military officers onto the opposition in November 1994, with the stated aim of securing the airport. Having tasted blood, the government forces led by Minister of Interior, Muse Behi Abdi, and Vice-President and Minister of Defense, Abdirahman Aw Ali – both of whom were staunch members of the *Calan Cas* – proceeded to attack the Eidagalle village of Toon.

Conflict spread to Burco, when government troops tried to take control of Habar Yonis checkpoints in the city’s vicinity in March 1995. Giving the military leaders plenty of rope and portraying the war effort as an ‘*Calan Cas* project’, the President managed to wash his hands of responsibility (Interview 14). The resulting war sparked the heaviest fighting since the anti-Barre struggle in which as many as 4,000 people lost their lives, and up to 180,000 fled to Ethiopia (Bradbury, 2008). Although this act of aggression rallied the Garhajis even more against the government, it was functional for Egal. For one the ‘war project’ allowed him to annihilate the organized Garhajis opposition and further debilitating it by bribing certain of its leaders. For another, having been able to portray the war as an act of the *Calan Cas*, Egal succeeded in politically delegitimizing them (Interview 14, 107, 108, 116).

While neither a necessary nor sufficient condition, the diverse episodes of mass violence appear having been instrumental for state-making in Somaliland

While Somaliland was in shatters, Egal emerged from these wars not only as winner, but in a strengthened position. Assuring himself of the support of the *guurti*, whom Egal convinced that the *Calan Cas* constituted a threat to peace in Somaliland (Interview 112), he incrementally sacked *Calan Cas* individuals from their ministerial positions, replacing them either with individuals from smaller clans, ‘traditional leaders’, and/or members of the Garhajis (Interview 7, 108). In order to deprive both the Garhajis leaders as well as the *Calan Cas* commanders of the ability to contest his political maneuvering militarily, Egal accommodated their rank and file by turning them into presidential guards. This not only served the purpose of removing the support base of his competitors, but also signaled other militias that it paid to belong to the state. The conflict was followed by the shrewdly engineered 1996 Hargeysa Summit, which served Egal to consolidate rudimentary state institutions.

While neither a necessary nor sufficient condition,^[4] the diverse episodes of mass violence appear having been instrumental for state-making in Somaliland. Although the SNM-led struggle did not exactly produce the outcomes Tilly describes for historical Europe – i.e. a tight administration, coherent army, etc. – it has been considered “formative in creating a ‘political community’ of shared interests” (Bradbury, 2008:50) and perceived as having served as a “cruel university in the arts of political mobilisation and popular leadership” (Bryden, 1999:137). Similarly, also the post-1991 civil wars are thought having “served to consolidate public support for the territory’s independence and to strengthen central government” (Bradbury, 2008:123), leading Huliaras (2002:159) to conclude that “[i]n sum, as happened in the case of medieval Europe [...], warfare had played a central and indeed essential role in the process of nation-formation in Somaliland.”

Hence, war *can* be constitutive of state-making processes, even in sub-Saharan Africa and in the present day. While war is surely neither a panacea nor an ‘angel of order’, in historical and macro-societal terms it appears to be more than a mere ‘daemon of decay’, or, as Enzensberger has it, a “political retrovirus [...] about nothing at all” (ibid., 1994, as in Cramer, 2006:77). Thus, the central question appears to be less *whether*, but rather *what kind* or *components* of mass violence can be constitutive of state-making, or *under what condition* war may enhance rather than inhibit state-making. Thereby, a key aspect seems to be in how far a particular war contributes to or precludes the standardization of commonly accepted institutions and identities amongst a territorially defined population. In contrast to south-central Somalia, the violence in Somaliland seems to have established at least a modicum of such common institutions and identities.

Bibliography

Adam, H. (1994). Formation and Recognition of New States: Somaliland in Contrast to Eritrea. *Review of African Political Economy*, 21(59), 21-38.

Adam, H. (1995). Somalia: A Terrible Beauty Being Born? In W. Zartman (Ed.), *Collapsed States – The Disintegration and Restoration of Legitimate Authority* (pp. 69-90). Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Ali, M. O., & Walls, M. (2008). *Peace Mapping: Somaliland Overview*. Academy for Peace and Development (APD). Hargeysa.

Bakonyi, J. (2009). Moral Economies of Mass Violence: Somalia 1988-1991. *Civil Wars*, 11(4), 434-454.

Balthasar, D. (2012): “State-making in Somalia and Somaliland: understanding war, nationalism and state trajectories as processes of institutional and socio-cognitive standardization.” PhD thesis, The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE).

Balthasar, D. (2013): “Somaliland’s Best Kept Secret: Shrewd Politics and War Projects as Means of State-Making”; In: *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 7(2): 218-238. Battera, F. (2003). Some Considerations on State Building in Divided Societies and the Role of the “International Community”: Somaliland and Somalia Compared. *Northeast African Studies*, 10(3), 225-247.

Battera, F. (2004). State- and Democracy-Building in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of Somaliland – A Comparative Perspective. *Global Jurist Frontiers*, 4(1), 1-21.

Böge, V., Brown, A., Clements, K., & Nolan, A. (2008). On Hybrid Political Orders and Emerging States: State Formation in the Context of ‘Fragility’. Berlin: Berghof Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management.

Bradbury, M. (2008). *Becoming Somaliland*. London: Progressio.

Brons, M. (2001). *Society, Security, Sovereignty and the State in Somalia – From Statelessness to Statelessness?* Utrecht: International Books.

Bryden, M. (1995). *Somaliland and Peace in the Horn of Africa: A Situation Report and Analysis*. Addis Ababa: United Nations Emergencies Unit for Ethiopia.

Bryden, M. (1999). New Hope for Somalia? The Building Block Approach. *Review of African Political Economy*, 26(79), 134-140.

Collier, P. (2004). *Development and Conflict*. Centre for the Study of African Economies. Oxford: Department of Economics.

Compagnon, D. (1990). The Somali Opposition Fronts: Some Comments and Questions. *Conflict Quarterly*, 13(1-2), 29-54.

Compagnon, D. (1998). Somali Armed Units – The Interplay of Political Entrepreneurship and Clan-Based Factionalism. In C. Clapham (Ed.), *African Guerillas* (pp. 73-90). Oxford: James Currey.

Cramer, C. J. (2006). *Civil War Is Not a Stupid Thing: Accounting for Violence in Developing Countries*. London: C. Hurst & Co.

- Crone, D. K. (1988). State, Social Elites and Government Capacity in Southeast Asia. *World Politics*, 40(2), 252-268.
- Deflem, M. (1999). Warfare, Political Leadership, and State Formation: The Case of the Zulu Kingdom, 1808-1979. *Ethnology*, 38(4), 371-391.
- Enzensberger, H. M. (1994). *Civil War*. London: Penguin and Granta.
- Flint, J. (1994). Somaliland: Struggling to Survive. *Africa Report*, 39(1), 36-40.
- Forti, D. (2011). A Pocket of Stability: Understanding Somaliland. *ACCORD Occasional Paper Series*(2).
- Garowe Online. (2007, 22.11.2007). Somalia: The Bo'ame Declaration of Dhulbahante Clan Elders, *Garowe Online*.
- Gilkes, P. (1993). Two Wasted Years: The Republic of Somaliland 1991-1993. London: Save the Children Fund.
- Glavitzka, R. (2008). "Doing Things the Traditional Way" – Ressourcenkonflikte und Lösungsmechanismen am Horn von Afrika ["Doing Things the Traditional Way" – Resource Conflicts and Solutions in the Horn of Africa]. In G. Leitner, R. Glavitzka, T. Roithner & A. Elbling (Eds.), *Schlaininger Arbeitspapiere für Friedensforschung, Abrüstung und nachhaltige Entwicklung*. Wien: Österreichisches Studienzentrums für Frieden und Konfliktlösung.
- Helling, D. (2009): "Anatomy of a 'Political Chameleon': Re-Examining Fluid Shapes and Solid Constants of Nationalism and Nation-Building"; Crisis States Research Centre (CSRC) Discussion Paper No. 17 (series 2); LSE: London.
- Herbst, J. I. (1990). War and the State in Africa. *International Security*, 14(4), 117-139.
- Herbst, J. I. (2000). *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Höhne, M. (2006). Traditional Authorities in Northern Somalia: Transformation of Positions and Powers. Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Working Paper, 82.
- Hoyle, P. (2000). Somaliland: Passing the Statehood Test? *IBRO Boundary and Security Bulletin*, 80-91.
- Huliaras, A. (2002). The Viability of Somaliland: Internal Constraints and Regional Geopolitics. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 20(2), 157-182.

- Jhazbhay, I. (2003). Somaliland – Africa’s best kept secret, A challenge to the international community? *African Security Review*, 12(4), 77-82.
- Jhazbhay, I. (2007). *Somaliland: Post-War Nation-Building and International Relations, 1991-2006*. PhD, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Jhazbhay, I. (2009). Somaliland: The Journey of Resistance, Reconciliation and Peace. *African Safety Promotion: A Journal of Injury and Violence Prevention*, 7(1), 50-76.
- Kaldor, M. (1999). *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kaplan, S. (2008). *Fixing Fragile States – A New Paradigm for Development*. Westpoint, Connecticut and London: Praeger Security International.
- Katzenstein, P. J. (1985). *Small States in World Markets*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Leander, A. (2004). Wars and the Un-making of States – Taking Tilly Seriously in the Contemporary World. In S. Guzzini & D. Jung (Eds.), *Contemporary Security Analysis and Copenhagen Peace Research* (pp. 69-80). London and New York: Routledge.
- Lemay-Hébert, N. (2009). Statebuilding without Nation-building? Legitimacy, State Failure and the Limits of the Institutionalist Approach. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 3(1), 21-45.
- Mann, M. (1988). *States, War and Capitalism: Studies in Political Sociology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Marchal, R. (1992). La Guerre a Mogadiscio [The War in Mogadishu]. *Politique Africaine*, 46, 120-125.
- Marchal, R. (1997). Forms of Violence and the Way to Control It: the Mooryaan of Mogadishu. In H. Adam & R. Ford (Eds.), *Mending Rips in the Sky, Options for Somali Communities in the 21th century*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Red Sea Press.
- Migdal, J. (2001). *State in Society: Studying How States and Societies Transform and Constitute One Another*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moe, L. W. (2009). *Flexible Approaches to State- and Governance-Building: Combining Traditional Leadership and State Authority in Somaliland; Draft*. Paper presented at the Post-Crisis State Transformation Conference, Linköping.
- Niemann, M. (2007). War Making and State Making in Central Africa. *Africa Today*, 22-39.

- North, D. C. (2005). *Understanding the Process of Economic Change*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Omaar, R. (1994). Somaliland: One Thorn Bush at a Time. *Current History – A Journal of Contemporary World Affairs*, 232-236.
- Othieno, T. (2008). A New Donor Approach to Fragile Societies: The Case of Somaliland. *Opinions*, 103.
- Pham, P. (2012). The Somaliland Exception: Lessons on Postconflict State Building from the Part of the Former Somalia that Works. *Marine Corps University Journal*, 3(1), 1-33.
- Prunier, G. (1990/91). A Candid View of the Somali National Movement. *Horn of Africa*, 13/14(3/4), 107-120.
- Renders, M. (2006). *'Traditional' Leaders and Institutions in the Building of the Muslim Republic of Somaliland*. Ph.D., University of Ghent, Ghent.
- Renders, M., & Terlinden, U. (2010). Negotiating Statehood in a Hybrid Political Order: The Case of Somaliland. *Development and Change*, 42(4), 723-746.
- Reno, W. (2003). *Somalia And Survival In the Shadow of the Global Economy*. Queen Elisabeth House Working Paper Series (QEHWPS No. 100).
- Richards, R. (2009). *Challenging the Ideal? Traditional Governance and the Modern State in Somaliland*. PhD, University of Bristol, Bristol.
- Samatar, I. M. (1997). Light at the End of the Tunnel: Some Reflections on the Struggle of the Somali National Movement. In H. M. Adam & R. Ford (Eds.), *Mending Rips in the Sky – Options for Somali Communities in the 21st Century* (pp. 21-48). Asmara: Red Sea Press.
- Spears, I. (2003). Reflections on Somaliland and Africa's Territorial Order. *Review of African Political Economy*, 95.
- Spears, I. (2004). Reflections on Somaliland and Africa's Territorial Order. In R. Ford, H. Adam & E. Ismail (Eds.), *War Destroys: Peace Nurtures – Somali Reconciliation and Development* (pp. 179-192). Asmara: The Red Sea Press.
- Spears, I. (2010). *Civil War in African States: The Search for Security*. Boulder and London: First Forum Press.
- Sufi, M. A. (2003). The Future Political Order for the Federal States of Somalia. *Northeast African Studies*,



10(3), 281-288. Terlinden, U., & Ibrahim, M. H. (2008). *Somaliland – A Success Story of Peace-Making, State-Building and Democratization?* Manuscript.

Tilly, C. (1992). *Coercion, Capital, and European States, A.D.990-1990*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Walls, M. (2009). The Emergence of a Somali State: Building Peace from Civil War in Somaliland. *African Affairs*, 1-19.

World Bank. (2003). *Breaking the Conflict Trap*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Notes

[1] For a more elaborate account of the effects of the civil war on Somaliland’s state-making project, see Helling (2009).

[2] In fact, it is generally argued that the 1991-1993 period was characterized by *peace* building and that *state*-building did not set in until 1993 (Bradbury, 2008; Ali & Walls, 2008). While Battera (2004:7) suggests that “[t]he [1991] Burco Congress represents the beginning of the state-building process in Somaliland,” Pham (2012:19) proposes that state-building in Somaliland did not start before 2001. A notable exception is I.M. Samatar (1997).

[3] For a more detailed account on the wars of the 1990s and their effect on Somaliland’s trajectory, see Balthasar (2013).

[4] See e.g. the case of Puntland, which “was unaffected by the civil strife that accompanied the collapse of the Somali state” (Battera, 2003:230), but nevertheless formed a similar polity.

Conflict over Resources and the Victimization of the Minorities in the South of Somalia

Catherine Besteman

Orienting question: How can we understand the violence in the Jubba Valley in relation to questions of political authority and violence more broadly in Somalia's recent history? Was the violence in the valley during and since 1991 a new form, distinct from pre-1991 experience, or is it a continuation of the type of violence imposed during the Barre regime? I will argue that Jubba Valley villagers have experienced more acute forms of the violence that plagued them prior to 1991, but also are experiencing a new variation (from Al Shabaab).

Historical Background

1. Minority Demographics in the South

Jubba (and Shabelle) River Valley settlements were created and populated by sedentary farmers of various and diverse ancestries, including populations who predated Somali arrivals, people who call themselves Reer Shabelle who moved into the valleys from Somalia-Ethiopia border region and are affiliated with the Ajuraan sub-clan, slaves, and Boran/Warday. The label '*jareer*', which refers to certain racialized physical features, distinguishes those with non-Somali ancestry from those with more Somali ancestry, identified as '*jileec*'.

Prior to the onset of Somalia's civil war, *jareer* Jubba and Shabelle valley villagers did not speak a common dialect or share a common kinship system or history. Many villagers in the lower Jubba River Valley continued to identify with their pre-enslavement east African ethnicities such as Yao and Makua. Mushunguli, in the lower Jubba valley, still spoke Zigua over a century after their Zegua ancestors from Tanzania had arrived as slaves into Somalia. Other minorities included Shabelle, Makanne, Eyle in Shabelle and inter-riverine areas and tiny groups of Boni in the Lower Jubba Valley. Other minorities with separate ancestries, languages, and histories lived along the coast, completely separate from the riverine minorities, including Bajuni, Reer Brava, and Reer Xamar (Few scholars include the Rahanweyn clan among minorities since the creation of armed militia in 1996 and the 2000 power-sharing formula where Rahanweyn were counted as equal to the other 3 Somali clans).

2. Experience of Minorities during the 1980s Barre Era

In the 1980s, ethnicity and relations between *jareer* riverine farmers and *jileec* pastoralists remained diverse. Along the Shabelle, riverine villages often had a client-like relationship with nearby pastoralists. Along the Jubba Valley, lower Valley villagers maintained pre-Somali identities and languages inherited from their enslaved ancestors. In Middle Jubba riverine villages Somali clan affiliation was common (Bartire, Laysan, Biyomal, Ajuraan), as were alliances with Somali pastoralist families in the bush (for example, minorities paid but never received *diya*). Some Darood families settled into Jubba Valley farming villages on the west bank and some Hawiye and Rahanweyn on the east bank.

Discrimination and racism against *jareer* was the norm in the Jubba Valley, including hate speech and physical abuse, and *jileec* pastoralists said Barre's laws against slavery kept them from re-enslaving Valley villagers. *Jareer* in cities held the lowest status jobs and had few economic opportunities and no political representation.

Because the government claimed ownership and sole authority over the legal distribution of land, land expropriation spread under land reform laws supported by foreign development agencies (especially USAID). In Lower Jubba, large concessions expropriated riverine land, employing *jareer* on sugar, rice, and banana plantations at poverty wages. In Middle Jubba, the new land tenure system requiring land registration enabled state-linked urban politicians and businessmen to expropriate riverine land cultivated by local farmers.

Foreign intervention and aid supported the planned transformation of the valley for commercial agriculture, to be managed by the newly created Ministry of Jubba Valley Development. As a result, state-associated politicians and businessmen who shared the knowledge of development plans for the Valley used the Valley as a base of personal accumulation, claiming land titles which they used for loans, claiming state-funded machinery, and sometimes obligating local farmers to work on their farms. Local villagers felt powerless to protest, particularly since some of the expropriators were in the military or were local state officials and used the threat of violence to subdue complaints (Thus, I agree with de Waal that by the late 1980s elites subscribed to the view that “some form of the security rentier state was the [enduring] norm”).

Discrimination and racism against jareer was the norm in the Jubba Valley, including hate speech and physical abuse, and jileec pastoralists said Barre's laws against slavery kept them from re-enslaving Valley villagers

3. 1991-2

As militias fought to control territory, none protected the unarmed riverine farmers and coastal populations, even in areas where the latter had local alliances with nearby sub-clans. Southern minorities were extremely vulnerable during 1991-2 because their assets were desirable and easily claimed, they lacked strong protectors and meaningful clan alliances, some were seen as having been protected by Barre's laws, and they lacked support networks outside the country.

Human rights observers describe a campaign to eject coastal minorities from the country as ‘foreigners’ by militias who then claimed their property. Along the middle Jubba river, Darood (west bank) and Hawiye (east bank) militias fought back and forth across the river, each side preying on *jareer* farmers by taxing them, kidnapping people for ransom, forcibly marrying local women, appropriating belongings and food, and abusing elders. Some *jareer* farmers assisted the occupying militias because of their clan affiliations and to protect themselves. Human rights workers described the Jubba Valley as a “shatter-zone” and “a graveyard” during early 1990s. The heavy demands by militias and drought led to an untenable situation of starvation and fear, causing *jareer* throughout the valley to flee to Kenya. Warlords and their militias took over plantations along lower Shabelle and lower Jubba and forced *jareer* to work in slave conditions.

The situation in 1991-2 suggested that occupying militias intended to claim riverine resources by force in order to benefit from potential future foreign investment. Their trepidations against riverine farmers were justified by racist ideologies that positioned minority farmers (and coastal populations) as either ‘foreigners’ or legitimately subservient to *jileec* ‘overlords’ because of their foreign/slave ancestry. Their claims to riverine farmland reflected a belief that local control would be rewarded, either within a new state formation or by returning foreign assistance organizations or both.

4. 1992-2005

Because of violence and displacement, a ‘Somali Bantu’ minority political consciousness emerged in the Kenyan refugee camps that encompassed Mushunguli, reer Shabelle, Warday, Eyle, and other *jareer* and some Asharaf and a new “Benadiri” identity that encompassed reer Brava, Bajuni, reer Xamar, and some Asharaf. These overarching ethnic groups did not previously exist. Somali Bantu and Benadiri gained international recognition as vulnerable minority groups and some received resettlement opportunities in the US from Kenyan refugee camps.

However, within Somalia, Somali Bantus and Benadiris did not gain political recognition, rights of self-determination, or control of their territories. The 1993 Jubbaland agreement allowed occupiers to remain on the land they had appropriated from *jareer* and did not include minority representations or interests at all. (See as well de Waal on Gabaweyn in upper Jubba, who lost their land first to Hawiye, and then to Marehan, who were allowed to keep it in under terms of agreement).

The closing of the Kenyan refugee camps inhabited by Bajuni and UNHCR 1995-6 repatriation efforts brought some Bajuni and *jareer*/Bantu back to Somalia, but many either returned to Kenyan camps or fled north into Puntland because of ongoing insecurity in their homes and because their property had been claimed by occupiers. Tens of thousands now live in IDP camps along the Afgoye corridor and in the north where they are repeatedly violated and lack rights. Human rights groups report that rape is widespread in IDP camps by majority clan men and other authorities against minority women, who have no recourse.

5. 2006

Some reports suggested that the rise of the Islamic Courts Union brought security in some coastal and riverine areas, but other reports suggest the ICU also acted as overlords in riverine areas by demanding heavy taxes. The Ethiopian invasion in 2006 produced huge insecurity throughout south-central districts and allowed dominant clan occupiers to return, followed by Al Shabaab. The rise of Al Shabaab has had serious consequences for riverine minorities, who are once again subject to control by outsiders who impose extreme punishments for failure to pay ‘taxes,’ obey cultural and religious rules, or for trying to flee. Local religious and cultural practices are not allowed and punished. Those who receive remittances are under scrutiny for being allied to West. Somali websites accuse Bantus of participation in Al Shabaab, either by choice or by abductions and complicity. Somali Bantus in the diaspora say Al Shabaab extorts resources from local populations.

The pervasive use of anti-minority hate speech in the diaspora and on Somali websites is an alarming indication of how local jareer-jileec inequalities have blown up into diasporic hostilities

Current Concerns

The inclination of foreign interveners to support and work with warlords sidelines minorities because the “local” leaders claiming to represent local or regional interests are not minorities and do not represent interests of minorities. The current struggles over the form and authority of ‘Jubbaland’ is a case in point. A focus on clan and clan-based militias as key to future peace and stability overlooks minorities, who have much more complicated social location than is easily captured in “clan” identities, which leave out minorities altogether. The 4.5

powersharing agreement was obviously unacceptable. Furthermore, a key dimension of the political jockeying between militias, “clans” and “leaders” in the south is the desire to lay claim to the potentially valuable riverine land, seen as of future international interest. Since the most dangerous part of the country is South-Central Somalia where minorities live, it is very difficult to get information other than through family-based diaspora channels. The pervasive use of anti-minority hate speech in the diaspora and on Somali websites is an alarming indication of how local *jareer-jileec* inequalities have blown up into diasporic hostilities.

6. Concerns for future governance

Recognizing that the most insecure and contested areas are those inhabited by minorities (whose interests were basically unrepresented in the 4.5 power sharing agreement, which minorities see as a vehicle to ensure dominant clan hegemony over their homelands), future governments must make a commitment to minority rights explicit in the constitution and in law, with policies and programs put into place and public statements that recognize the existence and rights of minorities and that confront hate speech and discrimination. Measures that confront impunity and the history of human rights abuses against minorities cannot be ignored. The fact of land expropriation, both under Barre and since by

dominant clans who have invaded riverine and inter-riverine areas, must be addressed, perhaps with a system for laying claims, adjudication, return of land, and future security. “Jubbaland” is an area of concern because of Al Shabaab/warlord contestation over Kismayo, generating a struggle for control with implications for minorities throughout the valley as those currently jockeying for control are not minorities. Minority IDPs need protection, especially women who are at high risk of rape by majority clan members and by local officials in IDP contexts. Finally, what will be the role of minorities in the diaspora, who support a vast number of minorities within the country, and who are now educated, multilingual, with global connections?

7. How to understand the violence in the Jubba Valley in relation to questions of political authority and violence more broadly in Somalia’s recent history?

Is Jubba Valley violence a new form of violence, distinct from pre-1991 experience? Or is it a continuation of the type of violence imposed during Barre regime?

I argue it is both. The Barre regime simultaneously forbade enslavement and forced subjugation of riverine minorities to dominant clans AND enabled urban political and business elites to appropriate riverine land. The former emboldened riverine farmers to attempt to manage their own political affairs, to negotiate as villages with neighboring pastoralist clans for compensation for physical injuries and livestock destruction of farms by pastoralists. Pastoralist clans in the middle valley area clearly articulated their understanding that Barre’s laws against slavery offered minorities protection (unwelcome in their eyes).

Violence during the 1980s took two forms:

1. Violence based in racialized inequalities. This form of violence was characterized by physical abuse by pastoralists against farmers, which farmers explained as individualized and personal and which pastoralists explained as their right. Farmers worked together to demand compensation for injuries and losses, which they sometimes achieved at modest levels. This violence thus occurred along lines drawn by kinship ancestry and race, where dominant clan Somalis could abuse minority riverine farmers, including those with whom they shared a clan affiliation.
2. Violence of the rentier state. This violence was perpetrated by those allied with the state against minority farmers – the violence of land expropriation and demands for poorly compensated labor, sometimes backed by armed force.

Violence during 1990s was a continuation of these experiences:

1. Opportunistic Violence. Local pastoralist clans armed by and/or allied with militias invaded and attacked riverine villages, demanding food, labor, and women, reasserting what they believed was their rightful position of dominance vis-a vis minority farmers. This was opportunistic violence enabled by state collapse and regional insecurity.
2. Militia Violence. Militias fought for the right to claim control over riverine land as act of state-building. When militia leaders proclaim themselves the President of Azania, or Jubbaland, they are making a

state-focused political calculation in the model set by Barre. They wish to control riverine resources, receive international political recognition, and be granted foreign aid.

Currently there is a third form of violence that is distinct from these two prior forms (e.g the violence of racism/kinship and the violence of the rentier state). This third form is the violence imposed on riverine farmers by locally-based, loose networks of Islamic fundamentalists, some of whom are foreigners, some of whom are newcomers from dominant Somali clans, and some of whom are riverine villagers themselves. This seems to be an entirely new political formation, not based on racism and clan membership, not oriented toward Western-based financial support or political recognition within “the international community”, and not oriented toward becoming a new rentier state (although Al Shabaab members to lay claim to resources in the form of a tax. But their primary concern seems to be control of mobility and cultural practice).

In sum, the Jubba valley has it all:

1. Violence on basis of clan and racialized identities. The patterning of this violence is fluid, shifting, and complex, and is sometimes wielded by organized militias and sometimes opportunistically. But in the context of this violence, race normally trumps clan, as dominant clan Somalis exert violence against minorities in order to assert social supremacy and control of resources.
2. Violence of rentier state, where the Jubba Valley is seen as valuable in political and material terms, and the contestation for power is about who will be seen as recipient of foreign aid and investment. Violence of state-building.
3. Violence in the valley is also being used to destroy contenders for power, directed at Al Shabaab or by Al Shabaab in order to build a new political order.

Clan Cleansing in Somalia: The Ruinous Legacy of 1991: A Book Review

Faisal Roble

If the epic poems of Guba, instigator in Somali, documented the internecine small-scale clan wars in the Hawd and Reserved Area in the 1890s-1920s, *Clan Cleansing in Somalia* undoubtedly serves as a repository for the historical origins and the memory reconstruction of mass violence in post-colonial Somalia. This time (1978 -present), though, the warfare was carried out with the “changing use of large-scale clan-based violence” as a technology to achieve political objectives. In the tradition of Robert H. Jackson and Carl G. Rosberg, who viewed ethnicity and religion as potent resources for political gains in African politics in their seminal work *Personal Rule in Black Africa: Prince, Autocrat, Prophet, Tyrant* (1982), Kapteijns illuminates the use of clan technology for political ends and its unavoidable consequences of communal mass violence and the ensuing state collapse in 1991.

Based on rich and diverse sources, including four bodies of scholarship (the anthropology of violence and the new, comparative genocide studies; scholarship on ethnicity and the state; the historiography on the Somali civil war (such as the works by Issa-Salwe, Cassanelli, and Compagnon), Kapteijns’ book presents a persuasive empirical as well as normative sociopolitical analysis – enabling her to present a plausible and compelling portrait of contemporary mass violence and its variations in Somalia with the following three themes:

1. Mass violence in Somalia started with the *politico military regime of Mohamed Siyad Barre* in the late 1970s, and was carried over by subsequent warlords and still continues to a limited degree in the southern regions of the country. The Barre regime carried state sponsored mass violence against civilians in the North (Somaliland) and in Northeast (Puntland) to punish civilians to dissuade them from supporting two respective armed movements (the Somali National Movement (SNM) and the Somali Salvation Democratic Front (SSDF). The culprits in the massacres carried out during Barre’s regime, *in the name of the state*, are his executive team, his inner circle advisors, and his top military aides (from many different clan backgrounds) who have yet to account for their deeds.
2. Those opposition fronts that sought to replace Barre’s regime, including SNM, the United Somali Congress (USC) – Somali Patriotic Movement (SPM) Jeer wing, waged war on civilians at differing but small scales. In the North, the so-called “Mopping Up Operation in Awdal” and armed attacks on refugee camps by the SNM, and in the case of USC-SPM, Jeer wing, the notoriously painful massacre of over 100 prominent civilians in Kismayo in December 1991, as witnessed by Jane Perez of the New York

Times, are glaring examples of massacres carried out by politically motivated opposition fronts against civilians.

3. The United Somali Congress (USC) led by the late Mohamed Farah Aidid is singled out in the book for its unique history of shifting the paradigm of war in 1991 by instigating large scale communal violence targeted against members of the Darood clans in Mogadishu and in Southern Somalia. Whereas in the early years of Somalia's civil war, mass violence was committed by and in the name of the Somali state, with small-scale attacks on civilians by the militias of armed opposition fronts, the USC leadership committed "clan cleansing" in the name of the Hawiye clan by presenting Daroods (among other things) as "*allochthonous . . . outsiders with no rights to reside in the capital,*" This, "key shift," as she calls it, led to armed USC militia killing civilians of particular clans, and/or the USC leadership intentionally arming neighbors against the clans portrayed as outsider's "The violence was in the form of communal violence in which common people targeted other common people on the basis of a particular construction of the group identities of both," writes Kapteijns.

This book is not only an authoritative research project in Somali Studies, but a serious source to be consulted on Somalia's future social repair and reconciliation

The events that took place in the 1991 time-frame encompass not only the clan cleansing that targeted "the" Darood but also the large-scale clan-based brutalization of civilians. Needless to say, within a short period of time, about 400, 000 mainly middle class urbanites, most of the Darood clan members, were chased out of Mogadishu and other towns of south and south central Somalia, their properties looted, their women raped and thousands of civilians killed, thus eroding not only the cosmopolitan nature of the city, but precipitating the total collapse of the state.

In a whopping 308 pages, Kapteijns skillfully weaves four chapters (the interpretation of the 1991 violence by poets, singers and playwrights; the political grievances of the 1970s and 1980s; the unprecedented "*clan cleansing*" in Mogadishu in 1991, and the need for a genuine reconciliation) into a rich and accessible tapestry of communal violence and state failure in Somalia.

Kapteijns' analysis, as she herself clearly states, does not include the international dimensions of the key shift of 1991. This is a task that deserves to be taken up by other scholars. For example, a comparison between the capture of Mogadishu by USC in 1991 and the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Front (EPRDF) capture of Addis Ababa after its triumph over Mengistu Haile Mariam of Ethiopia in June 1990 and the subsequent collapse of Somalia and political stabilization of Ethiopia would be very enlightening.

However, *Clan Cleansing* is exhaustive to the extent possible. With over 60 pages (Pp. 240-308) of meticulously referenced notes, bibliography, timeline of major events, and glossary, this book is not only an authoritative research project in Somali Studies, but a serious source to be consulted on Somalia's

future social repair and reconciliation. It is rich with names of actors, places where real activities took place, and names of victims who barely survived but were able to escape.

Marshaling her unmatched scholarly mastery of the Somali literature (herself a fluent Somali speaker and a protégé of the late Andrzejewski), Kapteijns unravels unique views about the 1991 civil war as understood by Somali poets, writers and playwrights. From a host of less known writers to the American-styled Canadian Somali poet, Mohamud Said Togane, whose *free verses* are not only “*equal opportunity offenders*,” but also constitute a powerful voice for the demystification of clan constructs, Kapteijns offers us untainted versions of an internal conversation carried among Somalis particularly about their own plight.

Add to that the power of singers such as Ahmed Naji’s “*Mogadishu, you have been violated*” (Xamaray waa lagu Xumeeyey), Cabdi Muxumed’s dark message to the USC, Faadumo Qaasim’s “*Oh! My country*,” (Dalkaygow) and Cabdullahi Shube’s melancholic depiction of the violence, and you have a full sociopolitical understanding of political clan and its tenacious power to undo the cosmopolitan city of Mogadishu in a matter of days.

Irrespective of social differences, the author concludes, clan, mixed with the potency of the entitlement-based concept of “*autochthony*” – a nativist philosophy that was used to hype hate narratives in the days leading to the 1991 civil war violence – is a powerful technology of war used by sectarian “*leaders*.” As a result, Somalia has seen its ugliest and most painful history in 1991; one such a depiction is when one Eedo Maryan, aunt Maryan, obviously a helpless Darood old lady, was captured by Mohamed Farah Aidid’s militia members and asked their leader (including the recently deceased `Ato) for direction as to what to do with the old lady. Embarrassed by the ugliness of the situation, the commander told the militia members to let Eedo go this time, “*but next time do not bring people like that to me; take care of them on the spot*.” However, Professor Abyan, a prominent opposition to the Barre regime for many years and many other citizens were “*taken care of*” by USC militia because of belonging to the wrong clan! Ironically the same hostile environment for victims of “*clan cleansing*” proved to be a safe haven for many for Barre’s henchmen thanks to their clan affiliation with the victorious militia of USC.

Kapteijns argues that the USC viewed the defeat of Barre’s regime as a victory not only against Barre, but against anyone who belonged to his clan family for whom the toll of “*ninkii dhoof ku yimid bay geeridu dhibaysaa*,” or “*those who are non-natives are afraid of death*” rung laud. (A nativist war song that was most recently heard blasting the kiosks and teashops of Mogadishu during the July 2013 Kismayo conflict.) In the end, Kapteijns tells the story of how a war that could have liberated Mogadishu from the yoke of Barre’s regime succumbed to *autochthony*, thus committing “*clan cleansing*” with the tacit acquiescence of the post-1991 Mogadishu-based *Manefesto* group.

To authenticate the degree to which Somalis felt the mass violence of the 1991, Kapteijns brilliantly utilizes poems by Mohamud Said Togane, who compares the 1991 mass violence to that of Rwanda’s ethnic cleansing. In a creative way, the author shapes and contextualizes the wailing and crying voices of Somalia’s writers, including poet Togane, and playwrights into what the author terms “*clan cleansing*.”

What is “*clan cleansing*,” one may ask? Clan cleansing is not “genocide as defined by the 1948 UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide” writes Kapteijns, lest this definition is imprecise. Neither is it “ethnic cleansing” for Somalis are one ethnic group. Armed with both context and in-depth knowledge of the anthropology of the Somalis, laden with historical and political insights, she writes the following exquisite lines to define what is clan cleansing and why study it:

“Clan cleansing is a concept applied to the 1991 mass violence caused by those who aspired to become the sole heirs of Barre ... who redefined the enemy in clan terms and used large-scale clan-based communal clan violence to achieve their political goal.”

To which Kapteijns adds:

“It was not a clan (or clans) that perpetrated clan cleansing, but political leaders who mobilized and organized ordinary people to commit violence in the name of clan.”

The same political leaders transported the technology of clan warfare from Hawiye on Darood conflict into Hawiye (Habar Gidir) on Hawiye (Abgaal) internecine fighting to the complete desecration of Mogadishu. Kapteijns developed a persuasive argument that says politically expedient and Faustian clan constructions are not sustainable.

Clan cleansing is one of several untold stories, like the massive rape Somali women had faced in the last 20 years, which lay at the root of Somalia’s unresolved conflict. If Nuruddin Farah in *Secrets* made us uncomfortable by telling us tightly-held dark family and personal secrets, or Yasmien Mohamoud’s *Nomad Diaries* gave us a sense of loss that preyed on Somalia’s post conflict family relations in the face of grinding urban America, Kapteijns unravels the code of silence which many Somalis have uneasily observed about “*clan cleansing*.” In her non-ideological narrative, she may as well disappoint both sides to the clan conflict when she clearly singles out the USC leadership, but exonerates the Hawiye masses, by assigning the crimes of “*clan cleansing*” to the leaders of USC. Despite vitriolic attacks by those who perpetrate the very crime that she explained and analyzes, Kapteijns’ theory of clan conflict, state collapse and the need for remedy for the victims is a valuable contribution to Somali/African studies.

Kapteijns argues that the 1991 clan cleansing is a history, indeed a human and a Somali history at the same time, and that this history can represent “not the unknown past we are supposed to repeat but the past we know”... so that our discourse may be guided to a fruitful destination – a destination of social repair and national reconciliation. Yet, this self-revealing truth is diluted and/or denied or concealed by the perpetrators or those who want to protect perpetrators. Despite intense denials, the names, real time events as recorded by journalists, aid workers and foreign government diplomats who witnessed the mass violence in Mogadishu, as well as the places and the times where and when clan cleansing history was made, are all potential sources of evidence for tomorrow’s social repair and reconciliation. Kapteijns’ *Clan Cleansing: the Ruinous History of 1991* is as much about the past as it is about the future of Somalia, thus the need for its translation into Somali language paramount.

Some Reflections on Lidwien Kapteijns' *Clan Cleansing in Somalia: The Ruinous Legacy of 1991* (2013)

David D. Laitin

I cannot over-emphasize the importance of this book for its three major accomplishments: (1) Bringing to a broad audience (with her own beautiful translations) the artistic depth of Somali critical commentaries on an otherwise unspeakable era; (2) Demonstrating the cynical denial of responsibility for egregious violations of human dignity by political elites (both government and rebel); as she shows, their construction of exclusive clan identities served as a prelude and a force in this horrific era of clan cleansing; and (3) Documenting the historical truth about responsibility for these unspeakable violations that is a necessary element for societal repair.

My commentary is offered not to diminish in any way the importance of this work, but rather to keep alive what we hear and read on Somali websites and in this book – that is an active contestation on how to make sense of the unbearable quarter-century since the Somali retreat from Ethiopia in 1988. Hopefully, my commentary will form part of the repair work that Kapteijns sees as essential for a *modus vivendi* among a population in a country whose parents and grandparents once envisioned as the homeland of a Somali nation.

The Political Construction of Clan Identities

Allow me to begin with Kapteijns' praise (“hard to imagine a more eloquent and poignant epitaph...”) of Nuruddin Farah's report on a visit to a Kenyan refugee camp, in which he was “nonplussed” with “a new form of Somali-speak” built on the “anachronistic sentiments of clannism” (p. 136). Compare this with what Kapteijns sees as “a central proposition of this study, namely that it was the political use of group identity constructs to take over the control of the state, not those groups or identities themselves that lay at the root of Somali civil war violence.” But if Nuruddin is right, these clan identities were not constructed by political elites, but rather were re-constructed on a rather powerful historical foundation.

Kapteijns tends to minimize the role of clan membership outside the purview of the state to protect its members, to secure rights to grazing land, and to settle disputes within the clan and across clans. Said Samatar's compelling historical ethnography of the role of clan in performing these functions reveals that

the clan was (and remains so in the nomadic regions) an essential identity for personal security. Kapteijns points out only in the final pages of the book (p. 227) how the British and Italians more or less re-activated clannism for purposes of efficient rule. The final substantive chapter (chapter 9) in I.M. Lewis' *A Pastoral Democracy* shows how these functions took on new meaning in the period of party organization as political independence approached, and this for power and position. And as Saadia Touval's work (*Somali Nationalism*) showed, clan identities were crucial for party advancement and political office in the pre-Siyaad period. To be sure, early in chapter 2 Kapteijns outlines some of the dynamics of clan politics before the catastrophe post 1988, but in subsequent discussions, Siyaad's approach to clan is taken as either invented or "anachronistic".

While minimizing the centrality of clan in the pre-Siyaad era, Kapteijns tends to minimize the attempts by Siyaad from 1969 through the end of the Ogaadeen war to weaken the political relevance of clans – whether it be in the support for a national script; the legal equality of all women; the treatment of orphans; and a socialist party devoted to equal opportunity (Writing off the entire Siyaad dictatorship as a "kleptocracy" (p. 220) is historically inaccurate). Obviously Siyaad's strategy failed, as clan identities resurfaced in a moment of recriminations and counter-recriminations in the wake of the Ogaadeen tragedy. A decade of socialism and a national language could not diminish the power of clans in the face of national failure.

If not powerful clan identities used by political authorities for purposes of maintaining that power, what then is new in 1988 (or worse 1991)? The narrative in this book suggests that it is the "hate-narratives" that are new. This may be the case, but Somalists will recall the infamous "Somali Poetic Combat" (Andrzejewski and Galaal 1963) and the equally derisive clan sentiments pervading the verses of the doyen of Somali invective, the Sayyid Maxamad Cabdille Xasan. I have suggested elsewhere, going back to the anthropological work of Evans-Pritchard, that what was new was the divorce of clannism from the system of clans. In the logic of that system of segmentary lineage attachments, clans would know with whom to align (by balancing power) in order to bring the rather frequent number of wars to quick ends. I learned from Kapteijns book that my interpretation was flawed: viz., there were numerous alliances across clans (e.g. the Irir coalition of Hawiye and Isaaq, pp. 275-7, fn. 37). However, the relevance of Evans-Pritchard's work to this problem is not diminished – clans are powerful social realities in segmentary lineage societies; clan-hatred is endemic; but as a system of clans, we should expect alliances to form and reform in order to

The narrative in this book suggests that it is the "hate-narratives" that are new

balance power and to keep warfare in check. My conjecture has been that General Caydiid, in fomenting an intra-Hawiye war, broke the systemic rules of alliance building, and therefore the expectations on what constituted a peace-building alliance, leading to a congeries of unstable war-lord alliances.

Indeed, alliances could shift among Somali clans because "hate-narratives" are subject to political revision. Clan hatreds are not ancient; in the Somali case, they are temporary and easily transferred elsewhere. This is so even in Kapteijns' account. Consider the Saaleban exception (p. 175, and fn. 123, p. 270). They are a sub-clan of the Habr Gedir (Hawiye) in whose compounds

Daaroods who witnessed “torture, mutilation, and gang rape” (from other Hawiye) could escape to safety. Kapteijns speculates that the hatred could be diminished for a group that felt secure in its power. Similarly, and not getting any sustained treatment in this book is the *modus vivendi* (though hardly a lasting friendship) that the Somaliland authorities established with the Daaroods (Dhulbahante and Warsangeli) in their unrecognized state. The hatreds Kapteijns illuminates are both deep (in motivation) but shallow (in time).

Allow me to add one more factor accounting for the nature of the clan hatreds in Somalia after the Ogaadeen retreat, a factor that only gets minimal mention in this treatise. In my visit in 1980 to several refugee camps and at the front line separating Somali and Ethiopian troops, I sat in a tent with Somali officers in charge of defending Galguduud. Asking for their clan identifications, I learned that they all had identities not of the infamous “MOD” designation. It was here that I learned of Siyaad’s clan genius (see p. 276, fn. 51 in Kapteijns for a glimpse) – he was able to reward minority sub-clans of the Isaaq and Hawiye, and to arm them against their higher-status co-clansmen. Part of the hatred coming from the Habr Gedir (Hawiye) and Habar Toljaco (Isaaq) was that their supremacy among clan-familiars was being effectively exposed and challenged. Siyaad’s brilliant backing of General Maxamad Samantar Ali (who comes from what Kapteijns calls, in a “politically correct” but uninformative description, a member of a “so-called minority group”) had a similar effect of angering higher status Somalis who felt they had a birthright to rule. (See an analysis of Samantar’s impressive rise to power in my book, *Nations, States, and Violence*). Siyaad’s genius was in fully understanding how best to make use of the still-relevant clan system.

Beyond the Caydiid deviation and the dismantling of the segmentary system, there is something new in Somali clan divisions! This factor is surely linked to the collapse of the ordered system of clans, and it has to do with the power of peace interests. We see nothing of the following post 1988 in the verses that Kapteijns offers us. In Salaan Carrabey’s *guudmar* “Ingratitude” (in Andrzejewski and Lewis, p.122), the poet begins with “Oh, clansmen, stop the war.” And then in lines 36-41 he warns: “And now if you start to devour each other / I will not stand aloof / But adding my strength to one side / I shall join in the attack on the other.” What was new in 1991 was neither clan identity nor clan hatred: what was new was the absence of powerful balancers with an interest in brokering peace. This role is embedded (in Evans-Pritchard’s understanding) in the very system of clans, and it was that system that was absent in the unbearable past quarter century in Somalia. Indeed the “prestigious” poetry illuminated in chapter 1 is on the scale of Salaan Carrabey’s; but it comes today from poets without the standing to mobilize their clans to balance power in order to achieve peace.

Perhaps in different words, the concern in my discussion here is that the more Kapteijns emphasizes the contingency and cynical construction of clan identities by the political class, the less convincing the argument that clan hatreds were driving unspeakable violence by the perpetrators.

The Motivation of the Perpetrators

One missing piece in the puzzle of the violent zealotry as exhibited by the militias during the cleansing campaigns is the voices of the rapists, the murderers, those who desecrated dead bodies. We learn of the conditions that facilitated these actions, having to do with hate-narratives, joblessness, opportunities to steal, and “habit” (pp. 191, 202). These are the hypothesized causal factors, but not direct evidence on the mind-sets of the perpetrators. This is the type of evidence collected by Franz Fanon in his classic *Wretched of the Earth*. In the present era, social scientists have collected direct evidence of failed suicide missionaries, and what motivated them. (In Palestine, it was not hatred or joblessness; thereby upsetting some favorite theories, as we know from Alan Krueger’s work on *What Makes a Terrorist*). Further, recent historical evidence demonstrates that soldiers in the trenches in World War I maybe hated their enemies, but still systematically shot at non-targets in defiance of orders. The motivations of the murderers in the Somali case remain obscure, and may not coincide with the causal factors that Kapteijns outlines. Kapteijns calls out for those who perpetrated violence to acknowledge their crimes; and any setting that requires them to do so will help fill in this lacuna in our understanding.

Towards a Reconstitution of Society

While powerful theoretically, Kapteijns’ hope to contextualize clan so that we will no longer objectify identities as in “*the Daarood*” (p. 155) a fault she finds in many commentators, including I.M. Lewis, is hard to apply in practice. Consider her (overly respectful, in my judgment) discussion of the Manifesto Group (pp. 108-15). Most analysts would report that this broad coalition of elders and intellectually excluded “*the Isaaq*”, a point Kapteijns makes without using the hated “*the*” and then again, only in a footnote (on p. 257, fn. 93). How else to explain the resistance of then former Prime Minister Maxamed Ibraahim Cigaal and Ibraahim Meygaag Samatar (a Ph.D. in economics, and certainly from the same social grouping as the Manifesto intellectuals), both Isaacs, to its recommendations? More interestingly, in reporting that this Manifesto group was “deeply rooted in Somali culture and religion” (p. 112), Kapteijns is reifying a “Somali” identity in a way she laments for a Daarood identity. Clearly, in thinking about a political solution, we will need to acknowledge the social foundation of clans and clan identities, even if political correctness requires us to use region as a euphemism. Acknowledging the power and meaning of clanship, while recognizing the costs of reifying it, is the challenge for the next generation of Somali state-builders.

Response to David Laitin's Reflections on Clan Cleansing in Somalia

Lidwien Kapteijns

David Laitin's reflections on *Clan Cleansing in Somalia: The Ruinous Turn of 1991* (2013) open up welcome space for further debate about Somali civil war violence in 1991-1992. The strengths Laitin highlights are considerable and include "the historical truth about responsibility" and the "cynical denial" of this responsibility" on the part of the political leaders who masterminded and organized this violence, as well as the inclusion in the book's evidential base of Somali artistic representations and interpretations of this violence.

Nevertheless, Laitin's response to *Clan Cleansing* includes significant points of disagreement. The latter deserve to be engaged, for, to the mind of the book's author, they either misrepresent the book's arguments or point at deeper differences in interpretation of the history the book analyzes. Before raising six specific points, this response to Laitin's critique will make two general observations, one about a silence and the other about a recurrent theme underlying Laitin's remarks. First, with regard to silence, it is surprising that Laitin's response – and this was true for the discussions during the World Peace Foundation (WPF) seminar as a whole – does not really engage with the central concept of *Clan Cleansing*, namely that of violence – *i.e.* large-scale, clan based violence against civilians – as a transformative factor in the history of Somalia's civil war and an obstacle to social reconstruction and moral repair in the present. Second, a theme that underlies and reoccurs in Laitin's response is his understanding of the role of clan in Somali society and politics. The latter appears to bear traces of an older anthropological paradigm in which clan is seen as a permanent trait of Somali society, one that responds to an extent to its changing context (for it can pop up, submerge, and resurface) but nevertheless has an existence underneath and outside of history. The below will elaborate on this insight.

1. On the conceptualization of clan:

There are serious problems and inconsistencies in Laitin's understanding of clan in his response to my book. This understanding, which causes him to find fault with some of *Clan Cleansing's* main arguments, is as follows: "Outside the purview of the state" and "in the pre-Siyaad era," Laitin notes, clan has always played a significant role in its ability "to protect its members, to secure rights to grazing land, and to settle disputes within the clan and across clans" (para. 5 and 3rd para. from the end). *Clan Cleansing* ignores and minimizes the social dimensions of clan identities, Laitin claims, for it simply presents clan identities as constructed by the political elite (para. 3 and 3rd para. from the end). To illustrate this, Laitin draws on the story, cited in my book on p. 136, about Nuruddin Farah's experience when he was looking for his family in

a Kenyan refugee camp just as the people who had been targeted for clan cleansing began to stream over the border. *Clan Cleansing* cites this story to highlight how the communal violence of the clan cleansing had so undermined the victims' identities as Somali citizens that they now expressed their identities in deeply felt clan terms. Laitin faults *Clan Cleansing* for missing the truth that underlying clan sentiments were reasserting themselves and claims that the book mistakenly sees these expressions of clan identity by the refugees as shaped by the political elite.

This is astounding to me. The historical transformation Laitin misses and to which Nuruddin so movingly bears witness is that of the birth of a new clan construct, or a new clan consciousness and identity – one that draws on past experiences and discourses but is at that moment primarily a response to the large-scale, clan-based violence unleashed on civilians by a specific fraction of the political class, namely the organizers of the clan cleansing campaign. By insisting that the

Clan Cleansing takes clan identities very seriously; it simply refuses to take them for granted as something always already known

clan identity expressed by these victims of organized clan-based violence was just the reemergence of underlying social clan identities that had (always?) already existed “outside of the purview of the state” and “in the pre-Siyaad era,” Laitin disregards the role of the political class in the violence these refugees had just survived. That a political scientist would underplay (ignore, minimize) the role of the state/political class and the clan-based violence it sponsored in shaping new clan constructs is unexpected and does not make for a compelling critique of the analysis of clan in *Clan Cleansing*.

Members of the political class controlling or competing for control over the state have been a major influence on constructions of clan identity from the colonial period onwards (see also Mamdani 1996). Their use of large-scale clan-based violence against civilians to reach their goals from 1979 onwards – one of *Clan Cleansing*'s central themes – has intensified their impact. Even today those who try to reclaim their place and property in areas that were clan-cleansed often meet with violence enabled by political elites. Indeed, the outcomes of the violent, clan-based, political and territorial “unmixing” of Somalis, in which large-scale, clan-based violence against civilians such as the campaign of clan cleansing played a major role, are still unfolding in Somalia as we speak. Referring to such processes, as Laitin does, just as underlying identities reasserting themselves and failing to adequately acknowledge how the state and/or the political class shaped and continue to shape clan identity constructs an ahistorical understanding of clan identity whose explanatory power has proven and is proving to be inadequate.

Clan Cleansing takes clan identities very seriously; it simply refuses to take them for granted as something always already known. It does not see them as stable monolithic social forms that submerge and reemerge at different times, but tries to understand how, why, and through whose agency their meanings and roles change in specific diachronic and synchronic contexts (See also Kapteijns 2010). Indeed, the question of how clan identity could become a force so lethal that an unprecedented, large part of the Somali people were targeted for death and expulsion in its name is one of the central questions of the book.

2. On the clan policies of the Barre regime:

Prof. Laitin's response to my book brings to light serious problems with his understanding of M.S. Barre's policies towards clan. He insists that Barre tried to lessen the political relevance of clan until 1978, when "clan identities resurfaced in ... the wake of the Ogaadeen tragedy" (para. 5). The reductive notion of clan identities "resurfacing" — in this case "after a decade of socialism and a national language" — is a persistent thread in Laitin's thinking that has already been noted. What is surprising is how Laitin in his praise for Barre's approach to clan overlooks a major policy the Barre regime implemented from its earliest days in power: its discrimination, persecution, and forced exile of tens of thousands of individuals of a particular clan. This political and economic persecution, which was followed by the first state-sponsored campaign of large-scale, clan-based violence against civilians in Mudug in 1979-1981, calls Laitin's assertion into question, as was also pointed out during the WPF seminar. Why is it not on his radar?

Laitin describes the moment in 1980 at which he became aware of what he calls Barre's "clan genius," a genius that lay "in fully understanding how *best* to make use of the still-relevant clan system" (para. 4 from end, my bold). This "best use," of course, consisted of masterminding clan resentments and sowing clan hatreds, a clear example of the impact the political and state class had on clan consciousness and identity. Moreover, one cannot help but wonder whether Barre indeed developed his clan genius only after 1978, as Laitin claims, or whether he had possessed this skill and practiced it from the beginning of his rule. Readers may want to consult the masterful 1995 dissertation and submission to this blog by Daniel Compagnon.

Two small claims Laitin makes in his section about Barre are inaccurate. *Clan Cleansing* never calls or considers Barre's approach to clan "invented" or "anachronistic" (para. 4), nor can it be fairly accused of "writing off the entire Barre dictatorship as a 'kleptocracy'" (para. 5). Laitin bases the latter on a reference the book makes to the regime's final years and ignores the whole of Chapter Two.

3. On clan hate-narratives:

Laitin's critique of the analysis of clan hate-narratives in *Clan Cleansing* reveals two basic misunderstandings of its arguments, each of which will be discussed in what follows.

First, Laitin believes that clan hate-narratives are nothing new, for Somali poets such as Sayyid Mohamed Abdille Hassan and others were masters of clan invective (para. 6 and 3rd para. from the end). What Laitin misses is that *Clan Cleansing* draws on a very specific concept here, namely Ben Lieberman's concept of "mythical national hate-narratives," which I call "mythical *clan* hate-narratives." Liebermann uses this concept to show how the kind of group hate-narratives that help persuade people to perpetrate crimes against humanity *differ* from the stories about other, factual and fictional, earlier group grievances, including the kind of poetic invective to which Laitin refers.

The group hate-narratives that take on a genocidal charge use *mythical time* – the long-term history of group grievances that lie at the core of this group's identity – to overwhelm *everyday time*, that is to say, *the time of everyday life*, which neighbors, friends, classmates, colleagues at work, and so forth, had more

or less peacefully shared irrespective of their clan backgrounds. (This is how such narratives come to constitute the rationales and justifications for large-scale communal violence). The hate-narratives that become charters to kill, moreover, further differ from other/older stories about grievance and exclusion because they convey a pressing urgency and hold that remedying the grievances at the heart of group identity is a matter of group survival and can ONLY be addressed by targeting all members of another group for brutal violence NOW. *Clan Cleansing* represents such mythical clan hate-narratives as something fundamentally new and documents their roles in the clan cleansing of 1991-1992. Again, a view that regards

The book does not represent these hate narratives as a cause of this violence, let alone a sole cause, but as a major discursive trigger

everything connected to clan as ‘same-old-same-old’ cannot begin to explain the campaign of clan cleansing and the War of the Militias that followed.

Second, Laitin takes issue with the book’s “argument that clan hatreds were driving unspeakable violence by the perpetrators” (3rd para. from the end). This is an inaccurate simplification of the argument *Clan Cleansing* makes about the role of clan hate-narratives as rationales and justifications of

the crimes against humanity it calls the campaign of clan cleansing. The book shows how mythical clan hate narratives (such as the allegation of Daarood allochthony and “100 years of Daarood domination”), together with the code words that stood in for them (such as *faqash* and *haraadiga Siyaad*), played a role in facilitating and justifying the large-scale violence Somali civilians perpetrated against other Somali civilians in the name of clan. However, the book does not present these hate narratives as a cause of this violence, let alone a sole cause, but as a major discursive *trigger* – one that, in the context of a complex and diverse set of causes, outlined throughout the book, helped move the perpetrators to violence.

4. On the motivations of the perpetrators:

Because *Clan Cleansing* does not include interviews with perpetrators, Laitin argues, the “motivations of the murderers in the Somali case remain obscure, and may not coincide with the causal factors that Kapteijns outlines” (2nd para. from the end). It is true that my book largely depends on sources other than hindsight oral accounts, whether from survivors, bystanders, perpetrators or rescuers. However, this does not mean that the motivations of the clan cleansers “remain obscure” in the book. Indeed the verbal acts of *that very time-period* and the explicit *contemporary* references to the mythical clan hate narratives in songs, poems, radio broadcasts, print and audio-visual news reports, diaries, eyewitness accounts, scholarly accounts, and so forth constitute a rich body of evidence. Would the motivations of Nazi perpetrators and the role of anti-Semitism in them have “remained obscure” if we had had no access to the hindsight accounts of the actual perpetrators? This is untenable and the same is true – *mutatis mutandis* – for the Somali case. That a memory project by Somalis, as outlined in *Clan Cleansing* on p. 19 and pp. 233 ff., would add to our understanding of what motivated the many individuals who participated in the clan cleansing campaign is obvious. However, this should not blind us to the substantial body of evidence about perpetrators’ motivations *Clan Cleansing* has already gathered.

5. On the shortcomings of the Manifesto:

Laitin's understanding of the Manifesto initiative of May 1990 is problematic because of its simplistic focus on clan. In Laitin's view, the Manifesto group must be taken to task for excluding important political leaders who were Isaaq by clan background, men such as Mohamed Ibrahim Cigaal and Ibrahim Meygaag Samatar. *Clan Cleansing* happens to cite the opinions of both men when they were interviewed about the Manifesto initiative a few months later (*Clan Cleansing* pp. 114-115). Neither complained about having been excluded but expressed their *political* disagreement with, and opposition to, the Manifesto project. Both believed that the time for political compromise with the regime had passed. Moreover, Meygaag was actually not even present in Somalia. He was in the U.S., where he was actively campaigning for the SNM and mobilizing members of the Somali diaspora for supporting a final *military assault* on Mogadishu rather than the *political compromise* proposed by the Manifesto Group.

Clan Cleansing analyzes the failure of the Manifesto initiative in terms of the *political* break-lines within the group: its members' differential relationships to the administrations of the past (e.g., some had been in Barre's prisons while others had politically and/or economically prospered) and their widely divergent political ambitions for a post-Barre political disposition. My book is quite explicit about the fact that the clan backgrounds associated with the major political and politico-military organizations in Somalia at this time were relevant to the political positions they took towards the ways in which the Barre regime should be brought down. Blaming the Manifesto Group for excluding their Isaaq peers or, for that matter, *Clan Cleansing* for presenting an analysis that contextualizes and explains political actions and behavior in terms that encompass more than clan, is reductive and ill conceived.

6. On the use of language and political correctness:

Laitin takes issue with two linguistic/typographical conventions adopted in *Clan Cleansing*, namely (i) when I refer to a group as “‘the’ clan X” (instead of simply “the clan X”) and (ii) when I refer to a caste group as a “so-called minority group.”

In the book I often refer to a particular clan as “‘the’ clan X” not because I want to be seen as “politically correct” but because I want to be analytically precise. I use a typographical convention that destabilizes clan as a single, monolithic actor only to *avoid attributing single agency to whole clans*. My rationale is that clans did not kill but that people killed in the name of clan. I assert that a concept that cannot distinguish between the masterminds, inciters, organizers, perpetrators, bystanders, or rescuers in a particular episode of violence is imprecise and stands in the way of the kinds of truth telling that may lead to social repair.

However, I do not just refuse to blame whole clans and stop my analysis right there; I go on to pursue the question why, during the campaign of clan cleansing, so many people flocked to clan banners and perpetrated violence in the name of their clan. My analysis of the mythical clan hate narratives offers a partial answer to that question. It presents a way of trying to avoid the reification of clan while pursuing in very concrete ways how constructions of clan identity and sentiment, as shaped by past and present,

played a role in the violence. Is Laitin not off the mark when, in the last para., he construes such an approach as a failure to “acknowledge the social foundation of clans and clan identities?”

Laitin also takes issue with my choice of words when I wrote that General Samantar belonged to a “so-called minority group” (para. 8). There is a reason why *Clan Cleansing* avoids using the caste label that has been imposed on particular Somali individuals and groups. I take the emotional power of group identity and identity labels in Somalia so seriously that, whenever my argument makes the use of clan or caste names inevitable, I try to signal that I reject the hierarchies implied in them. For me, calling the general by the name of a particular caste, as Laitin asks me to do, is like using the “n”-word in English. To my mind, casually using such caste names signals racist collusion *unless and until the people who have been labeled this way reclaim this name as a badge of honor*. I hope that they will want to do so one day, but that decision is theirs.

Bibliography

Compagnon, Daniel. 1995. “Ressources politiques, régulation autoritaire et domination personnelle en Somalie: Le régime de Siyaad Barre (1969-1991).” Ph.D. dissertation, Political Science, Université de Pau et des Pays de l’Adour.

Farah, Nuruddin. 2000. *Yesterday, Tomorrow: Voices from the Somali Diaspora*. New York: Cassell.

Kapteijns, Lidwien. 2010. “I. M. Lewis and Somali Clanship: A Critique.” *Northeast African Studies* n.s. 1, 1: 1-25.

Lieberman, Ben. 2006. “Nationalist Narratives, Violence Between Neighbours and Ethnic Cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina: A Case of Cognitive Dissonance.” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, 3: 295-309.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.